DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY COMMITTEE

BACKGROUND GUIDE

NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL MODEL UNITED NATIONS • MARCH 17-20, 2010

© 2009-2010 International Model United Nations Association, Inc. Used and distributed under license.

NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL MODEL UNITED NATIONS

The 36th Annual Conference • March 17-20, 2010

Lisa Cuesta
Secretary-General
University of Pennsylvania

Jerry Guo
Director-General
Dartmouth College

Ryan Burke
Conference Director
University of South Carolina

Emily Robertson
Chief of Staff
Duke University

Othman Ouenes
Chief of External Relations
Stanford University

Andrew Porter-Price
Director of Security
University of Connecticut

Ileana Adamez
Under-Secretary-General
University of Massachusetts, Boston

Max Ross
Under-Secretary-General
Dartmouth College

Erin Williamson
Under-Secretary-General
Florida State University

Luke Russell
Under-Secretary-General
University of Connecticut

Jenny Gai
Under-Secretary-General
University of Pennsylvania

Chris Talamo
Under-Secretary-General
Dartmouth College

NHSMUN is a project of the International Model United Nations Association, Incorporated (IMUNA). IMUNA, a not-for-profit, all volunteer organization, is dedicated to furthering global issues education at the secondary school level.

October 2009

Dear Delegates,

Let me be the first to welcome you to the 2010 National High School Model United Nations Conference! My name is Max Ross, and I serve as the Under-Secretary-General (USG) of the General Assembly Mains Committees (GA Mains). As far as my duties as USG are concerned, I stay heavily involved with your Directors, Assistant Directors, and Chairs during both the preparation and simulation parts of the conference. Essentially, my job is to ensure that all aspects of the GA Mains committees run smoothly, from the time that topics were selected last spring to the time that actual debate takes place in committee this winter. You will soon see for yourselves that your dais is both exceptionally talented and extremely dedicated, and there is no doubt that this will be reflected in your experience at the conference. My advice to you: come well prepared, have an open mind, and get as much out of the experience as you possibly can! The conference will only be as great as its delegates are, and I have no doubt that all of you will help make NHSMUN 2010 productive and enjoyable for all.

Now, a little bit about myself: I was born and raised in New Jersey, and despite the bad rap that out-of-state residents frequently give it, I would never want to grow up anywhere else! I'm currently a junior at Dartmouth College in Hanover, New Hampshire, where I'm studying Romance Languages and International Studies. I have a number of hobbies and passions, but none is quite as thrilling as the airing of a new episode of *LOST*. That's right—if you would ever like to discuss theories, characters, or your favorite scenes of what I consider to be one of the finest shows in the history of television (or if you are not a *LOST* fan and need someone to explain why it is a valuable time investment), please contact me!

Including my years as both a delegate and staff member, this year's conference will be my seventh consecutive NHSMUN, six of which I have spent on GA Mains. Needless to say, I am very fond of these larger committees. I greatly enjoy the diverse perspectives that surface during debate, and I'm sure that this year will be no exception. Although I will not be sitting on the dais, I will be floating around the different GA Mains committees and ensuring that everything is going smoothly. I will be highly accessible throughout the conference, and if you see me walking by, please stop me and introduce yourself!

Your esteemed Directors and Assistant Directors have been hard at work for the past year working with the rest of staff to ensure that you will have the best experience possible at the conference. I'd like to ask all of you to put effort into these topics and to respect the mission of our conference and the integrity of our staff.

I'm very excited to meet all of you in March! Until then, please feel free to contact me at the email address or telephone number below with any questions or concerns that you may have.

Sincerely,

Max Ross
Under-Secretary-General, GA Mains
maxross03@gmail.com | (732)-859-6466

NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL MODEL UNITED NATIONS

The 36th Annual Conference • March 17-20, 2010

Lisa Cuesta
Secretary-General
University of Pennsylvania

Jerry Guo
Director-General
Dartmouth College

Ryan Burke
Conference Director
University of South Carolina

Emily Robertson
Chief of Staff
Duke University

Othman Ouenes
Chief of External Relations
Stanford University

Andrew Porter-Price
Director of Security
University of Connecticut

Ileana Adamez
Under-Secretary-General
University of Massachusetts, Boston

Max Ross
Under-Secretary-General
Dartmouth College

Erin Williamson
Under-Secretary-General
Florida State University

Luke Russell
Under-Secretary-General
University of Connecticut

Jenny Gai
Under-Secretary-General
University of Pennsylvania

Chris Talamo
Under-Secretary-General
Dartmouth College

NHSMUN is a project of the International Model United Nations Association, Incorporated (IMUNA). IMUNA, a not-for-profit, all volunteer organization, is dedicated to furthering global issues education at the secondary school level.

October 2009

Dear Delegates,

Say hello to NHSMUN 2010! I'm Ada Petiwala, your Director for the Disarmament and International Security Committee, more commonly known as DISEC. I write to you from the greatest place in the world—Fez, Morocco—where I am currently studying Arabic. Though I am a big fan of linguistics, I am formally a Political Studies major/International Relations minor at Bard College, the second greatest place in the world. As a Bardian, I take pride in the fact that I go a school that "puts the 'liberal' in 'liberal arts.'" It's a big change from my hometown in Long Island, New York, but I've come to love the scenic Hudson Valley and all the peace it brings to my otherwise hectic life.

When I am not concocting schemes to study or live in the Middle East, I am either discussing music (indie rock/hip-hop/rap/electronica/world/classical… you name it, I love it), organizing and decorating my dorm room, practicing the many aspects of Harry Potter culture, or anticipating the next episode of True Blood. I'm also very involved in activities at Bard; I'm a Student Senator, a DJ at WXBC, and Publicity Coordinator for the Muslim Students Organization.

This is my sixth time participating in DISEC, including being Assistant Director of the committee last year. While I've debated a variety of topics at several conferences, the ones I chose this year are not only my personal interests, but reflect new and old matters DISEC must confront. Security sector reform in Africa is an emerging issue and challenging to discuss. Because it is constantly evolving, researching it will be a demanding process. Though Demining is a well-worn topic, it necessitates innovative, efficient, and clear solutions; this requires knowledge on the prolific history of mine action, as well as up-to-date information on the issue. I have full confidence that you will prepare thoroughly for committee, and cannot wait to read your position papers, as well as listen to your opinions during debate.

Use the resources that are available to you; there are some excellent websites and journals out there that specialize in disarmament issues. Keep yourself updated on several security-related matters. Many topics in DISEC are intertwined, and knowing about them can help you in committee. Above all, if you have any questions—about the topics, DISEC, NHSMUN, or anything else—feel free to contact me. I am always available to chat, and would love to help you!

DISEC 2010 is going to be fantastic. See you in March!

Sincerely,

Ada Petiwala
ada.petiwala@gmail.com

16 Dallas Avenue
New Hyde Park, NY 11040

A Note on Research and Preparation

Delegate preparation is paramount to a successful and exciting National High School Model United Nations 2010 Conference. We have provided this Background Guide to introduce the topics that will be discussed in your committee; these papers are designed to give you a description of the topics and the committee. They will not give you a complete description of the topic areas and they will not contain the most up-to-date information, particularly in regards to rapidly evolving issues. We encourage and expect each delegate to fully explore the topics and be able to identify and analyze the intricacies of the issues. Delegates must be prepared to intelligently utilize their newly acquired knowledge and apply it to their own countries' policy. You will find that your state has a unique position on the topics that cannot be substituted for or with the opinions of another state.

The task of preparing and researching for the conference is challenging, but it can be interesting and rewarding. We have provided each school with a copy of the **Delegation Preparation Guide**. The Guide contains detailed instructions on how to write a position paper and how to effectively participate in committee sessions. (**Note:** some position papers have unique guidelines that are detailed within respective committees' Background Guides.) The Guide also gives a synopsis of the types of research materials and resources available to you and where they can be found. A brief history of the United Nations and the NHSMUN conference are also included. The annotated rules of procedure complete the Delegate Preparation Guide.

An essential part of representing a nation in an international body is the ability to articulate that state's views in writing. Accordingly, it is the policy of NHSMUN to require each delegate (or double-delegation team) to write position papers. The position papers should clearly outline the country's policies on the topic areas to be discussed and what factors contribute to these policies. In addition, each paper *must* address the Research and Preparation questions at the end of the committee Background Guide. Most importantly, **the paper must be written from the point of view of the country you are representing at NHSMUN 2010** and should articulate the policies you will espouse at the conference. All papers should be typed and double-spaced. The papers will be read by the Director of each committee and returned at the start of the conference with brief comments and constructive advice.

You are responsible for sending a copy of your paper to the Director of your committee. Additionally, your delegation is responsible for bringing a bound copy of all of the position papers—one for each committee to which your school has been assigned—**to the conference** (to be submitted during registration). Specific requirements of the bound copy have been sent to the faculty advisor/club president. In addition to position papers, each delegation must prepare one brief summary statement on the basic economic, political, and social structures of its country, as well as on its foreign policy. Please mail country summary statements to the Director-General of NHSMUN 2010 at the address below. All copies should be **postmarked** no later than **February 16th** and mailed to:

Jerry Guo, Director-General **Hinman Box 658** **Dartmouth College** **Hanover, NH 03755**	**Ada Petiwala, Director** **16 Dallas Avenue** **New Hyde Park, New York 11040**
(Country Summaries)	**(Individual papers)**

Delegations are required to mail **hard copies** of papers to the Director-General and Directors.
NHSMUN Staff will not consider e-mail submissions as an adequate substitution.

Delegations that do not submit position papers to Directors or Summary Statements to the Director-General will be ineligible for awards.

COMMITTEE HISTORY

Devoted to "the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security," the Disarmament and International Security Committee (DISEC) of the United Nations (UN) focuses on the topics of arms control, pacifistic conflict resolution, and global safety. As a General Assembly (GA) Mains Committee, DISEC is inclusive of all UN Member States, serving as a large forum for discussion on all topics regarding international security. Each member has one vote.

Though the Security Council (UNSC) is the only UN body capable of imposing force upon Member States (economically, militarily, or otherwise), the First Committee makes valuable recommendations to the Security Council on all aspects of matters that place global peace at risk. Because the First Committee's legislative process incorporates the voice of every Member States to the UN, its resolutions are always respected and considered by the Security Council. These resolutions are also salient due to their normative nature.

The First Committee is part of a large global security framework. Besides the Security Council, this framework includes the Conference on Disarmament (CD), the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), and the UN Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR), amongst other NGOs and regional groups. To this end, the First Committee focuses on achieving definite goals, such as establishing a Nuclear Weapons Free Zones (NWFZ) in Central Asia. As DISEC resolutions must be passed by the entire General Assembly (GA), it is necessary that the First Committee be centralized upon specific, accomplishable tasks; broad undertakings may otherwise hinder the efficiency and passing of the First Committee's legislation.

Successes in DISEC include curbing illicit small arms and light weapons (SALW) trafficking to establishing important weapons treaties, such as the 1970 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and the 1996 Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT). DISEC has not wavered in its mission to promote international disarmament; recent items on its agenda include non-state terrorist actors, reduction of military budgets, and the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

SIMULATION

The Disarmament and International Security Committee (DISEC), or the First Committee, is one of the largest bodies comprising the United Nations. All Member States are represented within the First Committee, making the body's debate extremely productive and its resolutions comprehensive. Because delegates of the First Committee number in the hundreds at NHSMUN, it is evident that the smooth flow of committee highly depends on the decorum practiced by those present within the room. Delegates must respect one another and the Dais in order for all voices and ideas to be heard during committee sessions.

