

DISEC: Disarmament and International Security



TABLE OF CONTENTS

LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY GENERAL..... 4
LETTER FROM THE HEAD CHAIRS..... 5
COMMITTEE PROCEDURE..... 6
INTRODUCTION..... 7
KEY TERMS..... 9
TOPIC B: Combatting AI Weaponization..... 14
TOPIC B: Combatting AI Weaponization..... 17
QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER - Topic A..... 19
QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER - Topic B..... 20
SOURCES CITED..... 21

LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY GENERAL

Delegates, Club and Team Advisors, Parents, and Any Other MUN Folks,

It is my esteemed privilege to welcome you all to Davis Model United Nations Conference XXIII! My name is Brody Andrews, and I am honored to serve as your Secretary-General for the 23rd DMUNC. On the weekend of May 2-3, 2026, delegates will have the opportunity to engage in fruitful debate and cooperation, and hopefully, make lifelong connections.

As a senior at UC Davis, this will be my final DMUNC and my final Model UN Conference. I've been to over 30 conferences in the eight years I've been doing MUN but nothing I've gotten to do in my Model UN career has been as rewarding as DMUNC. Last year I got the opportunity to serve as the Director General of DMUNC XXII and it brought me so much joy to watch a massive number of future leaders bring their imaginative ideas to important debates. Thank you all for the opportunity to watch the magic unfold again, I truly cannot wait to see and be inspired by all of you in May.

I joined MUN my freshman year in high school and I could not be more grateful for the experiences it has brought me. Having been in your position I know how simultaneously nerve-wracking and exciting a MUN weekend can be. Whether this is your first conference or your 100th I'm happy you chose to come to DMUNC. In college, MUN has only become a larger part of my life. Not only has MUN afforded me educational and competitive opportunities, but it has also brought me lasting relationships with incredible people who continue to push and support me every day.

As someone who has done Model UN for so many years, I've had all the classic MUN experiences. Every author's panel, crisis update, closing ceremony celebration, and moderated caucus speech led me to DMUNC and I couldn't be happier. As graduation looms large, I want to remind all of you of the amazing joys that MUN can bring and all of the exciting things college has in store for all of you. When you love MUN, it loves you back. The skills you will improve, friendships you will form, and knowledge you will gain from even one MUN conference is enough to make having to explain what a crisis committee is to your non-MUN friends worth it.

I have had the honor of serving as the Director General of DMUNC XXII and as the crisis director for DMUNC XXI's The Muppets committee and DMUNC XX's Star Wars JCC on the Rebels side. With three DMUNCs and countless more conferences under my belt, I feel confident that my experience and passion will help make DMUNC XXIII a truly memorable conference. However, none of this would be possible without the hard work of the CONSEC and staff members who have worked tirelessly for months to prepare for DMUNC XXIII. Running DMUNC is in *no way* a one person job and I am eternally grateful to every single DMUNC staff member. My greatest thanks goes to my Director General Mae Tyson who has stepped up at every turn in extraordinary ways. Thank you Mae, CONSEC, head chairs, crisis directors, and all the DMUNC staff.

Delegates, we have been planning this weekend since August of 2025 and we're so excited for you to enjoy it. I encourage you to read through your committee background guides thoroughly and formulate collaborative resolutions. I look forward to the thought-provoking ideas that each of you will bring forth to your respective committees. Good luck! We truly can't wait to share this with you.

Sincerely,

Brody Andrews | Secretary-General

Davis Model United Nations Conference XXIII

dmuncsg1@gmail.com

LETTER FROM THE HEAD CHAIRS

Dear Delegates,

Both Head Chair Grace as well as Head Chair Gagandeep, applaud you and welcome you to the United Nations General Assembly First Committee. Which is also known as the Disarmament and International Security Committee for the Annual DMUNC conference at The University of California, Davis. This is our first DMUNC conference that we will be attending as well as Head Chairing and can't wait to meet you all! It is with great honor that we will both have the esteemed privilege to guide this committee and ensure that everything runs smoothly. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns please feel free to contact either of us with any questions. We are here to help and provide any information that is necessary to succeed!

