

DISEC Topic Guide

Chair Introductions:

Hi everyone, my name is Lucas Chi, your head chair for this committee, and this is my first time head chairing! I am a junior at California High School. I have done Model United Nations for 5 years now, and it has truly taught me many valuable lessons, which are not only applicable within better understanding how the world works, but also in understanding how to best negotiate with other people and to allow your own voices to be heard. In my free time, some of my hobbies include piano (currently I'm playing Ballade no. 1), viola (viola gang!), Science Bowl, History Bowl, and Origami. Please feel free to reach out if you have any questions!

Email: lucaschi08@gmail.com

Hey everyone, I am Varsha Kethineni, a junior at California High School. I've been actively involved in Model UN since my freshman year, where I've developed a passion for diplomacy and international relations. In my free time, I love to kickbox and do MMA, which has taught me discipline, perseverance and the importance of teamwork. For the committee, we are seeking delegates who are dedicated to solving the issues at hand, and most importantly, do not forget to have fun!

Email: vkethineni999@gmail.com

Topic A: Conflict in Myanmar

I. Topic Background

The conflict in Myanmar is one of the longest-running and most complex crises in modern history, rooted in ethnic tensions, military rule, human rights violations, and struggles for democracy. Since gaining independence from Britain in 1948, Myanmar has experienced persistent conflicts involving the military, ethnic armed groups, and pro-democracy movement. The 2021 military coup further destabilized the country, triggering widespread resistance and a severe humanitarian crisis. Myanmar, formerly known as Burma, is home to over 135 recognized ethnic groups, with the Bamar ethnic majority historically dominating political and military power. Ethnic minorities, including the Karen, Kachin, Shan, and Rohingya, have been systematically marginalized. Under British colonial rule (1824–1948), the British implemented a "divide and rule" strategy, favoring some minorities while excluding others from governance. When Myanmar gained independence in 1948, post-independence Myanmar saw a succession of military takeovers. In 1962, General Ne Win led a coup, establishing a military-controlled socialist state that nationalized industries and repressed opposition. The military, known as the Tatmadaw, maintained strict control through successive regimes, brutally suppressing dissent, as seen in the 1988 pro-democracy uprisings, which resulted in over 3,000 deaths, and the 2007

Saffron Revolution, led by Buddhist monks against economic mismanagement and military oppression. In 2011, Myanmar transitioned to civilian rule under a military-backed government. Political reforms led to the release of political prisoners, economic liberalization, and increased civil liberties. The 2015 elections marked a shift, with the National League for Democracy



(NLD), led by Aung San Suu Kyi, winning by a landslide. However, the military-drafted 2008 Constitution ensured that the Tatmadaw retained significant power, controlling 25% of parliamentary seats and key ministries, including defense and border affairs.

On February 1,

2021, the military staged a coup, detaining Aung San Suu Kyi and top NLD officials, citing unsubstantiated claims of electoral fraud in the 2020 elections. The coup triggered mass protests and a civil disobedience movement, which the Tatmadaw responded to with deadly force. As of 2024, over 4,500 civilians have been killed, more than 20,000 arrested, and entire villages razed in counterinsurgency operations. Internet blackouts and targeted arrests were used to stifle dissent. Armed resistance escalated following the coup. The People's Defense Forces (PDF), formed by pro-democracy activists, launched guerrilla attacks against military forces. Ethnic armed organizations (EAOs), including the Kachin Independence Army (KIA) and the Karen National Union (KNU), intensified their offensives, leading to widespread conflict. The Tatmadaw's response has included indiscriminate airstrikes, mass killings, and forced conscription. One of Myanmar's most severe crises is the persecution of the Rohingya, a predominantly Muslim minority. The 1982 Citizenship Law effectively rendered them stateless, denying them basic rights. In 2017, the Tatmadaw launched a violent campaign in Rakhine State, killing at least 10,000 Rohingya and displacing over 700,000 to refugee camps in Bangladesh. The United Nations has described this as ethnic cleansing, and the International Court of Justice has heard cases accusing Myanmar of genocide. The Rohingya remain in limbo, with no clear path for repatriation or legal recognition. As of 2025, Myanmar's economy is in decline. Foreign investment has plummeted, inflation has soared, and the kyat (Myanmar's currency) has depreciated sharply. Over 17.6 million people require humanitarian aid, and internal displacement has surpassed 2.6 million due to ongoing violence. Food shortages, lack of healthcare access, and disrupted education systems further exacerbate the crisis. Myanmar's

conflict remains deeply entrenched, with no clear resolution in sight. The military regime continues to face armed resistance from pro-democracy and ethnic groups, while international diplomatic efforts have yielded limited success. Without a fundamental power shift, national reconciliation, and structural reforms, Myanmar's crisis is likely to persist. The future hinges on sustained resistance, external diplomatic pressure, and a potential shift in regional power dynamics. Addressing this crisis requires a coordinated international effort, significant humanitarian aid, and a long-term commitment to restoring democracy and ethnic inclusivity.

II. Affected Parties

- Civilians: Everyday people caught in the fighting, their safety is the top priority.
- Soldiers (Tatmadaw): The military members carrying out the current government's orders, their actions drive much of the violence.
- Soldiers (Resistance Groups): Those fighting against the military, their actions are shaping the resistance movement.
- Governments (Military Junta): The current ruling group, their decisions impact everyone in Myanmar.
- Governments (NUG): The shadow government trying to establish democracy, they represent an alternative future.
- Pro-Democracy Groups: Activists and organizations pushing for democratic change, they drive social movements.
- Ethnic Armed Organizations (EAOs): Groups representing ethnic minorities, they control territories and fight for autonomy.
- Humanitarian Aid Workers: Those providing food, medicine, and shelter, they are essential for survival.
- Journalists and Media: Those reporting on the conflict, they shape how the world understands the situation.
- Religious Leaders: Influential figures who may try to mediate or provide support, they can influence communities.
- Business Owners: Their businesses are disrupted, and they face economic instability.
- Children: They are especially vulnerable, and their futures are deeply affected.
- Refugees: Those who have fled to other countries, they need international protection.
- Farmers: Those who grow food, and are being affected by the conflict, which causes food shortages.
- Teachers and Healthcare Workers: Essential service providers, and their services are disrupted.
- Future Generations: The young people who will inherit the consequences of today's actions.
- International Community: Countries and organizations outside Myanmar, their actions can influence the conflict.