Without proper observance of decorum, DISEC can easily become a chaotic environment. Delegates will caucus outside of the committee room while formal debate based on the Speaker's List continues inside. Notes will be passed and double delegations will be split up to visit different caucus blocs. There will be pressure to quickly write comprehensive resolutions, and near constant conflict and communication with your fellow delegates will make for an intense experience. At times, the committee may seem to be in frenzy, but with the guidance of the Dais and the rules and procedures, your collective efforts will converge to produce resolutions of astonishing magnitude. It is easy to be frustrated, especially in such a large committee, when you have little opportunity to speak formally, but don't be discouraged; instead, utilize all the chances you have to express your ideas and potential solutions, whether through resolution writing, caucusing, or the Speaker's List.

Please look over NHSMUN's rules of procedure carefully—not only will this help maintain proper decorum, but the committee will move faster if unhindered by questions on parliamentary procedure. Remember that these rules can be altered or suspended at the discretion of the Dais if it will improve the flow of debate. The Dais is here to guide you on all committee matters; while the Director and Assistant Director are always available to discuss substantive issues, questions on procedure can be generally be deferred to the Chair. Through excellent preparation prior to the conference and solid decorum during committee sessions, you can make DISEC 2010 a rewarding experience for yourself, your fellow delegates, and the Dais.

Something that will aid in delegate preparation is a new program NHSMUN is starting this year: blogs. Each Director and Assistant Director will maintain a committee blog covering new developments and critical analysis of issues related to the topic. Delegates are encouraged to comment on the staff's posts and ask questions; starting a dialogue before the conference will lead to more comprehensive and effective solutions. View the committee blog at:

http://nhsmun2010disec.wordpress.com

The staff will update the blog at least three times a month. **Delegates are highly encouraged to stay updated on new posts and whatever information the dais provides.**

SECURITY SECTOR REFORM IN AFRICA

TOPIC A

INTRODUCTION

A state's safety is imperative to its daily functioning and relies upon the efficient performance of its security sector. The security sector is generally defined as being inclusive of all entities involved in managing, directing, overseeing, or monitoring a state's safety and protection against threats to its security ("Security" 2). This may involve a range of actors, from judicial institutions such as national court systems to statutory security actors, as in those state-mandated groups specified to enforce the rule of law. Statutory security actors include the national military and police workforce, which have the active authority and instruments to administer immediate and long-term security services.

In post-conflict situations, the security environment may be extremely unstable, rendering the official state security sector powerless to combat internal chaos. In this scenario, outside security actors are more than likely to step in. United Nations (UN) peacekeeping missions as well as militaries provided by regional organizations are examples of such external forces. Others may include "armed opposition movements, militias, and private security firms" (Anderlini 31). The combination of these entities juggling various defense operations in different areas of one state can result in a disorganized overlap. For example, police reform efforts supported by NGOs may interfere with the national government's police reform programs. Often, this convoluted mixture of internal and external actors may worsen an already precarious situation. This is demonstrative of the need to have a liable and proficient national security sector; without it, security management is left dangerously in the hands of actors with indefinite objectives.

In order to prevent the disintegration of national safety of Member States around the world, security sector reform (SSR) is essential. SSR is the intricate task of transforming the security sector into a highly professional, accountable, cohesive, and efficient unit. In developing countries, SSR is largely focused on enhancing the security sector's efficiency and responsibility. In transitional countries, where tense political changes are underway, SSR's main aim is to create democratic governance methods that will stabilize the security sector; in effect, the goal is to instate civilian control of the security sector, as opposed to dictatorial administration. Finally, in post-conflict countries, SSR typically involves entirely rebuilding a damaged and ineffective security sector.

SSR is conducted for a variety of notable purposes:

- strengthening internal responses to crises specific to the state,
- eliminating institutional corruption and bribery,
- fostering trust between the state and its citizens by valuing human security,
- ensuring that "forces do not regroup to destabilize or pose a threat to peace," and
- protecting human rights (Anderlini 31).

In Africa, the security sector has an exceptional need for transformation and fortification. Violent, recurring conflicts are a seemingly perpetual problem on the continent, and capable, qualified security actors are needed to maintain peace and security while these governments rebuild their bureaucracy (Bendix 10). The 1990s demonstrated an increase in the number and intensity of armed conflicts in the region, costing at least US$18 billion per year in stabilization efforts. Physical threats, such as small arms and high crime rates, remain constant. Even for civilians, "public safety is low in many countries and internal stability remains a problem" (12).

Thus far, efforts to provide African nations with a common SSR strategy have fallen short, and most attempts at reform have been focused on individual states. Even the kinds of entities partaking in SSR have varied dramatically, including "private security/military companies, local militias, guerilla armies, warlords, vigilantes, and community policing groups," resulting in a widespread lack of well-coordinated national police and military personnel (Bendix 13). However, this isolated treatment of SSR cannot continue, as the conflicts

that African states are facing are often driven by international forces. The porous borders between African states help promulgate the trade of small arms and light weapons (SALW) between nations. Refugees also flee conflict nations by crossing international borders, which too often destabilizes the nations that host these refugees. Because of these international dimensions to conflict, an organized effort on the part of the international community to restructure African police and military is crucial. A success in transforming the security sector, especially in relation to ongoing border and SALW control attempts, can foster extreme positive change in the African continent. Not only will violent conflict be stemmed if protective forces are strengthened, but citizens throughout Africa will gain the confidence to rebuild their lives knowing they are safeguarded.

HISTORY AND DESCRIPTION OF THE ISSUE

"In cases of severe conflict, the public (state) police appears to be either irrelevant, or themselves a part of the problem; and armed force tends to be monopolized by the military and various non-state militias. It is striking that… politicians seem to have 'given up' on existing police structures, and created new armed units that act as roving agents of repression, control, and regime protection."

-Janine Rauch
"Recent Conflicts in Police Reform and
Post-Conflict Africa"

The power dynamics between African militaries and police forces have a long, complex history from the colonial to post-Cold war era. In general, the military has enjoyed an increasing role within the security sector, whereas the police force has been significantly devalued, because governments have tended to rely upon militaries and rival militias to prop up dictatorial or one-party rule. For instance, the ruling party *Mouvement Revolutionaire Nationale pour le Developpement* (MRND) in 1994 Rwanda gave ultimate power to the national civilian militia it funded, the heavily-armed *interhamwe* (Rauch 118). Nigeria also underwent a series of military coups in 1966 and 1993, consequentially empowering a one-party military regime until its 1999 democratic elections (98). Civil wars in South Africa, Angola, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), and Sudan, amongst many others, have also fueled militaries and militias to take control over society – bearing much violence and instability as a result. This has also come at the expense of the police force, which has lost credibility as a serious protector of the state and its peoples.

Colonial and Transitional Africa

The security sector during European colonial rule of Africa was highly "apolitical, impartial, and law-abiding" (Legwaila 34). It was primarily composed of the army, police force, and the prison service; its function was to protect colonies from outside attack as well as internal insurgency. Despite this efficiency, almost no African administration or officers existed in any of these armed forces. "Africans were recruited only into the lowest ranks…and were subservient to European and Asian officers" (Raunch and van der Spuy 78). European officers would oversee African colonies, forcing European "military culture, structures, doctrine, training, standards, and discipline" upon the indigenous inhabitants (Legwaila 34). It is important to note that the colonial security sector was founded upon the need to protect colonial interests instead of the African natives: "the colonial state never reached the depth of social penetration…as an instrument of foreign domination whose borders were arbitrarily imposed by colonial fiat, it remained simultaneously distant and oppressive" (Bendix 12). Hence, "human security"—the idea that security institutions exist foremost to protect civilians—did not exist.

As a rule, armies in Africa had only ceremonial value; the real power lay in the hands of the colonial security sector. Colonial administrators so fiercely disciplined the Africans' regiments that the African security sector operated under a political ethos that was rigid, undemocratic, and discriminatory. However, this did not mean that colonial personnel themselves were not subject to the rule of law, as they "operated strictly within prescribed legal parameters" (Legwaila 35). As a result, the colonial security sector was valued by colonial governments as "an invaluable part of the apparatus of implementing the colonial agenda" (35). African natives, however, viewed the colonial security sector as the oppressor instead of their own government. This

approach later shaped their own security sectors after decolonization. In the post-colonial period, the African security sector—especially military actors—became the offshoot of authoritarian African government, exercising subjugation and control much like the colonizing officers had exercised over the African armies.

The transitional era proved to be brutal, especially with the introduction of rebel groups, non-state militias, and even colonial security sectors, all of which vied for control of the newly independent nations. Often, the main conflicts were not with the government, but between non-state actors. The Movement for the Popular Liberation of Angola (MPLA), for example, not only fought against the Portugese colonial government that ruled at the time, but also sought to "assure ascendancy over its rivals [other liberation movements]" (Rauch 62). With the looming threat of domestic rebellion as the primary cause of concern, colonial powers focused their entire military and police strength internally.

Liberation movements took advantage of lax border patrol by colonial security forces to import weapons from abroad—the MPLA heavily relied on Cuban military support (62), and the illegal importation of these weapons was only possible because of Angola's porous borders. Similarly, the Sudan-DRC border is still poorly patrolled, primarily because it is "characterized by gallery forest, marshland, and savannah," inhibiting patrol forces from effectively moving up and down the border (Marks 14). Additionally, traditional ties between ethnic groups separated by arbitrary borders set during colonial times did not falter; the Logo and Kakwa, tribes common to Sudan and the DRC, have always had the ability to cross the shared border with ease (15). Consequently, licit and illicit SALW trade was facilitated due in large part to strained police and military forces at the border.

Post-colonial Africa

Many African states agreed to a peaceful decolonization process, such as the southern African nations under the Lusaka Manifesto of 1969. Despite this phenomenon, however, historians note that "due to the intransigence of the white-minority-ruled states that clung to power doggedly, armed struggle emerged as a viable option" (Molomo 6). Many liberated African countries underwent civil wars and were subject to violent multiparty elections, leading to a total shift in security sector objectives. Whereas during colonial administration the security sector was largely apolitical, during post-colonialism, African governments relied on military and police forces as agents of political agendas.

The Angolan Marxist-inclined MPLA originally fought and won against Portuguese colonial control; for 40 years thereafter, it battled against rival liberation movements to retain its one-party military regime. Even after the institution of democratic elections and the adoption of a constitution in 1992, which changed the government structure of Angola, the country's police and military structures remained parallel to those of the Portuguese armies that had colonized them. As Janine Rauch posits, "Part of the [Portuguese] colonial legacy has been a strong security police widely feared for its repressive tactics" (Rauch 63). Angolan police forces were instruments of the MPLA's repressive regime.

Because of the political infancy of these regimes and the lack of a strong military tradition in the newly independent states, the security sectors of African nations were dependent on foreign support. During the Cold war era, the Angolan government and its security sector relied especially on the help of outside states for militaristic expertise, support, and defense materials. As mentioned previously, Cuba was a major supporter of the MPLA, but rival Angolan liberation movements still transferred arms illicitly across borders in order to agitate and overthrow the MPLA government. In effect, the MPLA's military was successful in carrying out the country's political objectives in squashing opposing rival groups. It is lamentable, however, that the protection of "human security" or even efficient patrolling of the state's borders were under-accomplished during the MPLA regime.

Case Study: South Africa

South Africa serves as an exception to these principles; even though it began the post-colonial era with a typical political police force, its security forces has since been molded into a very progressive actor in the

state's efforts towards SSR. During South Africa's administration under successive generations of Dutch and British colonists, the colonial security sector existed to carry out colonially-oriented objectives despite the withdrawal of the United Kingdom; one of these objectives was discrimination against black South Africans, who made up 80% of the country's population (Rauch 20). This lead to "the enforcement of racist and unpopular laws [which] created a profound crisis of legitimacy for the criminal justice system in South Africa" (20). Police and military officers crushed popular dissent in South Africa's *de facto* civil war, forever obscuring their objectives as the primary protectors of civilians. As part of the counter-revolutionary strategy, these uniformed services executed "leadership through mass detentions, trials, harassments, and assassinations" (20). As a result, police and military services were extremely unpopular among the citizenry, and were thus specially targeted by pro-democracy advocates.

By the time apartheid rule ended in the early 1990s, the legacy of violence continued to haunt the security sector; "the 'deregulation of social control' during the end of apartheid and the negotiation period facilitated increased levels of crime and social violence" (Rauch 21). With the precedent set by the colonial security services' through their use of aggression and subjugation as means of obtaining and preserving power in the not too distant past, violence became accepted in all spheres of life. However, after the 1994 elections and the adoption of a new constitution, police and military reform was at the forefront of institutional change in South Africa. Because fostering state legitimacy was a primary goal of the new South African government, accountability and oversight in the security sector was particularly stressed by new administrations. Though apartheid rule left South African perceptions of the security sector completely tattered, proceeding democratic governments have moved to create more trust between the uniformed force and the people they serve.

Rocklyn Williams from the Institute of Security Studies writes:

> "Virtually all African security institutions, in general, and armed forces, in particular, are near mirror reflections of their former colonial security institutions. The rank structure is the same with very few exceptions (one of them being the largely unsuccessful attempts by the National Party in South Africa in the 1950s to create a rank structure based on those of the original Boer commandos), the doctrine has admitted to few indigenous revisions (notwithstanding the fact that many of the new defense forces were constituted out of indigenous African guerrilla armies with their own, non-Western traditions and doctrines), their institutional culture aping that of either the British, the French or the American value system and the ideological themes that pervade their discourse are manifestly European in origin" ("Africa and Challenges" 5).

Before the end of apartheid, the African security sector was so rooted in its colonial origins, it was unable to mold to the needs of the African people it vowed to protect. Instead, it answered to the political elites who had their own agendas unrelated to the benefit of their constituents. Historically, African communities have depended upon outside forces from the UN and other NGOs for physical protection and monetary aid. However, as the South African police and military became more democratic and accountable, less aid was required from outside actors. The lesson that should be drawn from the case of South Africa is that it is especially important for the international community to aid in transforming African police and military personnel into legitimate, professional security actors, and while these reforms are taking place, external aid can be effective. Should reform not be introduced, though, the African security sector will be ineffectual and squander resources provided by external institutions, ad infinitum.

Case Study: Liberia's Security Sector

Liberia is a prime example of how SSR is currently implemented in Africa, and what improvements are necessary for reform efforts to be successful in the region. Having a history of criminal security actors and an inadequate police and military system, Liberia demonstrates that a country can indeed emerge from a weak security framework, albeit with only constant, pointed programming, definite amounts of physical support, and uninterrupted monetary aid from donor nations. Its current security sector is an uneven mix of professional military actors from outside of the nation and untrained internal security personnel. This

illustrates the necessity to legitimize national institutions in Africa in order to reduce reliance on external forces for daily security services.

From the mid-1980s to the late-1990s, Liberia underwent civil war and unrest under the rule of President Samuel Doe and, afterwards, President Charles Taylor. Taylor, having ended Doe's oppressive administration in Liberia's 1997 presidential elections, was seen as a symbol of safer times ahead. Because the "elections were intended to produce a government that would guarantee the safety and security of political parties in particular and the Liberian people in general," Taylor was directed towards restructuring "the army, police, and various security agencies to reflect the neutrality of the administration" (Malan 8). However, he immediately began to use several state security groups as his own private militia; under his government, a system was developed that "marginalized and hollowed-out state institutions," especially the security sector (1).

Instead of fulfilling his promises to unify and professionalize the security sector, Taylor "created a network of competing security units and militias, headed by long-standing supporters" (Malan 9). One of his most brutal moves was replacing the Krahn Armed forces of Liberia—the national military—with untrained troops that reported directly to him (Gombert 3). Any soldiers who were not a part of Taylor's cadre were subject to institutional brutality. Most neutral security forces, especially in rural areas, were not paid well enough to support themselves on a daily basis; because of this, security forces would "compel local communities to provide food, shelter, and labor assistance" (Malan 9). It was clear that Taylor's security apparatus "was meant to serve the regime, not the nation, and was designed, controlled, and used—rather, misused—by him mainly against Liberia's people and neighbors" (Gombert 5). It was no coincidence, then, that Liberian society developed a deep mistrust of law enforcement and military officers, and citizens were unable to believe that the state security sector would ever benefit them.

After the Taylor presidency and the discovery of the governmental machinery that supported his rule, it was clear that the Liberian security structure was characterized by "redundancy, inadequate control, and incoherence" (Malan 10). The Liberian administration featured fifteen agencies and groups, which were tasked with overlapping yet ambiguous security tasks; power remained highly centralized in the office of the President. Perhaps most disturbingly, despite the fact that the security sector is given special attention in the Liberian Constitution, and the legislative branch of the government has always had the constitutional power to implement SSR, none of these privileges have been actively practiced. The goal of the post-Taylor government was to "build a 3,500 member police force and a 2,000 member armed force." This task has since been completed, but some of these personnel still lack basic training and the professionalism of legitimate national security forces (Gombert 5).

Due to these inadequacies, outside donors have been major actors in SSR in Liberia, though these efforts have been largely ineffective. For example, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) provided support to the Liberian National Police (LNP) by donating money for high-level training, though very few officers were actually involved in the short-term training process (the training by the USAID lasted less than a year). A few lessons may be drawn from the USAID program. As mentioned earlier, fifteen groups are charged with security tasks in Liberia; the reform of just one of these many groups can not change the efficiency of the security sector as a whole. Additionally, if SSR is to be executed at all, it must be a widespread and enduring process. Weak and erratic funding, as well as lack of follow-through, has jeopardized the SSR process in Liberia. Donor nations and organizations have not created long-term programs that would help sustain national security forces in the future, plainly missing the point of SSR in the first place.

Currently, the security sector relies on the UN Mission in Liberia (UNMIL), the impartial UN peacekeeping force stationed in the country. However, UNMIL does not have the capacity to be the primary defender of the state. Dependence upon this force has only diminished positive opinions about the Liberian military and police sector, especially in the eyes of the Liberian people. Furthermore, compulsive reliance upon private military companies (PMCs) has lowered confidence in national security actors. For example, the PMC DynCorp was hired by the US in 2005 to train and professionalize thousands of Liberian security forces; such

dependence on outside forces fosters less positive views on the strength of the national government itself ("Liberia:"). Finally, because SSR is implemented in such a sporadic manner in Liberia, the country's borders have been neglected, allowing for cross-border illicit arms trade and even mercenary movements across state lines. It is important to note that the lack of a cohesive SSR policy on the parts of both national and international actors has generated this massive security hole.

A Cycle of Instability

Though the security sector in each African state has its own issues with legitimacy and efficacy, certain problems face the entire continental African security sector at large. Borders, for one, are constant causes of dispute. In Africa, ethnic tribes are separated between two or more countries, and their location in geographically compromising areas causes patrolling to be an especially difficult task. Overextension of military and police personnel is another cause for concern; because internal instability is widespread, uniformed services are highly concentrated in conflict zones and are infrequently present (visually and authoritatively) in peaceful zones, which risks the spread of conflict zones. Put simply, "the African state does not broadcast its powers to the peripheral concerns of its territory" (Rauch 11). Also significant is the fact that most of Africa's wars have been within the state, and that postcolonial African politics have entangled the once-apolitical security sector actors. Military officers and policemen are "perpetrators, targets, and casualties" of war; the objectives of the security sector, let alone SSR, are therefore unclear for the African nation and its people (11).

Moreover, the Liberian case exemplifies the general process SSR has undergone in the African continent. Countries emerging from civil war and militaristic regimes are given attention as places SSR must be implemented; as such, international donors and private companies enter those areas to transform the security sector. However, SSR processes with either indefinite objectives or goals common to other SSR processes only muddle security sector development, and such redundancies only reduce the efficiency of the holistic process. Additionally, irregular funding, inefficient training, and impractical use of sponsorship have weakened SSR practices in Africa. Also, reliance upon outside security actors for long periods of time cripples the SSR agenda in terms of strengthening national security forces. After colonialism ended, it was expected that Africans would have a sense of ownership over their own burgeoning governments and security forces, but the security sector has failed them to this day. The African people's attitude towards security institutions has not changed at all; they still view the security sector as a perpetrator of crime and distrust it almost entirely.

CURRENT STATUS

SSR: Attempts to Create a Comprehensive Approach

Though SSR is an emerging concept, several international and regional organizations have attempted to define its principles, goals, and limits. The first of these is the UN, which has historically practiced SSR through various peacekeeping missions. However, it still lacks the capacity and support to undertake a variety of SSR activities because SSR has never been the overarching goal of peacekeeping agendas. This problem was addressed in 2007 by the C-34, Member States of the UN Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations. Publishing a report in the same year, the C-34 "recognized the need for a holistic and coherent approach to SSR within the UN system and recommended the need for an overall strategy to identify and clarify the main elements of the concept of SSR" (McFate 8). In January 2008, a response to this report was published by the UN entitled "Securing Peace and Development: The Role of the United Nations in Supporting Security Sector Reform." This was the first UN document addressing SSR in an all-encompassing manner. The report presents an open definition of security sector reform with the broad understanding that many "effective and accountable security institutions are essential for sustainable peace and development" (McFate 9). UN involvement in areas of implementation will be secondary to national and regional action. The report also places strong emphasis on national leadership and that every SSR initiative must be tailored to specific contexts. Though the UN plans to "better support national authorities undertaking SSR" via the UN SSR team, its focus concerns only post-conflict SSR (McFate 9). Border control issues as well as SALW

trafficking are not addressed as long-term problems, whereas organizational issues within the UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) are discussed with more vigilance.

The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) has been an early leader in constructing a strong foundation for SSR implementation. Recognizing the connection between effective security and sustainable development, its Development Assistance Committee (DAC) published comprehensive SSR guidelines in April 2004, as well as a detailed handbook on SSR implementation in 2007. The handbook is one of the most useful materials currently circulating within the security sector field; it covers issues in post-conflict SSR as well as the application of SSR sector by sector. However, the OECD lacks the specificity required to address each national situation, and only speaks in general terms. It is oriented towards establishing broad principles and guidelines, not offering explicit recommendations for security sector development: "it lacks the operational specificity found, for instance, in military field manuals that explain in granular detail how to conduct an operation from start to finish" (McFate 8). The handbook is also written from the perspective of donors instead of stakeholders: "it portrays SSR as something that gets done to developing countries, not something they decide to do – and drive and shape – with partnership donors" (8). Nevertheless, the handbook is a very practical introductory document for SSR donors, though it only references local and national ownership in rhetoric.

Similar to the OECD approach to SSR, the Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF) is centered on creating best practices for the security sector, with a special focus on democratic governance methods. As a developer of the SSR concept, DCAF supports the operations of international organizations conducting SSR, but does not provide physical aid. In 2008, DCAF introduced its International Security System Advisory Team, which aims to coordinate SSR programs, develop training, and provide countries with experts in the field. Because the DCAF'S Team consists of only four experts, however, it is uncertain whether its SSR capabilities can be used in a country-wide context. But, since DCAF's SSR initiatives have been fairly recent, it is expected that they will develop over time to influence reform strategies (McFate 10).

Only a handful of international organizations have recognized the significance of SSR and its relation to stability and peace within a state. Acting upon this realization, they have developed the concept within important SSR documents and handbooks. But, what remains to be seen is a comprehensive set of guidelines that combines SSR policy and practice. SSR is being understood as a necessary tool to legitimize government military actions by political leaders, but there are no specific proposals on how to act upon this conceptualization. Moreover, regional history and current circumstances are rarely taken into consideration, and instead are replaced by general guidelines that are so broad that they can fit into any context. How should rank structure change to make the military more organized? How can police capacity be increased in order to patrol borders more effectively? What can governments do to increase civilians' trust in security institutions? Such pertinent questions must not be answered with rhetoric but with definite ideas for utilization. In Africa especially, leaders are charged with the daunting task of reforming an institution that citizens have lost total respect for, as it has been an historical executor of violence and suppression. To guide them, the international community must recognize challenges particular to the African situation, and provide insightful, practical, and specific SSR implementation guidelines.