III. Key Terms and Definitions

- **Tatmadaw:** Myanmar's military, which has played a dominant role in the country's governance, staging multiple coups and suppressing opposition movements.
- **Ethnic Armed Organizations (EAOs):** Armed groups representing various ethnic minorities that have been engaged in conflicts with the central government over autonomy and rights.
- **National League for Democracy (NLD):** A pro-democracy political party led by Aung San Suu Kyi that won multiple elections but was repeatedly suppressed by the military.
- **People's Defense Forces (PDF):** Armed resistance groups formed after the 2021 military coup to fight against military rule, often collaborating with ethnic armed groups.
- **Rohingya:** A predominantly Muslim ethnic minority that has faced systemic persecution, including mass killings and displacement, leading to international accusations of genocide.
- **Five-Point Consensus:** A peace initiative proposed by the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) in 2021 to resolve Myanmar's crisis, which has seen limited success due to military resistance.
- **2008 Constitution:** A military-drafted constitution that grants the Tatmadaw significant political power, including control over key ministries and a guaranteed 25% of parliamentary seats.
- **Civil Disobedience Movement (CDM):** A nationwide protest movement against military rule, including strikes by workers, students, and government employees.
- **Rakhine State:** A region in western Myanmar that has been the epicenter of the Rohingya crisis, with repeated military crackdowns and large-scale displacement.
- **International Court of Justice (ICJ):** The principal judicial body of the United Nations, which is reviewing allegations of genocide against Myanmar's military for its treatment of the Rohingya.
- **United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC):** A UN body that monitors human rights violations, including those committed by the Myanmar military against ethnic minorities and pro-democracy activists.

- ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations): A regional organization that has attempted to mediate the Myanmar crisis through diplomatic initiatives, though its effectiveness has been limited.
- Kachin Independence Army (KIA): One of Myanmar's largest ethnic armed groups, engaged in long-standing conflict with the Tatmadaw over autonomy and resource control.
- Karen National Union (KNU): An ethnic political and military organization advocating for Karen self-determination, often involved in clashes with Myanmar's military.
- State Administration Council (SAC): The governing body established by the Myanmar military after the 2021 coup, widely condemned as illegitimate by the international community.
- Humanitarian Crisis: The severe impact of Myanmar's conflict, including mass displacement, food shortages, and restricted access to healthcare, affecting millions of civilians.
- Targeted Sanctions: Economic and diplomatic penalties imposed by countries such as the U.S. and the EU on Myanmar's military leaders and affiliated businesses in response to human rights abuses.
- Military Junta: A government led by military officials, as seen in Myanmar following the 2021 coup, characterized by authoritarian rule and suppression of dissent.
- Genocide: The intentional destruction of an ethnic, racial, or religious group, a charge brought against Myanmar's military for its actions against the Rohingya.
- Internal Displacement: The forced relocation of civilians within Myanmar due to ongoing military offensives and conflict, with over 2.6 million people currently displaced.

IV. Historical Events

- Myanmar's Independence (1948): Myanmar gained independence from British rule on January 4, 1948, marking the beginning of its challenges with internal conflict and military influence in governance.
- First Military Coup (1962): General Ne Win led a coup, overthrowing the civilian government and establishing a military-controlled socialist state, setting the stage for

decades of military dominance.

- 8888 Uprising (1988): A pro-democracy protest movement erupted across Myanmar, demanding an end to military rule. The military violently suppressed the demonstrations, killing thousands.
- Establishment of the State Law and Order Restoration Council (SLORC) (1988): Following the crackdown on protests, the military rebranded its leadership under SLORC, reinforcing authoritarian rule.
- 1990 General Elections: The National League for Democracy (NLD) won a landslide victory, but the military refused to transfer power, leading to continued repression of pro-democracy activists.
- Saffron Revolution (2007): Buddhist monks led protests against economic hardships and military rule. The military responded with a violent crackdown, drawing international condemnation.
- 2010 General Elections: The military-backed Union Solidarity and Development Party (USDP) won in an election widely criticized as fraudulent. This election marked the beginning of Myanmar's partial political liberalization.
- 2015 Democratic Transition: The NLD, led by Aung San Suu Kyi, won a significant victory in the general elections, leading to a power-sharing arrangement with the military under the 2008 Constitution.
- Rohingya Crisis (2017): Myanmar's military launched a brutal crackdown on the Rohingya Muslim minority, forcing over 700,000 people to flee to Bangladesh. The military was accused of genocide by international bodies.
- 2021 Military Coup: The Tatmadaw seized power again on February 1, 2021, detaining elected leaders and sparking widespread protests, resistance movements, and armed conflicts.
- Formation of the National Unity Government (NUG) (2021): Opponents of the coup, including ousted lawmakers, formed a parallel government to challenge military rule and coordinate resistance efforts.
- Escalation of Armed Resistance (2021-Present): The emergence of the People's Defense Forces (PDFs) and increased collaboration with ethnic armed groups have intensified

Myanmar's civil war.

- ASEAN's Five-Point Consensus (2021): ASEAN attempted to mediate the conflict, but Myanmar's military has largely ignored the agreement, leading to continued violence.
- ICJ Genocide Case Against Myanmar (2022-Present): The International Court of Justice (ICJ) is examining allegations that Myanmar's military committed genocide against the Rohingya.
- Ongoing Humanitarian Crisis: Myanmar faces mass displacement, economic decline, and food insecurity due to prolonged conflict and military rule.