SSR Management at the National Level

Many African countries have undertaken SSR projects in recent years, especially to restructure their military and police sectors. South Africa has been a major proponent of SSR, and it was the first African country to raise the issue of SSR in a UN Security Council open debate on SSR on 20 February 2007. It has since also hosted the International Workshop on Enhancing Security Sector Reform in Africa: Towards an African Perspective in Cape Town. Representatives from 47 countries were present, including representatives from 25 African countries. The goals of the Workshop were to:

- Provide a forum through which African states could develop a common perspective on security sector needs,

- Allow African states to contribute policy recommendations on how the UN should handle SSR conceptualization and implementation in Africa, and
- Improve the cohesion and cooperation between the UN and other multilateral organizations willing to support SSR in Africa (A/62/554-S/2007/687).

The Workshop published a number of valuable insights. In its case studies of South Africa and Sierra Leone, it identified different conditions and areas of reform: South Africa's main challenge is to transform local institutions before confronting the national sphere, whereas Sierra Leone's efforts must be directed towards political commitment and long-term support for SSR (A/62/554-S/2007/687). The value of coordinated regional dynamics was also highlighted; in the case of the DRC, external support was not directed towards the right sectors. As stated by the co-chairs of the Workshop Peter Burian and Dumisani S. Kumalo, "The challenge is to ensure external support for local initiatives rather than local support for external initiatives" (A/62/554-S/2007/687). Though the Workshop emphasizes greatly that all SSR initiatives in Africa should be driven by local and national policymakers, it also notes that external fiscal support is necessary for any initiatives to succeed.

Besides encouraging action on the part of other African nations, South Africa has moved forward in its own police and military transformation. After the undue influence of the South African National Defense Force (SANDF) as a promoter of apartheid rule, it moved to make the Department of Defense (DoD) a more transparent and accountable unit, in order to cultivate a strong relationship between civil society and the government. Instead of waging war with its own people, as it was under the 'Total Strategy' employed to discriminate against blacks, the DoD's structure had to be transformed rapidly and completely. The Defense Secretariat, for example, had its main structures revitalized and its mission clarified. Each role within it—Minister of Defense, Secretary for Defense, Chief of the SANDF—was narrowed to specific, goal-oriented tasks. Also, the new SANDF force was reduced from its size during apartheid rule and consisted of units and levels deployed for very different defense situations. There is a special focus on decentralizing forces and moving them towards various South African regions, so as to spread security forces in a viable, efficient manner. Though the reduction of military forces will lead to less South African initiatives outside of its borders, it is still necessary for the South African people to begin trusting the institution as a legitimate security force once again ("South" 20).

Other states such as Cote D'Ivoire, Zambia, and Botswana have followed in South Africa's footsteps, also reducing their militaries and restructuring their police forces similar to the South African model to allow for widespread SSR. Louis Matshwenyego Fisher, commander of the Botswanan Defense Force (BDF), asserted that "most conflicts in the world are internal as opposed to wars between states," indicating a need to shift focus "from a state-centered to a people-centered definition of security" (Molomo 6). With this idea in mind, the Botswanan constitution tasks the police force with maintaining internal law and order, while the military provides territorial enforcement. Some of the top security challenges are indeed cross-border crime and illicit small arms trade; illegal Zimbabwean immigrants, for instance, pose an economic *and* security problem for Botswanan officials. While the organization and mandates of Botswanan military and police forces are more advanced as compared to Botswana's neighboring countries, the country lacks a comprehensive defense policy to coordinate these two entities. The "formulation [of the national defense policy] is ad hoc…largely a response to issues as they arise" (Molomo 10).

Zambia's SSR program focuses on promoting security in a bottom-up fashion. "The very concept of security is cause for fear," posits Eric Bonnemaison; the country is acting to remove this fear in its people (Phiri 6). Subsequent to seventeen years of one-party rule, during which professionalism was damaged in the armed forces and "defense force appointees to political offices were not trusted," Zambia established SSR initiatives in 1996 (6). One of Zambia's first programs introduced Victims Support Units (VSU) into police stations, to directly handle human rights abuse cases. Each VSU is mandated to "deal with issues involving vulnerable persons in society…deal with issues concerning property grabbing…[and] equally provides counseling and empathy to victims of rape, incest, defilement, and child abuse. It also reports on perpetrators of such offences so as to enable arrests and prosecution" ("Zambia"). By empowering VSUs, the Zambian government hopes to remove civilian distrust of the police force, as well as foster professionalism and

accountability within its security sector. Another notable act was the opening of the Parliamentary Committee on National Security and Foreign Affairs to the Zambian public; allowing civilian participation in SSR increases trust and transparency between the government and its citizens. An added positive step towards SSR is that Zambian defense forces have understood that regional security is essential to the country's own security. To prevent a spillover of the conflict in the DRC to their nation, Zambia has made it a priority to keep border patrols along the Zambia-DRC border well-manned in order to stem conflict that could arise from an influx of the DRC's refugees (Phiri 8).

Generally, national action by African countries is limited because their political environments are either manipulated by single-party rule or by "big men" shaping weak parties' policies, through government corruption. As a result of the "close association between former liberation leaders and political leadership" and their "inherited predisposition towards secrecy in security matters," African defense policy formulation has been hidden from the public (Cawthra 10). The legislatures that usually shape such policy, such as parliaments and the committees within them, "are weak and often lack capacity, and in some states they simply do not exist" (Cawthra 10). Another problem is the undermining of national action by donor countries. Sometimes, these countries are frustrated with the corrupt nature of some government structures, and instead choose to funnel resources and money into non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that practice SSR. This contributes to overlapping, inefficient SSR programs as well as the undermining of national initiatives.

Regional and Sub-Regional SSR Influences

Pax Africa, the African Union (AU), and the Organization of African Unity (OAU) have been developing their own SSR initiatives in a theoretical setting, though implementation in terms of providing physical training forces from any of these organizations has yet to be seen. The AU, for instance, has held two workshops since 2006 on SSR issues, but they have resulted in very broad, principle-based resolutions; there is no indication that it is progressing towards a specific, regional mechanism through which SSR can be executed. However, the AU is slowly formulating the Common African Defense and Security Policy (CADSP), which may include SSR guidelines – though it makes clear that it does not want to interfere in national proposals (Cawthra 10). The OAU also practices this policy of non-intervention in African states' internal affairs.

Sub-regional organizations are varied in their SSR approaches, but many of them overlap with one another or are too weak to be effective. The Eastern African Community (EAC), for example, promises joint training, sharing of intelligence, and joint operations, but it consists of only three members: Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda (Cawthra 5). On the contrary, the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) is not only one of the oldest sub-regional organizations in Africa, but also "has the most sophisticated security management system in Africa, and the most experienced in terms of peacekeeping and peacemaking" (Cawthra 5). Countries within this organization have signed a mutual military assistance treaty, through which an attack on one country means an attack on all. Border security is inextricably tied to economics stability, for the smooth flow of goods in and out of the country demands reliable and trustworthy security. Based on this principle, ECOWAS promotes SSR for the financial security of the region as well.

International SSR Donors and Private Military Companies

As mentioned earlier, several international organizations have been clarifying the concept of SSR and working toward crafting police and military reform programs. The World Bank has emerged as a leading finance institution for SSR; more and more, it funds programs that "fight corruption, creating transparent and accountable budgets" (McFate 10). The Bank's agenda has also recently included security by tying certain poverty reduction strategies to SSR. The European Union (EU) involves itself via reform of "police, prosecutors, judges, and prison managers in a comprehensive fashion" (McFate 11). It's European Security and Defense Policy specifically focuses on police and military reform, but the training programs it implements are small and limited to a short period of time. Although these training programs are effective for the modest number of officers it affects, they don't focus on building long-term efficiency.

Private military companies (PMCs) are agents of SSR themselves; countries hire these companies to manage security problems or outsource for training of the state force. However, this devalues national security policies, and places national security in the hands of non-state actors. PMCs often have unknown objectives and goals, which make them a risk themselves to the security of the host nation; their use in crisis situations can complicate outcomes, and their use in non-crisis situations calls their motives into question. Companies such as DynCorp and Xe, formerly known as Blackwater Worldwide, perform security operations on the behest of national governments, but SSR is meant to move away from reliance on these third-party actors. While PMCs are valued for their professionalism and organizational capacity, it is important to note that they are paid to operate within countries. Ultimately, national money is funneled towards an outside source rather than fortification of internal forces. Hence, using PMCs to patrol borders and combat SALW trade may stabilize chaotic country situations, but in the long-term national police and military forces are weakened. It is imperative to create guidelines by which African national governments can ensure SSR without the meddling of non-state actors in matters of top-priority country security.

BLOC POSITIONS

African States

Many African states are in need of some aid regarding their SSR programs, be it financial or organizational. Nations leading the way in SSR initiatives—namely South Africa, Botswana, Zambia, and others—are influential in both bilateral security plans and regional security proposals. When it comes to military and police reform, the aforementioned states have perfected their practices and continually strive for organizational aptness. But, these states' national plans are specific to their contexts and their successes may not be repeated if their SSR processes are implemented elsewhere. Many African states, however, have not met with so much success. In conflict-ridden states such as the DRC or Sudan, SSR may seem a secondary process to procurement of basic food and health supplies. These states oftentimes look for external actors to support their security policies, and may not embrace SSR programs that require extensive spending on their parts. Overall, African states are generally in favor of increased foreign aid for security sectors and SSR alike, though the individual national security situations of each state will color just how extensive and necessary support may be.

Developed and Donor States

Donor states, or states that provide financial or physical support towards a cause in another country, play a huge role in this debate. They not only help form SSR policies in a theoretical sense but also provide the financial backing for African SSR programs to be successful. The United Kingdom (UK) has designed an SSR strategy specific to Africa, seeking to tackle security shortcomings from the perspective of development. Its African SSR strategy is focused on four specific goals: analysis for policy development, partnering with other countries for institutional reform, capacity building through networking, and mainstreaming SSR into multilateral activities (McFate 11). Donor states also host many of the headquarters of large PMCs, and so have the power to regulate them and their policies. Even without PMCs donor states frequently send soldiers and policemen to African nations to support African security sectors through peacekeeping missions and other programs, and so these governments often function similarly to PMCs. Developed states and donor states both have the capacity to help African SSR initiatives, but their willingness to involve African leaders in decision-making processes is rare. They do not trust their funds and services in the hands of African governments, and instead look to NGOs and other organizations to levy power against the national forces. Their perspective is largely that of a benefactor rather than that of a collaborator.

Developing States

The issue of SSR is certainly not limited in scope to Africa, although the scope of this committee will be limited to African situations. However, many (but not all) of the principles established here are also applicable to developing states in other regions that similarly face civil wars and bureaucratic corruption regularly. These

states are also looking for conceptual solutions to their instability and advice on how to implement them, and will generally want to increase the attention paid to SSR. Like the African states, they will generally push for more funding and assistance from outside agents, but may do so with varying enthusiasm depending on their individual security needs. In committee, these states will also seek solutions that can easily be applied to their nations so that they may benefit from the productivity of the committee.

COMMITTEE MISSION

The First Committee's ultimate goal is to provide guidelines to effectively reform the police and military forces in Africa, under specific, context-based SSR proposals. This means that all perspectives—national, sub-regional, regional, and international—must be taken into account when creating a resolution. The First Committee will also focus on reforming the police and military with the long-term idea of combating SALW trade and controlling borders; these are, after all, some of the most pressing issues in Africa today and will be heavily influenced by goal-oriented SSR strategies. Essentially, the First Committee's hard work in debate should result in a comprehensive approach to confronting SSR in Africa.