V. Significant Documents

- 1947 Panglong Agreement: A historic agreement between ethnic leaders and the central government promising autonomy, though it was later disregarded, contributing to ethnic conflicts.
- 1948 Myanmar Constitution: Myanmar's first post-independence constitution established a parliamentary system, which was later abolished by the 1962 military coup.
- 1974 Constitution: Introduced by the military, this document solidified one-party rule under the Burma Socialist Programme Party, reducing political freedoms.
- 2008 Constitution: Drafted by the military, this constitution guarantees military control over key ministries and reserves 25% of parliamentary seats for the Tatmadaw.
- National Ceasefire Agreement (NCA) (2015): A peace agreement between the government and several ethnic armed groups, though many major groups did not sign it.
- ASEAN Five-Point Consensus (2021): A diplomatic initiative aimed at resolving Myanmar's post-coup crisis, calling for dialogue and an end to violence, though largely ineffective.
- ICJ Ruling on Rohingya Genocide (Ongoing): A legal case at the International Court of Justice assessing Myanmar's responsibility for alleged genocidal actions against the Rohingya.

- U.S. and EU Sanctions on Myanmar (Post-2021): A series of economic sanctions targeting military leaders and businesses linked to the junta.
- United Nations Resolutions on Myanmar: Multiple UN resolutions condemning military violence and human rights abuses, though enforcement remains limited.

VI. Key Issues

1. Efforts such as the Nationwide Ceasefire Agreement (NCA) have seen partial success but failed to bring a lasting peace. Dialogue between ethnic groups, democratic movements, and international stakeholders remains crucial for a long-term resolution.
2. Myanmar, or Burma, has endured ongoing conflict since it became independent from British colonialism in 1948. Ethnic tensions, military dictatorship, and demands for autonomy have powered decades of conflict, resulting in extended civil wars and humanitarian disasters.
3. Myanmar is home to over 135 ethnic groups, and some of them call for greater autonomy or independence. There are also armed groups like the Kachin Independence Army (KIA), Arakan Army (AA), and Karen National Union (KNU) that have clashed with the central government. The failure of the government to bring these groups into the political process has led to continued violence.
4. The Rohingya Muslim minority in Rakhine State have been subjected to statelessness, systematic discrimination, and military crackdowns. The 2017 military crackdown prompted a mass flight of over 700,000 Rohingya refugees to Bangladesh, prompting global outrage and accusations of genocide.
5. Myanmar's armed forces, or Tatmadaw, have controlled the politics of their nation. The coup d'etat in 2021 that removed the democratically elected NLD administration of Aung San Suu Kyi led to anti-regime protests across the country and brutal suppression. The military continues to maintain power and instigates strife and insurgency.
6. Extrajudicial killings, torture, forced recruitment, and rape have been reported. State and non-state actors have been implicated in human rights abuses, which have evoked international condemnation and calls for accountability through international legal mechanisms.
7. Other nations like China, India, and Thailand continue to pursue strategic and economic interests in Myanmar. ASEAN has attempted to launch diplomatic intervention with limited success. The UN, Western nations, and human rights organizations, however, continue to apply sanctions and demand the return of democracy.
8. Myanmar's economy is undermined by conflict, sanctions, and poor management. Natural resources like jade, timber, and oil are typically controlled by military-backed enterprises or ethnic armed organizations, perpetuating corruption and funding further conflict.

VII. Current Situation

1. Myanmar finds itself in a state of ongoing conflict and political instability following the 2021 military coup. The Tatmadaw-led military junta continues to suppress the resistance groups as it is increasingly faced by ethnic armed organizations, pro-democracy forces, and the People's Defense Forces (PDF). Violent clashes between these forces have escalated in several key regions, including Sagaing, Kachin, and Karen states, resulting in a sharp escalation of civilian fatalities and displacement. The use of air raids and heavy artillery by the military has contributed to the violence, with devastating destruction and suffering.
2. The humanitarian crisis in Myanmar has become more entrenched, with over 2 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) struggling to access food, shelter, and health services. The junta has restricted humanitarian relief programs, and global organizations have had trouble in delivering relief. Human rights violations, such as arbitrary detention, extrajudicial killings, and torture, have been persistent, stirring outrage among the global community. The conflict also accelerated economic uncertainty with rising inflation, unemployment, and shortages of food throughout the country that affected millions of nationals.
3. Internationally, Myanmar stands alone with Western countries imposing sanctions against the junta on military leaders and key economic sectors. There have been diplomatic attempts by the United Nations and ASEAN but so far none of them has yielded a solution. ASEAN's Five-Point Consensus has not worked in being enforced effectively, and the military has continued to resist talking to the opposition. Meanwhile, China and Russia continue to provide strategic and economic support to the military regime, complicating international efforts to pressure the junta into negotiations.
4. The crisis has also continued regional instability, as refugee numbers seeking out neighboring countries such as Thailand, India, and Bangladesh have multiplied. The conditions are still extremely volatile with extremist groups becoming increasingly powerful in areas and the army holding power in major urban areas. While the civil war continues in Myanmar with no signs of abatement, the path towards peace and rebuilding democracy hangs by a thread with internal resistance and international pressure worldwide hanging on the outcome.

VIII. Past International Action

The global community has reacted to Myanmar's persistent conflicts, human rights violations, and political turmoil in various ways. These reactions have included diplomatic measures, economic sanctions, human assistance, and legal measures aimed at addressing the problems of the country.

The UN has led the way in responding to Myanmar's crises, particularly since the 2017 Rohingya crisis and the 2021 military coup. The UN Security Council and the UN General Assembly have passed a number of resolutions condemning human rights abuses and calling for inclusive

dialogue. The UN Human Rights Council established the Independent Investigative Mechanism for Myanmar in 2018 to collect evidence of war crimes and crimes against humanity. Furthermore, the International Court of Justice has been entertaining a case against Myanmar for committing genocide against the Rohingya people.