It is especially important to note that the delegates are not responsible for creating solutions that relate to all aspects of illicit small arms trafficking or border control. Though the scope of the First Committee certainly allows for resolutions on these matters, they should only be mentioned in relation to police and military reform. Delegates should pay special attention to the history of security institutions in African sub-regions, and how they can restructure or strengthen the current security sector to promote peace and stability in the continent. Think about how the UN can work with regional organizations, as well as other NGOs, to promote SSR initiatives. Remember that ultimately, SSR implementation is in the hands of national governments – it is up to you to create effective, feasible solutions that these governments can execute.

LANDMINES: THE URGENCY OF DEMINING
TOPIC B

"The events in this paragraph take no more than one hundredth of a second to unfold. The sudden exertion of pressure detonates a low explosive that in turn detonates a high explosive charge. The blast sends a violent wave of energy through human tissue that carries with it shattered fragments of metal, plastic, earth, vegetation, bone, flesh, clothing, and footwear. The remains of the limb are now connected to the body by slivers of flesh. The wound is saturated with a cocktail of particles delivered at speeds of thousands of miles an hour by the blast wave."

-Lydia Monin and Andrew Gallimore,
The Devil's Garden: A History of Landmines

INTRODUCTION

Landmines are the deadly, unseen remnants of war. They are conventional weapons "designed to explode from the presence, proximity, or contact" of a person or a vehicle (Landmine Monitor Executive Summary 2008). Used primarily in warfare, these indiscriminative "victim-operated traps" have been valued as an effective battle tactic: "weapons that lie hidden for days, weeks, or years and can still cause damage to enemy soldiers during an attack are useful to armies short on personnel" (Monin 46). Landmines are dangerous because of their longevity; even after a war is over, a mined area can cause serious injuries to civilian passers-by, including unsuspecting children and livestock. Victims of landmines either immediately die, or suffer from "blindness, burns, destroyed limbs and shrapnel wounds," resulting in lifelong health problems ("What is"). Mined areas devastate agriculture-based local economies as well, for their fertility is rendered useless by lethal landmines scattered in the ground.

There are two types of landmines:

- **Anti-tank landmines (ATL)**: These landmines are specifically designed to detonate under the pressure of a vehicle, especially large tanks. Because of this, they are less harmful to humans as they require at least 350 pounds of applied pressure to set off. Additionally, ATLs are large in size and easy to remove. As such, the use of ATLs has significantly decreased after World War II—many modern militaries view them as inefficient because opposing forces can quickly locate and extract them ("Landmines").
- **Anti-personnel landmines (APL)**: APLs are far more destructive than ATLs, principally because they are small, undetectable, and are intended to cause severe injury to the person that detonates them. Over 300 types of APLs exist today. Some are activated immediately by pressure from above, while others explode only following a number of disturbances. Some even have protection mechanisms designed to injure the deminer. The most common types of APLs are blast mines, which explode immediately when they are disturbed. Other frequently used APLs are fragmentation mines which are packed with small metal fragments called shrapnel that add further injury after the explosive injury caused by the detonation of the landmine. Such mines often have the ability to injure or kill anyone standing one hundred feet or closer to the mine (Monin 37).

Since ATLs are naturally antiquated and are largely out of use, the international community has placed less emphasis on prohibiting their production and use. Conversely, because APLs have humanitarian and economic drawbacks, the movement to limit them is quickly gaining momentum. The 1997 Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on their Destruction (also known as the Mine Ban Treaty) commits Member States to eliminate their use and production of APLs. One of the Treaty's specific goals is to influence Member States to "clear mines in their territory, or support efforts to clear mines in mined countries, within 10 years [of signing the Treaty]" ("Treaty Basics").

Though endeavors to clear mines, or "demine," have been constant on the part of many nations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and regional groups, there are several challenges during the demining process. First and foremost, the removal process is expensive; APLs take from US$3-30 to produce, but their extraction costs about US$1,000 to execute ("Landmines: A Deadly"). As mentioned earlier, some APL types are designed to detonate if taken apart by a deminer; this makes the demining process as life-threatening to the deminer as it is to the civilian population. Demining is by no means a quick procedure; it takes a well-trained expert an entire day to demine twenty to fifty square meters of land (4). Another factor slowing demining attempts is the fact that demining technologies still do not match the efficiency or reliability of manual demining, which does not leave mined areas 100% free of risk. These complicated issues only scratch the surface when attempting to demine large tracts of land.

Keeping in mind the challenges mentioned above, it is imperative that the international community coordinate a general demining scheme which all countries can follow. Current demining efforts are organized by several agencies, but the lack of synchronization, funding, manpower, and resources still impedes the demining process. By creating a comprehensive set of guidelines and providing unique solutions to the obstacles in demining, the First Committee can aid states party to the Mine Ban Treaty in meeting their 10-year demining goals and can even pressure non-Member States to accede to the Treaty and begin their own demining efforts. Landmines take 26,000 innocent lives every year, so the international community must move quickly to end this hazardous and widespread humanitarian danger (Garvin).

HISTORY AND DESCRIPTION OF THE ISSUE

The Greeks and Romans are credited with the creation of the earliest "victim-operated traps," using small objects to slow down their opponents. Their invention, the caltrop, was a piece of metal twisted to produce spikes; laying one on the ground with one spike up was guaranteed to injure attacking forces. Though caltrops contrast greatly from modern landmines because they did not use explosive material, they are seen as landmine antecedents for their use as "substitute soldiers" (Monin 46). They were also "force multipliers," used to boost military strength (Roy 3).

The initial use of an explosive device in the battlefield can be dated back to 2000 BC, when the Assyrians and ancient Egyptians would "dig a mine under the corner of an enemy's fortification, fill the hole with flammable material, and light it," resulting in the collapse of the targeted structure (Monin 40). These early landmines differed from modern landmines in two ways: they were not set off by the victim but rather required the implementer to light it for detonation, and they had no long-term value. These types of landmines were also used by the early Ming dynasty of the 14th to the 17th centuries against Mongol invaders; Chinese archeologists recently discovered "iron balls with a small hollow extension...used for loading and detonating powder" (45). The precursor closest to the modern landmine, however, was invented during the American Civil War of the mid-1800s: soldiers employed "a landmine with explosives in it that could unwittingly be detonated by its intended victim" (46).

Minefields and their Inevitable Proliferation

World War I

ATLs were first created and employed during WWI, though they were mostly "large and awkward" (Monin 46). Since they were easy to detect but took a great amount of pressure to detonate, ATLs were effortlessly removed from the battlefield by opposing armies, and used against the original producers of the weapon. To counter this strategy, armies created APLs to protect the ATLs from being removed and displaced. APLs would set off as soon as enemy soldiers attempted to remove the ATL, disabling them completely. APLs were further used as "defensive barriers and to close roads" (47). They had a great "nuisance value," in that departing armies would scatter them sporadically in areas they were leaving, to act as "lethal obstacles" for any opposing armies entering the battlefield. It is important to note, however, that APLs were not used as a

main war tactic during World War I. Instead, "new weapons of the industrial age gave rise to defensive tactics and technology that marginalized them [APLs]" (Roy 8).

The Inter-War Years

During the inter-war years, Germany was the leader in the development of military technologies, and it placed special emphasis on developing effective ATLs and APLs. The invention of a "light-weight, easy-to-handle, powerful explosive" named trinitrotoluene (TNT) in the 1920s resulted in the production of more reliable landmines (Monin 48). Additionally, landmines became valued for their psychological impact; with mines scattered around abandoned land, it was easy to diminish opposing armies' morale and deter them from practicing effective defense strategies. "Inter-war doctrines and training manuals were recognizing the importance of landmines and postulated that they would be laid in large numbers in future wars" (Roy 9). Countries such as Russia, Italy, and France all researched and developed a variety of ATLs and APLs during the inter-war years, entering WWII prepared with metallic mine detectors (Monin 49).

World War II and After

The invention of the German S-Mine prior to WWII provoked fear in the Allied armies and significantly increased the number of casualties on the battleground. The S-Mine could be detonated in three different ways, though it was not the only APL used during the war. Field Marshal Montgomery, Commander of the British Eighth Army in North Africa, portrayed the difficulties presented by this new fragmentation mine:

> "The mine is now a definite factor in war, and has come to stay. The anti-tank mine presents no difficulties that cannot be easily overcome, as infantry can walk over it. But the S-Mine (a German jumping fragmentation mine), and the booby trap are new problems that have got to be faced up to in no uncertain way and with a very robust mentality. If this is not done the troops will get nervous of this and mine-conscious, and then you are done" (Brooks 149).

Besides the aforementioned S-Mine, the Germans also invented the formidable scatterable mine, which was perfected by the Italians who later enabled these mines to be scattered from air (Monin 55). The Axis powers also developed a remote-controlled mine, allowing for armies to direct when their mines would detonate.

The most common landmines used during the war were APLs with trip wires. These mines were interestingly made specifically to injure, but not kill soldiers, so as to drain the enemy army's resources. While the Axis powers continually improvised with mines in order to outmaneuver the Allies, the Allies improvised their methods of detecting, clearing, and burying landmines. Mines were left in abandoned camps, trees, and even civilian houses along roads that armies were known to travel along. It was during this time that the proliferation and dispersal of APLs became key battle tactics for both opposing forces.

Landmines were often laid in "ordered minefields" to slow down the enemy's advance; the Germans were especially proficient in this, measuring out the distances between their ATLs and APLs (Monin 51). Complex minefields were created with a combination of ATLs and APLs, but sometimes ATL fields were adjacent and separate from APL fields. The army laying the mines would usually keep maps of exactly where the mines were, which opposing armies often sought to steal so that they, too, might be able to navigate the mine fields. Although laying minefields was initially an orderly process, towards the end of the war landmines became frequently employed. This was because both sides were losing manpower and the morale to fight tactical battles. Landmines, then, were laid in any area lacking adequate army personnel. The Soviet Union, for instance, "used millions of mines in defensive belts, [though] they also used mines offensively along roads to disrupt supply routes and to take unsuspecting soldiers by surprise," and the "Japanese laid a considerable number of minefields against the Allies, using them in the jungle, along beaches and anywhere they were short on manpower" (52-53).

Finally established as legitimate conventional arms, APLs were a "constant, unseen threat that could psychologically break a soldier," and were used in almost every conflict after the World Wars (Monin 63).

Landmines were used in nearly every battle of the Cold War, even though by that point landmines were so widespread in use that they often harmed the very soldiers that laid them. Especially during the Vietnam War, despite having superior technological weapons, American soldiers were unable to cope with the raw threat of landmines. The Viet-Cong forces "did not lay protective minefields, but instead took their mines to the American camps by targeting roads and footpaths" (Roy 30). Now that landmines could be found anywhere in Vietnamese soil, during wartime casualties were the highest; after the war, landmines caused devastation to Vietnamese civilians every day. This scenario is relevant to wars in Afghanistan, Kosovo, Angola, Iran, Cambodia, and many other countries—landmines were laid in countless, unmarked areas and to this day, these un-cleared areas are a source of fear and destruction to those countries' visitors and citizens.

Attempts to Clear Minefields

Wartime Efforts and Humanitarian Demining

During WWII, the British honed their demining techniques, largely in response to the Germans' prolific use of landmines during the war. Because Axis landmines were either charted by Axis maps or set in obvious locations, it was not difficult to demine them. To obliterate minefields, the British fired explosive cables and torpedoes that not only blasted through the minefield's fence, but also detonated any of the landmines within the minefield. Though this was not a thorough technique and was extremely destructive to the land itself, it was the first of many attempts to avoid landmine obstacles. British tanks would be attached to "huge threshers or flails on the front of them," which would strike the ground and detonate mines "in much the same way that today's mine-clearance vehicles do" (Monin 56-57). Manual clearance was also attempted. Mines were collected, put into a pile, and had their detonators removed. However, some landmines were so corroded that they exploded when the deminer touched them and subsequently caused severe injuries and countless deaths. Because landmines were in their early stages of development and very unreliable, they would even sometimes detonate without any apparent cause. This impeded the demining process.