The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) has also been the key regional player behind Myanmar's crisis management. ASEAN issued the Five-Point Consensus in response to the coup in 2021, calling for an immediate end to violence, dialogue among all parties concerned, and humanitarian assistance. Implementation was slow, with the military junta in Myanmar openly flouting its obligations. ASEAN reacted by attempting to exclude the junta from more participation at higher-level talks.

The West, under the leadership of the United States, European Union, the United Kingdom, and Canada, applied targeted sanctions on Myanmar's generals, military junta-owned or allied companies, and key industries such as natural resource exports. Sanctions are designed to withhold funding for the military and force the government to reverse its abolition of democratic rule. However, enforcement has been challenging, accompanied by economic interdependence with China, Russia, and other local allies, which restrained their effects.

Humanitarian organizations such as the UNHCR, the Red Cross, and NGOs have provided significant humanitarian assistance to displaced individuals in Myanmar and Rohingya refugees in Bangladesh. The U.S., UK, and Japan have contributed funds for relief programs, although limited access to areas affected by military decrees continues to be an ongoing problem.

There has been recourse to law in international courts for attempting to try Myanmar's military. Aside from the ICJ case, there has been the opening of an investigation by the International Criminal Court (ICC) into crimes against the Rohingya. There has also been the assistance of nations and human rights groups in gathering human rights violations for potential future prosecutions.

Despite all these global efforts, Myanmar's armed forces have remained adamant, and peace and democratization progress has been so incremental. The efficacy of future foreign intervention will depend on more severe sanction enforcement, diplomatic pressure, and regional coordination to apply pressure for real change.

IX. Questions to Consider

1. How can the international community ensure accountability for the Myanmar military's actions, particularly in relation to the Rohingya genocide, and what legal mechanisms should be used to pursue justice?

2. What steps should the United Nations take to facilitate dialogue between Myanmar's military junta and ethnic armed groups to reach a sustainable peace agreement while protecting minority rights?
3. How can ASEAN's Five-Point Consensus be strengthened to ensure tangible outcomes, and what role should ASEAN member states play in applying pressure on Myanmar's military junta to end the violence?
4. What strategies should be employed by the international community to ensure the safe and unhindered delivery of humanitarian aid to civilians in Myanmar, particularly in conflict zones controlled by the military?
5. To what extent should the international community officially recognize Myanmar's National Unity Government (NUG) as the legitimate governing body, and what implications would this recognition have on international diplomacy and support for Myanmar's pro-democracy movement?
6. What concrete actions can be taken to prevent the further displacement of over 2.6 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) in Myanmar, and how can host countries be supported in addressing the refugee crisis caused by the conflict?
7. What specific legal and political reforms should Myanmar implement to address the statelessness of the Rohingya and ensure their inclusion in the political, social, and economic life of the country?
8. How can Myanmar's neighboring countries, particularly Bangladesh, Thailand, and India, collaborate with international organizations to prevent the spillover of conflict and manage the growing refugee crisis in the region?
9. What role can regional powers such as China and India play in influencing Myanmar's military junta to engage in meaningful peace negotiations, and how can the international community mitigate their influence on the conflict?
10. What are the necessary political, military, and social reforms that Myanmar must undertake to guarantee the long-term stability of the country and prevent the return of military rule?

X. Works Cited

"A state-led massacre triggers an exodus of Rohingyas from Myanmar". *The Economist*. 9 September 2017.

Coates, Stephen; Birsell, Robert; Fletcher, Philippa (1 February 2021). Feast, Lincoln; MacSwan, Angus; McCool, Grant (eds.). ["Myanmar military seizes power, detains elected leader Aung San Suu Kyi"](#). *news.trust.org*. Reuters..

Malerba, Andre; DeCicca, Lauren (8 November 2013). ["In pictures: A ceasefire in Myanmar?"](#). Al-Jazeera.

Miliband, David (12 December 2016). ["How to Bring Peace to the World's Longest Civil War"](#). *Time*.

["Myanmar's political future remains cloudy as the junta wobbles"](#). *East Asia Forum*. 5 February 2024.

Neuman, Scott (13 September 2017). ["Aung San Suu Kyi To Skip U.N. Meeting As Criticism Over Rohingya Crisis Grows"](#). *NPR*.

Rahman Yaacob (6 December 2023). ["Commentary: Myanmar's military stares at defeat as rebel forces go on the offensive"](#). *CNA*.

[^] ["UN officials alarmed by civilian targeting amid renewed fighting in Myanmar | UN News"](#). *news.un.org*. 29 July 2024.

Jong Min Lee (7 March 2024). ["Will Myanmar Become the Next North Korea?"](#). *The Diplomat*.

["World Court Rules Against Myanmar on Rohingya"](#). *Human Rights Watch*. 23 January 2020.

["Constitution of 1947 - Myanmar Law Library"](#). *www.myanmar-law-library.org* (in French).

["Myanmar: National unity government must be recognised"](#). *www.ituc-csi.org*. 19 April 2021.

Topic B: AI Warfare:

I. Topic Background

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into contemporary military systems signifies a profound paradigm shift in global strategic doctrines, fundamentally reshaping the character of warfare. AI, in its essence, empowers computational systems to execute complex cognitive functions, including advanced pattern recognition, autonomous decision-making, and sophisticated data synthesis. Current AI applications within military contexts encompass a spectrum of capabilities. For instance, autonomous unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), leveraging sophisticated computer vision and machine learning algorithms, are being developed for

autonomous target acquisition and engagement, potentially minimizing human exposure in high-risk operational environments. AI-driven cyber defense systems, utilizing anomaly detection and behavioral analysis, enhance the ability to identify and neutralize complex cyber threats, such as those targeting critical infrastructure and strategic assets. Logistical optimization tools, employing predictive analytics and real-time data processing, ensure efficient resource allocation and supply chain management, thereby enhancing operational readiness. However, the deployment of AI in warfare poses significant ethical and legal dilemmas. The potential for fully autonomous weapons systems to make lethal decisions without substantive human intervention raises critical questions regarding accountability and human control, potentially contravening principles of international humanitarian law, such as the principle of distinction codified in Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions. Algorithmic bias in target identification algorithms, stemming from biased training datasets, could lead to unintended civilian casualties, contradicting the principle of proportionality. The accelerated pace of AI development and the potential for a destabilizing arms race between nations, such as the United States and China, which are allocating substantial resources to AI-driven military applications, as evidenced by their respective defense budgets and research initiatives, underscores the imperative for international dialogue and regulatory frameworks. The challenge lies in establishing robust guidelines that ensure meaningful human control, prevent the proliferation of fully autonomous weapons, and uphold the principles of distinction and proportionality in armed conflict, while acknowledging the potential benefits AI offers in enhancing military efficiency and reducing human risk. It is crucial to consider the long-term strategic implications of AI integration and to emphasize that AI remains a tool, demanding responsible governance to mitigate potential adverse consequences.