Demining was at first a military-operated process, as armies would demine during the war in order to ensure fewer landmine-related casualties. However, as the great wars ended without the completion of the demining process, it became evident to the international community that demining was a *humanitarian* task. Humanitarian demining and mine action, then, became large movements on the part of donor countries and NGOs during the 1980s. Machinery began to be employed by the newly created United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS), and research was done to better manual clearance techniques. Countries such as Mozambique, Angola, and Afghanistan—some of the most heavily mined countries in the world—received their own mine action missions with the purpose of demining civilian areas and restoring normalcy to the lives of landmine victims.

Though initial efforts to utilize military demining techniques with civilians were sponsored by the UN in 1987, under a national reconstruction effort in war-torn Afghanistan, they ultimately failed due to a lack of demining equipment as well as organizational mismanagement (Monin 166). The first successful humanitarian mine clearance program was set up in 1988 when the HALO Trust, a non-profit organization specializing in the "removal of the hazardous debris of war," established demining teams in Afghanistan ("The Halo"). In many ways, HALO's program instituted the foundation for growing mine clearance projects throughout the world. First, it focused on slowing down the demining process, which usually "required speed in order to clear small, defined paths…to create 'safe' routes through minefields" during wartime (Monin 166). Previous techniques employed by armies involved detonating mines with rollers, flails, and fuel-air explosives or "using armoured ploughs to push the mines aside"; these methods were quick, but very unreliable and extremely damaging to land (167). The HALO program in Afghanistan instead focused on thoroughness, employing military experts with the technical knowledge in mine-laying, to replace machines in terms of mine clearing; the idea was that human deminers provide 100% assurance that an affected area is completely cleared, leaving no doubts that the affected area is safe enough for release to the public. HALO also placed emphasis on clearing as much land as possible for widespread community use, deviating from military clearance methods which only focused on creating safe, but very small paths through minefields. The attention paid to efficiency,

diligence, and pace ultimately made the HALO strategy highly effective and future humanitarian demining programs were based off of the tenets and techniques used by the organization.

United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS)

In the late 1990s, there was a surge in the attention given to mine action, with civilian deaths amounting to an estimated 35,000 per year in mined countries (Monin 124). The UN formed its Mine Action Service in 1997 with the mandate to not only send UN Mine Action Teams (UNMATs) to manually and efficiently clear mined areas, but to also educate communities about the dangers of landmines and provide long-term health services to landmine victims. UNMAS describes the five pillars of demining:

- Removing and destroying landmines and explosive remnants of war and marking or fencing off areas contaminated with them.
- Mine-risk education to help people understand the risks they face, identify mines and explosive remnants of war and learn how to stay out of harm's way.
- Medical assistance and rehabilitation services to victims, including job skills training and employment opportunities.
- Advocating for a world free from the threat of landmines and encouraging countries to participate in international treaties and conventions designed to end the production, trade, shipment or use of mines and to uphold the rights of persons with disabilities.
- Helping countries destroy their stockpiles of mines as required by international agreements, such as the 1999 anti-personnel mine-ban treaty ("What is Mine Action?").

The UNMAS has developed into one of the most extensive mine action programs in the world. Its fourteen UN agencies carry out mine action operations, which can be implemented depending "on the scope of the problem, the amount of assistance requested by national governments, and on any special circumstances, such as large-scale movement of refugee populations or the need to deliver relief supplies to isolated mine-affected communities" ("Where It Happens"). Much of its work, however, depends on the financing it receives from donor countries. Though it has cleared over 12,000 hazardous areas in Afghanistan, the UNMAS reports that some of its lesser-funded programs have failed to prevent an increase of landmine deaths in the period between 2006 and 2008 ("Afghanistan Summary").

The 1997 Mine Ban Treaty

Two years after it was signed, the Mine Ban Treaty went into effect in 1999, providing demining goals which Member States would have to reach over the following ten years. 156 countries have ratified or acceded to it as of 1 June 2008, and two other nations have signed but not ratified the treaty ("The Ottawa Convention: Signatories and States-Parties"). The timeline that the Mine Ban Treaty establishes is very rigorous; Article 5 indicates that each state party to the Treaty must undertake "to destroy or ensure the destruction of all anti-personnel mines in mined areas under its jurisdiction or control as soon as possible but not later than ten years after the entry into force of this Convention for that State Party" (Mine Ban Treaty). It also indicates that if the proposed ten-year deadline cannot be met by the Member State, then it must indicate the impediments to its demining process, and detailed explanations on its current demining efforts and the financial aid it requires for future mine action (Mine Ban Treaty).

Member States have taken the treaty extremely seriously, by implementing national demining programs in coordination with outside donor governments and NGOs. The commitment on the part of countries such as Afghanistan, Burundi, and Sudan has led to complete stockpile destruction and the implementation of long-term demining programs (Landmine Monitor Executive Summary 2008). As of 2004, Djibouti, El Salvador, Kosovo, Moldova, and Costa Rica have all been declared mine safe ("Landmines Overview"). The number of landmine-caused deaths has decreased to an estimated 15,000 to 20,000 per year from the 35,000 deaths per year reported in the 1990s ("Landmines Overview"). This positive progress and dedication has pressured other Member States to fortify their own demining programs, or assist landmine-affected countries in their mine action. Still, Russia and China, two countries with an indefinite but extremely large amount of landmines

in their country, have yet to accede to the treaty. The United States, which funds various demining programs, still reserves the right to proliferate and develop the weapons because it has also not joined. Despite the Mine Ban Treaty's exceptionally positive influence on the development of effective demining programs, the fact that the countries containing the most landmines have yet to join the Treaty has an ill effect on Member States.

The International Mine Action Standards (IMAS)

The Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining developed the IMAS, in coordination with the UN Mine Action Service and mine action experts, to provide comprehensive and professional guidelines for countries and NGOs working towards efficient mine action. These guidelines evolve every year, and "name preferred methods and technologies for activities such as mine detection, mine clearance, destroying or disposing of landmines, and providing mine-risk education" ("How the Work is Done"). Additionally, the IMAS is unique in that it has formulated specific guidelines for landmine-affected countries that have requested assistance, namely Afghanistan, Albania, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Jordan, Laos, Mozambique, Sri Lanka, and the Sudan. Most importantly, the IMAS provides the quality management of mine clearing operations. Essentially, each component of the operation has its own level of efficiency that it must meet for the operation to be deemed complete. These high standards have been imposed to assure that when a mine clearing operation is done, that area is completely safe and risk-free. Though the IMAS provides the technical expertise necessary to conduct demining operations, the implementation of these guidelines has proven to be difficult for nations without the financial or physical capacity to demine.

Challenges to Efficient Landmine Clearance

Despite the IMAS standards that are in place, the worldwide UNMAS missions to demine, and the Mine Ban Treaty's constant pressure on nations to invest in mine clearance programs, demining has been a painfully slow process. The motives to clear landmines are clearly evident, but the actual demining process is so difficult to implement that land release goals (the intention of demining an area completely to bring it back for civilian use) are continually unmet. Though the process of demining may seem straightforward at a first glance, there are many obstacles preventing its widespread implementation.

Manual vs. Mechanical

There are two types of demining: mechanical and manual.

Mechanical demining is carried out by machines, largely "constructed or adapted from military vehicles or armored vehicles of the same or similar type with the same or reduced size" (Habib "Mechanical Mine Clearance Technologies" 4). While these machines clear the land of mines quickly, they lack efficiency and do not meet the IMAS/UNMAS quality assurance standards. Not all mines are destroyed, but the fertility of the mined area is—mechanical vegetation cutters clear out all undergrowth before destroying landmines. The most common vegetation and mine clearance machine used is the standard, armored European tractor, with a mounted hedge and verge cutter, but even it remains inefficient and environmentally unfriendly. Other types of mine clearance machines have flail systems: "They consist of a large number of chains with clearing elements similar to hammers, attached to them and connected to a rapidly rotating drum that beats and mills the ground. The flails hit the ground and either detonate or destroy all types of landmines" (Habib "Mechanical Mine Clearance Technologies" 5-6).

Manual demining is a hands-on process executed by professional deminers. This process is far more thorough than mechanical demining. The deminer usually uses a metal detector to scan for a mine, after which he or she "uses a prodder to feel, locate and identify the object causing the signal, after which the deminer carefully uncovers it" (Habib "Mine Clearance Techniques" 3). The mine is then deactivated and removed. Because mined areas usually have bits of shrapnel, cans, and metal fragments already within the ground, manual detection of landmines is a lengthy, painstaking process for the deminer. Dogs, insects, and bacteria then

come into play. Mine detection dogs can work on any type of terrain and are estimated to be about one thousand times more effective than machine metal detectors when it comes to sensing explosives.

Both types of demining have their shortcomings. Mechanical demining requires the purchase of expensive machinery, most of which is less effective than manual demining in the first place. Humanitarian demining is conducted for the purpose of land release, but land is destroyed by many demining machines. Mechanical demining also detonates landmines in a mined area, but after the landmines are destroyed they are not manually cleared, largely defeating the purpose of demining operations. Manual demining is an extremely long and tiring process, because metal detectors can be very ineffective in mined areas that have bits of metal or minerals mixed into the ground. Even the use of dogs in the process can be ineffective: they can only work several hours at a time, are easily "overwhelmed in areas with dense landmine contamination," and "become confused if they can smell explosive coming from several sources at once" (Habib "Mine Clearance Techniques" 3).

Financial Burdens

One mine can cost up to US$1000 to remove. The UN estimated in 1994 that the total cost to demine by 2010 (under the US 2010 Initiative) was US$33 billion; however, the amount of money pledged by donor governments (US$430 million) falls billions of dollars short of that amount ("Landmines: Problems"). Though the UNMAS has its own trust fund devoted to financing its many mine action projects, there is no guarantee that this money will last to complete long-term projects in countries such as Cambodia or Afghanistan. Countries are less willing to put money towards demining because the process can be so dangerous, especially when manual clearance is used. Besides funding problems for the actual implementation of mine action programs, there is also little money funneled towards research and technology for better demining machines and tools, namely detectors. The financial aspect clearly affects demining programs; less funding means less new technology and fewer techniques to efficiently clear mined areas, lessening the amount of mined areas cleared per day significantly.

Environmental Factors

The effectiveness of demining operation depends highly upon the environment of the mined area. In Africa, demining is known to be a "long, hot, laborious task" (Monin 124). The earth is often dry and hard, requiring deminers to first soften the ground with water before beginning detection. There are other hazards, such as snakes and other poisonous animals ready to strike the deminer. On the other hand, in Southeast Asia and South America, vegetation poses a huge problem. For instance, mined land in Cambodia is "now covered by thick scrub, bamboo, jungle or elephant grass. The vegetation must be cut and removed, piece by piece, by hand, to ground level to check for trip wires before metal detectors can be used to check for buried mines" ("Landmines: Problems"). In completely abandoned mined areas, the metal density within the ground is high, toughening the clearance process a great deal.

Aging "Mine Gardens"

An overlooked, but important obstacle to demining is the fact that many minefields were buried many decades ago. Changing environmental conditions, as well as changes in the use of that land, can alter the mapping of known landmines and can make the process more complex. Mines may be "corroded, waterlogged, impregnated with mud or dirt, and can behave quite unpredictably; stakes that carried fragmentation mines may have fallen over; trip wires may be caught up in overgrown bushes, grass or roots; wind gusts may sway a bush enough to pull a trip wire and detonate a nearby mine" ("Landmines: Problems"). Detecting such landmines can prove to be nearly impossible. They are "sometimes buried in deep ground to avoid discovery by metal detectors. Hitting a mine may simply dislodge dirt which allows the mine to detonate the next time a person steps on it. Similarly, deeper mines may not detonate when the ground is hard, but rain may soften the ground to the point where even a child's footstep will set them off" ("Landmines: Problems").