II. Affected Parties

- **Soldiers:** Soldiers face changing roles and increased risks as AI alters combat strategies and weapon systems.
- **Civilians:** Civilians are vulnerable to increased harm due to AI's potential for errors in target identification.
- **Governments:** Governments grapple with the complex task of regulating AI's use in warfare to maintain control and prevent escalation.
- **Technology Companies:** Technology companies bear responsibility for the ethical implications of their AI creations used in military applications.

- Future Generations: Future generations will inherit the consequences of today's decisions regarding AI's integration into warfare.
- International Community: The entire world is affected, because the spread of AI weapons could lead to global instability.

III. Key Terms and Definitions

- Artificial Intelligence (AI): AI involves the development of computer systems capable of performing tasks that typically require human intelligence,¹ such as problem-solving and decision-making.²
- Autonomous Weapons Systems (AWS): These are weapon systems designed to select and engage targets without direct human intervention, raising complex ethical and legal questions.
- Cyber Warfare: This refers to the use of digital attacks, such as hacking and malware, to disrupt or damage an adversary's computer systems and networks.
- Target Identification: This is the process of using technology, often AI-driven, to accurately determine and locate potential targets for military engagement.
- Logistics: Logistics encompasses the strategic planning and execution of moving and supplying military forces with essential resources, including personnel, equipment, and supplies.
- International Humanitarian Law (IHL): IHL is a set of international rules that seek to limit the suffering caused by armed conflict by protecting civilians and those no longer participating in hostilities.
- Algorithmic Bias: This occurs when AI systems produce unfair or discriminatory outcomes due to biased data used during their training, leading to potential injustices.
- Escalation: Escalation describes the process of a conflict intensifying, often leading to increased violence and broader involvement of parties.
- Machine Learning: Machine learning is a type of AI that enables computers to learn from data without explicit programming, improving their performance over time.
- Deep Learning: A sophisticated form of machine learning, deep learning uses complex neural networks to analyze large datasets and recognize intricate patterns.
- Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV): Commonly known as a drone, a UAV is an aircraft operated remotely or autonomously, often used for reconnaissance or combat.
- Reconnaissance: Reconnaissance involves the gathering of information about an enemy or area through observation, often using advanced technology like drones or satellites.
- Predictive Analytics: This is the use of data and statistical models to forecast future trends and events, aiding in strategic decision-making.
- Human-in-the-Loop: This describes a system where a human operator remains involved in the decision-making process, particularly in critical applications like weapons systems.

- **Meaningful Human Control:** This is the concept that humans should maintain the ability to understand, intervene in, and ultimately control the actions of AI systems, especially in military contexts.
- **Proliferation:** Proliferation refers to the rapid spread or increase of something, particularly weapons technology, which can destabilize international security.

IV. Historical Events

The Evolution of Machine Guns (Late 19th - Early 20th Century): The introduction of rapid-fire weaponry during this period fundamentally altered battlefield tactics, resulting in unprecedented levels of casualties during World War I.¹ This historical precedent underscores the potential for technological advancements to dramatically escalate the scale and intensity of armed conflict, a concern directly applicable to the development of autonomous weapons systems.

The Development of Radar Systems (World War II): The implementation of radar technology provided early warning capabilities, significantly enhancing defensive strategies and operational advantages. This exemplifies the impact of advanced sensor systems and automated detection on military operations, foreshadowing the sophisticated sensor networks and AI-driven targeting systems prevalent in contemporary military technology.

The Implementation of the ENIAC Computer (1940s): The early application of electronic computation for ballistic calculations demonstrates the military's long-standing reliance on advanced computing technologies.² This trajectory highlights the progressive integration of computational power into military capabilities, culminating in the development of contemporary AI-driven systems.

The Manhattan Project and the Advent of Nuclear Armaments (1940s): The development and deployment of nuclear weapons during World War II introduced an era of unparalleled destructive potential.³ This historical event instigated international discussions regarding the imperative for rigorous regulatory frameworks to govern the development and deployment of transformative military technologies, a lesson of paramount relevance in the context of AI-driven weaponry.

The Establishment of the Geneva Conventions (1949): In the aftermath of World War II, the Geneva Conventions established international legal standards aimed at protecting non-combatants and mitigating unnecessary suffering during armed conflict.⁴ These conventions emphasize the enduring necessity of adhering to ethical and legal norms in military operations, a

challenge significantly amplified by the introduction of AI, necessitating meticulous consideration of accountability and adherence to existing legal frameworks.

The Cold War and the Nuclear Arms Race (1947-1991): The protracted geopolitical rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union, characterized by the pursuit of nuclear weapons superiority, exemplified the destabilizing potential of unconstrained technological competition.⁵ The prospect of mutually assured destruction underscores the inherent risks associated with arms races, a concern that finds a contemporary parallel in the burgeoning development of AI-driven military capabilities.

The Space Race (1950s-1960s): The competitive drive to achieve spaceflight spurred significant advancements in computing and automation. This demonstrates the capacity of geopolitical competition to accelerate technological innovation, often with dual-use applications in both civilian and military domains, a pattern relevant to the development of AI.