CURRENT STATUS

International Standards

Work has progressed on creating up-to-date standards for mechanical demining, all under the initiatives of the IMAS. Each year the IMAS Review Board meets to discuss and approve of new standards; these are highly valued by the international community, especially landmine-affected countries. Other organizations, such as the European Committee for Standardization (CEN) have created standards for demining machines and the processes to be utilized after their employed, so as to ensure greater efficiency in mechanical demining procedures (UNMAS Annual Report 2008 29). The UNMAS is particularly involved in regulating international standards, and its UNMATs attend conferences worldwide to enforce standards in both mechanical and manual demining.

New Technologies and Techniques

To counter the ineffectiveness of dogs in manual demining, mine clearance agencies have researched the use of rats in conjunction with dogs to increase chances of successful mine detection. Rats "have a better sense of smell, are cheaper to keep and maintain and they are more resistant to tropical disease. Since they are smaller, they can be transported even more easily. In addition, they are very suitable for repetitive tasks" (Habib "Mine Clearance Techniques" 4). Besides this, the development of robots to be used in place of human deminers is also being tested. This development is especially important because it can protect humans from being injured during manual demining; though this robotic demining is still in its very early stages of development, it can be extremely beneficial and efficient in the future, if used.

The most important developments happen to be in the area of mine detection. Mine detectors "need to achieve a high probability of detection while maintaining a low probability of false alarms," and past models have been very inefficient in this area. However, the creation of reliable mine detection and prodding machines is high on the priority list for UNMAS, which conducts conferences with the Geneva Centre for Humanitarian Demining annually to discuss improvements that can be made in both manual and mechanical demining.

Country Programs

Afghanistan:
Afghanistan has one of the largest mine action programs in the world. The UNMAS established Afghanistan's own Mine Action Centre in the late 1990s, and Afghanistan is seen as a model of how mine clearance programs should be crafted. Currently, there are over 525 mine action teams deployed nationwide, with a variety of mechanical and manual demining objectives. These teams led in the release of over 200 square kilometers of land back to Afghan communities, as a result of the destruction of 26,599 APLs and 657 ATLs (UNMAS Annual Report 2007 37). Afghanistan's mine action programs focus on integrating the needs of the community with landmine clearance, so the biggest and most hazardous areas are cleared first. The HALO Trust, a large demining agency, also engages local Afghans in their operations, building community support for the long and costly process.

Angola:
Though Angola remains one of the most heavily mined countries in the world, improvements have been made in clearing its mined areas since 2002. First, efforts have been made to include mine action in its poverty reduction strategy papers (PRSPs), allowing a greater chance of funding to be funneled towards a national mine action program. The government designed its 2006–2011 Strategic Mine Action Plan, and is implementing its outlined mine-clearing projects now. One of its main remaining objectives is the reuse of mined land for farming, because of Angola's primary agricultural and economic needs ("Angola").

Cambodia:
Despite 35 years of war and violence that have left Cambodia riddled with mines, the Cambodian government is embarking on an ambitious project to clear its country of mines by 2015 under its Mine Action Strategy ("Cambodia"). Its biggest challenge is maintaining the funding it requires to demine by their target date. However, Cambodia has already stated that they wish to complete their demining process independently and with little international aid. Recent surveys indicated that 200 square kilometers must be cleared, with another 733 square kilometers "requiring a combination of technical surveys and clearance due to the potential presence of mines" ("Cambodia"). The Cambodian Mine Action Authority (CMAA) also intends to incorporate Cambodians into its mine clearance projects by training at a provincial level.

Egypt:
Egypt's growing population has pressured it "to increase land usage…placing an ever-growing number of people in close proximity to mine-infested areas, even as landmine threats continue to restrict opportunities to gain benefits from land usage" ("Egypt"). As a result, Egypt has recently re-fortified its mine action programs, requesting a total US$3,351,700 in 2007 for its projects ("Egypt").

The aforementioned country programs are some of the most prominent in the world, though much work remains to be done in the demining arena. Many demining efforts give priority to the time-consuming process of clearing known, heavily-mined areas, ignoring other huge areas that are rendered unusable by the presence of just a few mines. This means that large amounts of land that can be easily cleared are not done so in a proper time frame, providing fewer opportunities for communities to use the land for economic and social benefit. What's more, there are still many areas where mines are suspected to be, but governments have not set out teams to determine whether or not these regions are of danger to the public; this is another detriment to local development. In some countries such as Iraq, where landmines number in the thousands, clearance techniques by those desperate to return to their homes have involved the burning of minefields. Civilians believe that such strategies detonate and destroy landmines, but in fact landmines sustain little damage or become extremely unstable; worse yet, burning of land increases the growth of vegetation in the area, making sighting of landmines even more complicated (Monin 191). Countries and organizations must work hand in hand in order to protect civilians from sustaining any more damage from these deadly, unseen weapons, and to prevent them from taking complicated demining efforts into their own hands.

BLOC POSITIONS

Developed States
While no state is free from the threat of landmines, developed states are plagued by fewer minefields than states nations. These countries have usually implemented demining programs on their own, usually because of mines laid during World War II, and are now largely free from the threat of mines. Most developed states have signed and ratified the Mine Ban Treaty, and are supportive of international efforts to reduce the number of mines around the world. However, these states are also the ones that are very skeptical of demining efforts. They often view manual demining efforts as being far too dangerous, and tend to prefer machine demining techniques. However, this financial support is necessary for the maintenance of the trust funds, and a concerted effort must be made to maintain the monetary resources for demining programs.

Developing States
Landmines can be found in almost every developing country around the world. For many states in which mines are a threat, but not a severe threat as it is in places like Afghanistan and Cambodia, support is high for international demining programs to help burden the manpower and financial costs of demining. However, because landmines might be sparser in these nations, it also makes detecting them much more difficult. Mines might be scattered throughout fields, or even simply isolated in small groups near civilian population centers, which are the most dangerous of all.

Heavily Mined States
Ironically, the most heavily mined states are not always the most supportive of demining programs. As we have seen in the case of Cambodia, some governments simply do not want any international aid to help solve

their landmine crisis. They consider the issue an internal one. These states are too often the sites of prominent, recent civil wars that have left the country and its people scarred by combat. The governments of such states are young and often unable to fully bear the costs of demining programs, and so do not choose to pursue the problem in favor of other pressing national issues.

COMMITTEE MISSION

The First Committee's ultimate duty is to develop a comprehensive method, in conjunction with the IMAS, UNMAS, and the guidelines set forth by the Mine Ban Treaty, to effectively demine on a worldwide scale. There are several countries that have not joined the Mine Ban Treaty and there is still landmine proliferation throughout the world. Fortunately, these are problems that are slowly diminishing due to the number of Member States that have ratified the Mine Ban Treaty and their commitment to banning landmines. Focusing especially on refining landmine clearance methods is important because demining is the only long-term method by which landmines can stop injuring and killing innocent civilians, especially children in conflict. It is **particularly** imperative that the First Committee keep in mind the differing landscapes of each mined country that contrast from other mined areas in the world, and pay special attention to this when creating a global mine clearance strategy.

RESEARCH AND PREPARATION QUESTIONS

As mentioned in the Note on Research and Preparation, it is imperative that delegates answer each of these questions in their position papers.

TOPIC A

1. What characterizes your country's security sector? What are its organization, structure, and purpose?

2. Does your country already have SSR initiatives? If so, what are they?

3. What is the relationship between military and police in your country? Describe the relations between these forces and civilians.

4. What role have outside institutions and donor nations played in your country's SSR attempts?

5. Which specific SSR initiatives does your country support with regard to police and military reform? How can you classify your country's SSR capacities and ability to transform?

6. What role does your country think the First Committee should play in SSR proposals? How can an organized effort be coordinated between the UN and other multilateral organizations, when implementing SSR agendas in Africa?

7. What is the role of private military companies in SSR? Does your country view them as legitimate security actors?

TOPIC B

1. What is your country's history with landmine use? Has it used landmines in warfare, exported or imported landmines, or created any new types of landmines?

2. Does your country have a strategic, national plan for demining?

3. If you are a mined country, how have landmines affected your economy and the livelihood of your citizens?

4. If you are a donor country, how much funding have you put towards demining programs? Have you provided any other types of assistance towards the cause?

5. Has your country implemented the International Mine Action Standards (IMAS) when demining?

6. What new technologies or techniques have you developed or utilized in the past 5 years when clearing landmines? What are the main obstacles to landmine clearance in your country?

7. What does your country feel is the best approach to an international demining process? Should demining initiatives be coordinated locally, nationally, or regionally?

IMPORTANT DOCUMENTS

The following documents have been hand-selected by Directors to further aid in delegate preparation. Please make a concerted effort to read and analyze these documents prior to the conference.

TOPIC A

Bendix, Daniel, and Ruth Stanley. *Security Sector Reform in Africa: The Promise and the Practice of a New Donor Approach*. 2nd ed. Vol. 3. 2008. Web. 27 Aug. 2009. <accord.org.za/downloads/op/op_2008_2.pdf>.

This document offers excellent solutions to the current donor approach to African SSR, as well as pointing out the key failures of specific donor situations of the past.

Hänggi, Heiner, and Vincenza Scherrer, eds. *Security Sector Reform and UN Integrated Missions: Experience from Burundi, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Haiti, and Kosovo*. 2008. *Publications*. The Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces, 2008. Web. 13 Aug. 2009. <http://www.dcaf.ch/publications/kms/details.cfm?lng=en&id=49473&nav1=4>.

As a primer on UN SSR practices, this document provides excellent insight as to how SSR is handled as a concept and in implementation by peacekeeping forces around the world.

OECD. *OECD DAC Handbook on Security Sector Reform: Supporting Security and Justice*. 2007. *OECD. OECD DAC Handbook on Security Sector Reform: Supporting Security and Justice. 2007*. OECD, 2007. Web. 9 July 2009. <http://www.oecd.org/document/6/0,3343,en_2649_33693550_37417926_1_1_1_1,00.html>.

This handbook is an essential document when it comes to understanding the basic guidelines and principles of Security Sector Reform. It delves into the origination of the SSR concept, and provides the viewpoints of policymakers and donors on SSR implementation.

Rauch, Janine, and Elrena Van der Spuy. *Recent Experiments in Police Reform in Post-Conflict Africa*. 2006. Oct. 2006. Web. 27 July 2009. <www.policeaccountability.co.za/File_Uploads/docs/File_Download.asp?ThisFile=PoliceReforminPostConflictAfricaReview.pdf>.

Providing case studies on nearly every police sector in the African continent, this paper is vital to understanding the evolution of the police force in Africa.

S/PRST/2007/3, "Securing Peace and Development: The Role of the United Nations in Supporting Security Sector Reform" 21 Feb. 2007.

This source is another essential document on the UN understanding of Security Sector Reform. As an official UN document, it provides a very formal perspective on SSR operations.

TOPIC B

Landmine Monitor. "Executive Summary." *Landmine Monitor (LM): Landmine Monitor*. Landmine Monitor. Web. 13 Aug. 2009. <http://lm.icbl.org/index.php/publications/display?url=lm/2008/es/toc.html>.

Offering a thorough summary of mine action throughout the year 2008, the Landmine Monitor is one of the most basic and helpful publications in terms of understanding key issues in the current demining agenda.

UNMAT. *Portfolio of Mine Action Projects 2009*. 2009. *Portfolio of Mine Action Projects 2009*. UNMAT, 2009. Web. 13 Aug. 2009. <http://www.mineaction.org/doc.asp?d=1078>.

More specific to country action than the Landmine Monitor, this UN document offers insight as to what recent developments are happen on a regional and national basis on demining and mine action.

"Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction" 18 Sept. 1997. <http://www.un.org/millennium/law/xxvi-22.htm>.
This document is one of the first comprehensive UN approaches to landmine control, and provides immense historical insight into the landmine issue.

Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining. A Guide to the International Mine Action Standards. 2004. Web. 21 July 2009. <www.mineactionstandards.org/IMAS_archive/Related/Guide_IMAS_2004.pdf>.
The International Mining Standards are extremely relevant to current demining action and must be understood before any country demining programs are enhanced or reformed.