The Development of Precision-Guided Munitions (1970s-Present): The emergence of precision-guided munitions enhanced targeting accuracy, aiming to minimize collateral damage.⁶ While intended to improve precision, these munitions represent a step toward increased automation in weapons systems, raising ethical concerns about the potential for fully autonomous AI weapons.

The Emergence of Cyber Warfare and Malicious Software (1980s-Present): The increasing prevalence of cyberattacks introduced a novel dimension to international conflict. This development necessitates the establishment of new legal frameworks and robust cybersecurity measures. The integration of AI into cyber operations further complicates the security landscape.

The Proliferation of Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) in Modern Warfare (2000s-Present): The increasing utilization of UAVs in military operations has raised ethical questions regarding remote warfare and target identification. UAVs provide a precedent for the ethical and legal complexities associated with the deployment of increasingly autonomous weapon systems.

The Stuxnet Cyberattack (2010): The Stuxnet worm demonstrated the potential for cyberattacks to cause physical damage to critical infrastructure. This event highlighted the vulnerability of critical systems to cyber warfare, underscoring the potential for AI-driven cyberattacks to inflict significant harm.

The Landmine Ban Treaty (1997): International consensus led to the prohibition of landmines due to their indiscriminate harm to civilians.⁷ This treaty serves as a precedent for international cooperation in banning weapons deemed excessively harmful, offering a potential model for addressing the ethical challenges of AI in warfare.

The Development of the Internet (1960s-Present): The transformative impact of the internet on information sharing and communication has reshaped the landscape of warfare. The proliferation of cyber warfare and the spread of misinformation underscore the complex challenges posed by the internet in modern conflict, challenges that are further amplified by AI.

V. Significant Documents

The Geneva Conventions (1949) constitute a foundational set of international legal principles that delineate permissible and prohibited conduct during armed conflict, specifically addressing the protection of non-combatants and the humane treatment of prisoners of war. These conventions serve to minimize human suffering amidst hostilities.

The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) (1968) is a multilateral treaty designed to prevent the dissemination of nuclear weapons, promote disarmament, and facilitate the peaceful use of nuclear technology, thereby reducing the global risk of nuclear warfare.

The Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) (1993) is an international agreement that comprehensively prohibits the development, production, stockpiling, and use of chemical weapons, reinforcing the international norm against the use of these inhumane armaments.

The Ottawa Treaty (Landmine Ban Treaty) (1997) is an international agreement that prohibits the use, stockpiling, production, and transfer of anti-personnel landmines, addressing the long-term humanitarian consequences of these indiscriminate weapons.

International Humanitarian Law (IHL) represents a body of legal principles and rules that seek to limit the effects of armed conflict for humanitarian reasons. It protects individuals not or no longer participating in hostilities and restricts the means and methods of warfare. IHL is an important consideration when addressing the ethical applications of AI in military contexts.

Discussions at the United Nations (UN) on Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems (LAWS) represent ongoing international deliberations concerning the development and deployment of autonomous weapons systems, aiming to establish regulatory frameworks to ensure human control over critical decisions in warfare.

The G7 Hiroshima AI Process is an initiative by the G7 nations to foster international dialogue and establish guidelines for the responsible development and deployment of artificial intelligence, including its potential military applications.

The EU AI Act is a proposed regulatory framework by the European Union that seeks to categorize AI systems based on their risk levels, with implications for the development and deployment of AI in military contexts.

VI. Key Issues

1. AI in military applications has raised numerous ethical, strategic, and technological concerns. While AI-driven systems enhance operational efficiency and decision-making, they also introduce unprecedented risks that must be addressed.
2. Autonomous weapons, often referred to as "killer robots," present significant ethical and legal dilemmas. The development of lethal autonomous weapon systems (LAWS) raises questions about accountability, compliance with international law, and the potential for unintended escalations in conflict. There is ongoing debate about whether such systems should be banned or strictly regulated.
3. AI-driven surveillance and reconnaissance technologies enable enhanced intelligence gathering but also pose threats to privacy and civil liberties. Nations use AI-powered systems for domestic monitoring and military operations, raising concerns about authoritarian control and human rights violations.
4. Cyber warfare capabilities powered by AI present both offensive and defensive challenges. AI can be used to enhance cybersecurity but also to conduct sophisticated cyberattacks, manipulate information, and disrupt critical infrastructure. The rapid advancement of AI-driven cyber tools increases the risk of asymmetric warfare and hybrid conflicts.
5. Bias and unpredictability in AI decision-making remain critical issues. AI models trained on biased datasets may reinforce discriminatory patterns, leading to flawed targeting or strategic miscalculations. The "black box" nature of some AI algorithms makes it difficult to fully understand their decision-making processes, raising reliability concerns in high-stakes military operations.
6. The integration of AI into military strategy has sparked an arms race among global powers. The U.S., China, and Russia are investing heavily in AI-driven defense technologies, potentially lowering the threshold for conflict. The lack of international agreements on AI in warfare raises concerns about unchecked proliferation and destabilization.
7. AI-enabled drone technology has revolutionized modern warfare, providing enhanced precision and reconnaissance capabilities. However, the increasing use of AI-powered drones by state and non-state actors raises the risk of autonomous warfare, cross-border conflicts, and civilian casualties.
8. Misinformation and psychological warfare have been amplified by AI-generated deepfakes and propaganda tools. AI can be used to spread false narratives, manipulate public perception, and influence elections or military strategies, complicating efforts to maintain trust and stability in global affairs.
9. International efforts to regulate military AI remain fragmented. While organizations such as the United Nations have called for discussions on AI governance, major military powers have yet to reach a consensus on ethical guidelines, arms control measures, and legal frameworks for AI use in warfare.