Monin, Lydia, and Andrew Gallimore. *The Devil's Gardens A History of Landmines*. London: Pimlico, 2002. Print.
This book provides historical analysis of landmine usage and useful knowledge on the origins of humanitarian demining.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

TOPIC A

UN Sources

A/62/554-S/2007/687. "Statement of the Co-Chairs of the International Workshop on Enhancing United Nations Support for Security Sector Reform in Africa: Towards an African Perspective." 29 November 2007.
A UN document geared specifically towards enhancing the donor approach to SSR in Africa.

Non-UN Sources

Anderlini, Sanam Naraghi and Conaway, Camille Pampell. "Security Sector Reform." Inclusive Security, Sustainable Peace: A Toolkit for Advocacy and Action. November 2004: 1-40.
Insightful toolkit on the concept of security sector reform and its relation to women in the armed forces.

Bendix, Daniel and Stanley, Ruth. "Security Sector Reform in Africa: The Promise and the Practice of a New Donor Approach." Occasional Paper Series: Vol. 3, No. 2 (2008): 1-58.
Provides excellent information as to the interaction between donor countries and receiving governments in the SSR scheme.

Cawthra, Gavin. "The Future of Security Sector reform in Africa." SSR in Southern Africa, Proceedings of the third Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of the Armed Forces (DCAF)-IISS Workshop. International Institute for Strategic Studies (November 2002): 1-16.
Comprehensive article on past actions by countries to facilitate SSR; provides perspectives from national, regional, and international levels.

"Country Classification." World Bank Data and Statistics. The World Bank. 1 August 2009. <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/DATASTATISTICS/0,,contentMDK:20420458~menuPK:64133156~pagePK:64133150~piPK:64133175~theSitePK:239419,00.html>
Clarifies World Bank definitions of "developing" and "developed" countries.

"Fragile and Conflict-Affected Countries." World Bank News and Broadcast. 1 August 2009. <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/DATASTATISTICS/0,,contentMDK:20420458~menuPK:64133156~pagePK:64133150~piPK:64133175~theSitePK:239419,00.html >
Clarifies World Bank definitions of "post-conflict" situations.

Gombert, David C. and Stearns, Brooke. "Comprehensive Security-Sector Reform: Making Liberia Safe." Africa Policy Journal, Vol. 2 (Fall 2006): 1-27.
Article giving insight into Liberia's SSR challenges and the political situations that shaped its view of "human security."

Legwaila, Joseph Legwaila. "Security Sector Reform in Peacebuilding: Relevance to Peace Building." Security Sector Reform: Its Relevance for Conflict Prevention, Peace Building, and Development. United Nations Office at Geneva (January 2003: 1-5.
Insightful piece on the history of SSR in Africa and its colonial roots.

"LIBERIA: U.S. Hires Private Company to Train 4,000-Man Army." February 15th, 2005. CorpWatch. August 1, 2009. <http://www.corpwatch.org/article.php?id=11857>
Article explaining DynCorp's role in reforming Liberia's military sector.

Malan, Mark. Security Sector Reform in Liberia: Mixed Results from Humble Beginnings. Strategic Studies Institute (March 2008): 1-89.

Provides an excellent, deeply detailed view into SSR in Liberia.

McFate, Sean. "Security Sector Reform: A Primer on Security Sector Reform in Conflict countries." United States Institute of Peace Special Report. 209 (2008): 1-20.
Gives an excellent overview on SSR in Africa, as well as discussions on the concept and implementation in history.

Marks, Joshua. Border In Name Only: Arms Trafficking and Armed Groups at the DRC-Sudan Border. Small Arms Survey (2007): 2-10.
A paper on border patrol, this article provides excessive and useful information on the difficulties faced in border control.

Molomo, Mpho G. "Security Sector Reform in Botswana." SSR in Southern Africa, Proceedings of the third Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of the Armed Forces (DCAF)-IISS Workshop. International Institute for Strategic Studies (November 2002): 1-20.
Article with concise, factual writing on Botswana's successes and limited failures in SSR.

Patel, H.H. "Race and International Politics." Journal Zambezia, Vol. 3, No. 1 (1973): 8
Provides a brief history of the Lusaka Manifesto of 1969.

Phiri, Bizeck Jube. "Democratization and Security Sector Reform in Botswana." SSR in Southern Africa, Proceedings of the third Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of the Armed Forces (DCAF)-IISS Workshop. International Institute for Strategic Studies (November 2002): 1-20.
Provides wonderful information about SSR in Botswana and its transformation over time due to political change.

Rauch, Janine and van der Spy, Elrena. Recent Experiments in Police Reform in Post-Conflict Africa: A Review. Institute for Democracy in Africa (October 2006): 1-165.
An extensive review of African police reform, this paper covers numerous case studies and examines, in-depth, SSR in the police sector.

"Security Sector Governance and Reform." Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces. May 2009: 2-8.
A backgrounder, this document provides insight on the functions of the security sector and who is responsible for reforming it.

"What is the Human Development Index?" Human Development Reports. The United Nations Development Programme. 27 July 2009. <http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/faq/question,68,en.html >
Gives details on how the term "developing nation" is applied to countries.

Williams, Rocky. "The Transformation of the South African Defense Sector since 1990." SSR in Southern Africa, Proceedings of the third Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of the Armed Forces (DCAF)-IISS Workshop. International Institute for Strategic Studies (November 2002): 1-22.
Given South Africa's importance as a country leading SSR in Africa, this article is particularly important for its factuality and readability.

Williams, Rocky. "Africa and the Challenges of Security Sector Reform." Building Stability in Africa: Challenges for the New Millenium. Institute for Security Studies (February 2000): 1-10.
Provides insight into the history of security problems in Africa and ways to solve them in the future.

"Zambia Police Service." 2006. Republic of Zambia website. 1 August 2009. <http://www.aprn.org.za/Countries/CountryDetail.asp?Cnt_ID=25>
Gives details about VSUs and their function in SSR programs within Zambia.

TOPIC B

UN Sources

A/64/287. "Assistance in Mine Action: Report of the Secretary-General." 12 August 2009.
A recent report on the status of mine action and its relation to the United Nations system.

A/Res/63/42. "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production, and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on their Destruction." 12 January 2009.
A United Nations General Assembly resolution with recommendations on improving mine action.

Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on their Destruction. 18 September 1997.
The historic and prime document on anti-personnel landmines.

UNMAS Annual Report. 2008.
The UNMAS Annual Report outlines all UNMAS activities in the year 2007; it is particularly helpful in assessing the progress of country programs.

Non-UN Sources

"Aghanistan Summary." E-Mine: Electronic Mine Information Network. UNMAS. 15 July 2009. < http://www.mineaction.org/country.asp?c=1>
Provides concise but recent information on demining efforts in Afghanistan.

"Angola." E-Mine: Electronic Mine Information Network. UNMAS. 15 July 2009. <http://www.mineaction.org/country.asp?c=2>
This summary of demining activities in Angola is salient in understanding the direction demining activities are taking in the country.

Brooks, S. (ed.), Montgomery and the Eighth Army. London: The Bodley Head, 1991.
This book focuses on landmine use during the North Africa campaign of WWII, and also gives insight into the vast proliferation of landmines during that time.

"Cambodia" E-Mine: Electronic Mine Information Network. UNMAS. 15 July 2009. <http://www.mineaction.org/country.asp?c=6>
Cambodia's ambitious programs are detailed in this summary.

Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on their Destruction (Mine Ban Treaty). 18 September 1997. <http://www.un.org/Depts/mine/UNDocs/ban_trty.htm>
The 1997 Mine Ban Treaty text.

"Egypt" E-Mine: Electronic Mine Information Network. UNMAS. 15 July 2009. < http://www.mineaction.org/country.asp?c=72>
Egypt's history with mines during WWII was particularly brutal; this concise article provides details on its demining programs to rid of the mines on its borders with Libya.

Garwin, Richard L. and Husbands, Jo L. "Progress in Humanitarian Demining: Technical and Policy Challenges." 22 November 1997. Federation of American Scientists (FAS). 13 July 209. < http://www.fas.org/rlg/de-mining.htm>
Viewing demining from a US policy perspective, this article outlines the problems in demining in both funding and technical aspects. It is especially proficient in detailing the main, overarching demining process, as well.

Habib, Maki K. "Mechanical Mine Clearance Technologies and Humanitarian Demining." April 2003.
A very detailed look into current demining technologies and their drawbacks.

Habib, Maki K. "Mine Clearance Techniques and Technologies for Effective Humanitarian Demining." Journal of Mine Action 6.1 (2002): 1-10.
A concise, to-the-point article on the obstacles faced in today's demining operations, and possible solutions to these obstacles.

"How the Work is Done." E-Mine: Electronic Mine Information Network. UNMAS. 15 July 2009. < http://www.mineaction.org/section.asp?s=how_its_done>
An excellent resource on current demining technologies.

"Landmines: A Deadly Inheritance." Impact of Armed Conflict on Children. 1996. UNICEF. 17 July 2009. < http://www.unicef.org/graca/mines.htm>
Focuses on the impact of landmines on civilians and the gruesome injuries they suffer for the rest of their lives.

"Landmines." Globalsecurity.org. 2000-2009. Federation of American Scientists (FAS). 13 July 2009. <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/systems/munitions/landmines.htm>
Provides a short history of landmine use, particularly by the United States, and gives information about landmine types.

"Landmine Monitor Executive Summary 2008." Mine Action Canada October 2008: 1-54.
Excellent report on 2007 mine action activities around the world, with special focus on the organizational and structural improvements in various country programs.

"Landmines Overview." Adopt-A-Minefield. 2004. United Nations Association of the United states of America. 12 July 2009. < http://www.unausa.org/Page.aspx?pid=789>
Gives concise information on landmine types.

"Landmines: Problems and Solutions." Asia-Pacific Magazine. May 1998. The University of Western Australia. 19 July 2009. <http://www.mech.uwa.edu.au/jpt/demining/info/probs-solns.html>
Outlines the demining process and solutions to its current failings.

Monin, Lydia and Gallimore, Andrew. The Devil's Gardens: A History of Landmines. London: Pimlico, 2002.
Comprehensive book providing detailed accounts of landmine use from the beginning of its existence until after the Cold War. Provides insight into early demining processes, as well.

"The Ottawa Convention: Signatories and States-Parties." Arms Control Association. June 2008. Arms Control Association. 12 July 2009. < http://www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/ottawasigs>
A factsheet on the Ottawa Convention focusing on the activities of Member States after ratification.

Roy, Roger L. and Friesen, Shaye K. "Historical Uses of Anti-personnel Landmines: Impact on Land Force Operations." Department of National Defence Canada October 1999: 3-30.
This paper gives a very detailed, but less technically-inclined account of landmine use throughout history, and the effects of landmines on the soldier's psychological and physical well-being.

"Treaty Basics" ICBL: The International Campaign to Ban Landmines. 2007. The International Campaign to Ban Landmines. 15 July 2009. <http://www.icbl.org/index.php/icbl/Treaties/MBT/Treaty-Basics>
A good backgrounder on the Mine Ban Treaty.

"What is a landmine?" ICBL: The International Campaign to Ban Landmines. 2007. The International Campaign to Ban Landmines. 15 July 2009. <http://www.icbl.org/index.php/icbl/Problem/Landmines/What-is-a-Landmine>
A good source for concise summaries on landmines, landmine types, and their effects.

"What is Mine Action?" E-Mine: Electronic Mine Information Network. UNMAS. 15 July 2009. <http://www.mineaction.org/section.asp?s=what_is_mine_action>
Provides a concise summary of UN principles and goals regarding mine action.

"Where it Happens." E-Mine: Electronic Mine Information Network. UNMAS. 15 July 2009. <http://www.mineaction.org/section.asp?s=where_it_happens>
A great resource outline demining country programs run by UNMAS and other UN organizations.