VII. Current Situation (¾ page)

1. The development of autonomous weapons systems (AWS) remains one of the most controversial aspects of AI militarization. These systems, capable of identifying, tracking, and engaging targets with minimal or no human intervention, are being developed by military powers such as the United States, China, and Russia. The U.S. has invested in AI-driven fighter jet programs like Skyborg and surveillance initiatives such as Project Maven. China has introduced AI-enhanced swarm drones that can coordinate attacks autonomously, while Russia has tested AI-driven robotic tanks and unmanned combat vehicles. While proponents argue that these weapons could reduce human casualties by keeping soldiers out of direct combat, critics warn of significant risks, including hacking vulnerabilities, unpredictable decision-making, and lack of accountability. Without human oversight, AI-powered weapons could misidentify civilian targets or escalate conflicts without proper judgment. The lack of an international legal framework regulating AWS further increases the likelihood of their deployment in future conflicts.
2. AI-driven intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) capabilities are significantly enhancing military decision-making. AI can process vast amounts of data from satellites, drones, and communication networks, allowing for more precise threat detection, enemy tracking, and predictive analysis of potential attacks. The U.S. military employs AI-enhanced satellite imagery to detect hidden military installations and troop movements. China has deployed AI-powered surveillance systems with facial recognition capabilities to monitor both domestic and foreign activities. However, these technologies also raise serious ethical concerns. Governments can use AI-enhanced ISR for mass surveillance, tracking political dissidents, and even targeting specific ethnic or religious groups. China's AI-driven surveillance system has been used to monitor and suppress Uyghur populations in Xinjiang, raising fears that similar AI tools could be deployed in military contexts for automated targeting and repression.
3. AI is rapidly transforming cyber warfare by automating hacking techniques, enhancing cyber defense capabilities, and facilitating large-scale disinformation campaigns. Nations are deploying AI-powered tools to identify vulnerabilities in enemy networks, conduct cyberattacks, and manipulate public perception through deepfake videos and AI-generated propaganda. In 2020, the U.S. Cyber Command launched Project IKE, an AI-powered cybersecurity initiative aimed at countering cyber threats in real time. Meanwhile, China has heavily invested in AI-driven cyber espionage, using algorithms to infiltrate networks and extract classified intelligence. Russia has used AI to generate disinformation campaigns, influencing elections and public sentiment worldwide. The rise of AI-driven cyber warfare has significantly increased the risk of asymmetric conflicts, allowing non-state actors and smaller nations to leverage AI cyber tools to disrupt global security. The absence of international agreements on AI cyber warfare

makes it difficult to establish norms and accountability for AI-driven cyberattacks.

4. AI is increasingly being integrated into strategic military decision-making. AI-powered systems are now assisting commanders with battlefield strategy, threat assessment, and logistical planning. The U.S. military has tested AI algorithms that analyze battlefield conditions and suggest optimal courses of action. China has developed AI-driven war-gaming systems designed to simulate military conflicts and predict possible outcomes. While these advancements promise increased efficiency and faster decision-making, they also come with serious risks. AI systems can be biased, misinterpret battlefield conditions, or fail in unpredictable scenarios. There is also concern that AI-driven decision-making could lead to faster conflict escalation, as AI systems prioritize strategic advantage over diplomatic resolution. If multiple nations begin relying on AI for military strategy, the risk of unintended escalation increases, as AI-driven systems may misinterpret defensive maneuvers as offensive actions.
5. AI is playing an increasingly important role in military logistics and operational planning. AI-powered algorithms can predict equipment failures, optimize supply chain management, and enhance troop deployment efficiency. The U.S. military has integrated AI into logistical planning to minimize waste and improve operational effectiveness, while China has similarly incorporated AI into military transport and resource distribution strategies. These advancements enable militaries to maintain a strategic edge by ensuring rapid and efficient mobilization. However, reliance on AI in logistics also introduces vulnerabilities, such as potential cyberattacks targeting automated supply chains or disruptions caused by flawed AI decision-making in high-stakes scenarios.
6. The global AI arms race has accelerated as countries compete to develop and deploy AI-powered military technologies. The U.S., China, and Russia are leading this race, but other nations, including India, Israel, and the United Kingdom, are also making significant investments in AI-driven military advancements. The U.S. Department of Defense's 2023 AI Strategy emphasized the rapid integration of AI across all branches of the military. Meanwhile, China's "Intelligentized Warfare" doctrine prioritizes AI as a core component of future conflicts. With billions of dollars allocated to AI military research, concerns about an uncontrolled arms race continue to grow. Without clear ethical guidelines or oversight mechanisms, AI-powered military technologies could lead to unregulated warfare, increased civilian casualties, and unpredictable global security risks.
7. The lack of international regulations governing AI militarization has created a dangerous environment where countries develop AI-driven military technologies with little oversight or accountability. Unlike nuclear weapons, which are regulated by international

treaties, AI weapons have no globally accepted restrictions. The absence of a unified legal framework means that AI-driven military advancements can be rapidly deployed without restrictions on their use, raising concerns about ethical implications, potential war crimes, and the proliferation of AI-powered weapons to rogue states or terrorist organizations. Several nations have proposed regulations, but international consensus remains elusive.

8. AI-driven military technology has also contributed to geopolitical instability by shifting the balance of power between nations. Countries with advanced AI capabilities are gaining a strategic advantage over those that lag behind, increasing tensions in already volatile regions. AI-powered surveillance, cyber warfare, and autonomous weapons can be used to exert influence over adversaries, disrupt political stability, and manipulate global power structures. Without international cooperation to regulate AI militarization, these technologies could fuel conflicts, increase mistrust among nations, and make diplomacy more challenging in an era of AI-driven warfare.

VIII. Past International Action

The United Nations (UN) has been involved in addressing the militarization of AI through multiple forums, with discussions at both the General Assembly and the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW). In 2018, the CCW held its first meeting to discuss lethal autonomous weapons systems (LAWS), also known as "killer robots." Member states have debated the ethical implications, risks, and regulations related to AI in warfare. The UN has called for a preemptive ban on the development and use of fully autonomous weapon systems that operate without meaningful human control, with some nations supporting such efforts while others, including military powers like the United States, Russia, and China, have been resistant. There has been a lack of consensus among member states on how to proceed, with some arguing that international restrictions would undermine their technological development.

The European Union (EU) has taken a proactive stance on the ethical concerns surrounding AI, including its militarization. The European Commission has supported the creation of regulations that ensure AI technologies, including those used in defense, are developed in a way that respects human rights. In 2021, the EU proposed the AI Act, which includes provisions for high-risk AI systems, potentially covering AI used in defense and military applications. However, enforcement remains challenging as military AI technologies are often classified or otherwise protected from regulation. The EU has also engaged in diplomatic efforts to create international agreements on the use of autonomous weapons, advocating for a ban on fully autonomous weapons without human oversight.

NATO has also recognized the importance of AI in modern warfare, integrating AI technologies into its strategic planning, intelligence, and military operations. NATO's 2020

Artificial Intelligence Strategy outlines how the alliance intends to harness AI for defense and ensure ethical use. While focusing on maintaining technological superiority, NATO emphasizes that AI should be used in ways that comply with international law, particularly the Geneva Conventions. Concerns within NATO about the militarization of AI include the potential for AI to be used in cyber warfare, autonomous drones, and surveillance systems, which could lead to escalation in conflicts.

The United States has been at the forefront of developing AI for military applications through initiatives like the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), which focuses on AI and autonomy in military systems. In 2020, the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) unveiled its AI Strategy, which focuses on enhancing national security through AI development while ensuring AI systems remain under human control and ethical oversight. The U.S. has not supported a ban on autonomous weapon systems, arguing that international regulations should focus on ensuring accountability for the actions of AI systems rather than restricting technological advancements.

China and Russia are also advancing the militarization of AI, with both countries investing heavily in AI technologies for defense purposes. China has made AI a central part of its Military-Civil Fusion strategy, aiming to integrate AI technologies across both civilian and military sectors. Russia has shown interest in using AI to enhance its military capabilities, particularly in the areas of cyber warfare and unmanned systems. Both nations have been resistant to international calls for a ban on autonomous weapon systems, arguing that such restrictions would undermine their security interests.

Humanitarian groups, such as Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International, have raised concerns about the potential for AI to be used in ways that violate human rights. These organizations have warned against the use of fully autonomous weapons that could make life-or-death decisions without human input. NGOs have also voiced concerns about the risks of AI in surveillance systems, where military AI could be used to monitor civilian populations and increase state control, potentially infringing on personal freedoms and privacy. Calls have been made for international treaties to regulate or ban autonomous weapons systems to ensure that AI does not exacerbate conflict and lead to the dehumanization of warfare.

The use of AI in warfare and its potential for abuse has prompted discussions within international legal circles about the need for new laws or frameworks to address accountability. While international courts like the International Criminal Court (ICC) and the International Court of Justice (ICJ) have not yet prosecuted the use of AI in military contexts, there have been debates about the potential for future legal actions if AI systems are used to commit war crimes. Legal scholars argue that current international laws, such as the Geneva Conventions, may not be adequate to address the complexities of AI in warfare, and that new international agreements may be necessary to hold nations accountable for the use of AI in armed conflicts.

IX. Questions to Consider

- 1) What can nations do domestically and internationally regarding AI to prevent harm and protect rights?
- 2) To what extent can AI be regulated regarding its use or incorporation in warfare?
- 3) How can societies better balance the negatives of AI with its positives?
- 4) To what extent can data be better protected?
- 5) How can the dual-use nature of AI be better monitored?
- 6) In what way could states' actions be monitored in the field of Artificial Intelligence and Big Data?
- 7) What should be done to protect states from cyber-attacks? In addition, how could we reduce and control espionage methods in the cyber world?
- 8) How can the proliferation of drones, military and commercial, be more transparent, and should there be any restrictions during transactions involving them?
- 9) What measures have to be taken to prevent the acquisition of the necessary know-how and means for the weaponization of drones by terrorist groups or paramilitary movements?

X. Works Cited

<https://unu.edu/article/militarization-ai-has-severe-implications-global-security-and-warfare#:~:text=The%20weaponization%20of%20AI%20raises,on%20the%20Daily%20Maverick%20website.>

<https://www.forbes.com/sites/bernardmarr/2024/09/17/how-ai-is-used-in-war-today/>

<https://nstxl.org/how-artificial-intelligence-is-changing-the-future-of-military-defense-strategies/#:~:text=AI%20can%20bridge%20gaps%20in,support%20systems%20are%20more%20enhanced.>

<https://www.armyupress.army.mil/Journals/Military-Review/English-Edition-Archives/SO-24/SO-24-Artificial-Intelligence-Strategic-Innovation-and-Emerging-Risks/>

<https://www.ie.edu/insights/articles/when-ai-meets-the-laws-of-war/#:~:text=The%20principle%20of%20distinction%20is,on%20civilians%20or%20civilian%20objects.>

<https://www.qmul.ac.uk/research/featured-research/the-ethical-implications-of-ai-in-warfare/>

[https://inss.ndu.edu/Events/Event-View/Article/2870040/ai-will-change-war/#:~:text=Artificial%20Intelligence%20\(AI\)%20could%20lead, human%20control%20over%20most%20decisions.](https://inss.ndu.edu/Events/Event-View/Article/2870040/ai-will-change-war/#:~:text=Artificial%20Intelligence%20(AI)%20could%20lead, human%20control%20over%20most%20decisions.)

<https://sdi.ai/blog/the-most-useful-military-applications-of-ai/#:~:text=Warfare%20systems%20such%20as%20weapons, systems%20to%20advise%20the%20DoD.>

<https://www.forbes.com/sites/bernardmarr/2024/09/17/how-ai-is-used-in-war-today/>

<https://gjia.georgetown.edu/2024/07/12/war-artificial-intelligence-and-the-future-of-conflict/r>

<https://www.citizen.org/article/ai-joe-report/#:~:text=Summarizing%20the%20key%20ethical%20issues, compliance%20with%20international%20law%2C%20including>