To begin, we both understand that the topics presented in this background guide will raise difficult conversations that relate to real world situations. Which is why, it is absolutely important that delegates handle these conversations with absolute respect for one another and be reminded that Model UN is a simulation of delegates playing a character of the country that they are representing. Additionally, it is important to take these conversations seriously and critically.

Secondly, the background guide will provide all of the necessary information needed to ensure that all delegates are following committee guidelines/procedures with a diplomatic approach. The purpose of this committee is to gain a better understanding of the topics presented that are also seen in real world situations and apply your own knowledge of ways to create purposeful solutions to the situations mentioned. Creating a through-provoking environment of knowledge.

Lastly, the goal of DMUNC and Model United Nations as a whole is to have fun. Which is why our goal as Head Chairs is to ensure that all the delegates participating are having fun and are treated with respect. Ultimately, creating a safe environment where delegates are diplomatic. We look forward to meeting you and wish you the best of luck as you prepare for DMUNC XXIII!

Best of Luck,

Gagandeep Kaur | *Head Chair*

gnpkaur@ucdavis.edu

Grace Hou | *Head Chair*

gyhou@ucdavis.edu

COMMITTEE PROCEDURE

Delegates would assure that throughout the committee, Topic A: Nuclear Crisis and Security as well as Topic B: Combatting AI Weaponization are addressed accordingly. The background guide provided will address both topics, providing background information on where to start and focus. But it is of utmost importance that delegates branch out to other sources of information.

Delegates would also follow the procedure of a general assembly conference. During the roll call, delegates must select *present* or *present and voting*. Please note that if a delegate selects *present and voting*, they are required to vote for every procedure. Additionally, whether a delegate chooses to be *present* or *present and voting* would not affect a delegate's likeliness to receive an award during committee.

This committee will be **tech-free**. This means that all resolutions must be handwritten. To ensure a free and equal opportunity for everyone, delegates must put away their cellphones and laptops for the entire duration of the committee. Failure to do so would result in automatic disqualification of awards and further consequences regarding the future participation of DMUNC.

When delegates set the agenda and provide their moderated caucuses, it is recommended (but not mandatory) that the agenda is set towards themes that are set in the background guide. Suppose a delegate chooses to debate a theme outside the background guide. In that case, it is crucial that the theme is relative to the committee's agenda.

INTRODUCTION

TOPIC A

The existence of nuclear power first began in 1941. With the first appearance of nuclear weaponry being in 1945 in the United States. This is also known as the *Trinity Test* in New Mexico, that had forever changed the understanding and extent to which weaponry can be used. This further caused nuclear power to be developed and advanced to create stronger and more powerful inventions to be made. Influencing other countries to create nuclear power as well.

Due to the advancement of nuclear power further developing nuclear weaponry, it has raised international concerns of security. This is because nuclear weaponry can be turned into a tactic to threaten other countries in times of conflict. Further creating an international nuclear crisis. Additionally, this results in further threats on nuclear proliferation, which impacts not only the countries that would be targeted, but the innocent residents of said countries and the entire world.

Moreover, the current nations as of 2025 that hold nuclear power are: The United States, China, Russia, The United Kingdom, France, India, North Korea, Pakistan, and Israel. Furthermore, these nations are yet to sign or ratify the *Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons* (TPNW). A treaty focused on prohibiting involvement with nuclear weapon activity. Forbidding the development, testing, producing, acquiring, possessing, stockpiling, and the use of nuclear weapons as a way to threaten ([United Nations](#)). Especially, when it involves other nations.

Lastly, the nuclear crisis on international security is a dire situation that needs to be addressed immediately. It causes concern for all people involved as well as innocent people who are not involved. Which is why it is of utmost importance to address this concern with the understanding of how nuclear power can be turned around to be utilized in a way that helps international issues. Which can be further developed to create solutions for other situations, such as climate change.

TOPIC B

AI weaponization has become an international security issue because militaries are increasingly building systems that can sense, classify, and respond faster than humans can realistically evaluate in real time. The concern is not only fully autonomous “killer robots,” but the broader shift toward automation across the targeting process—from surveillance and identification to prioritization, recommendation, and engagement. As more steps are delegated to software, combat can move toward machine-speed decision cycles, where mistakes scale quickly and responsibility becomes harder to trace.

A major driver is the demand for rapid response, especially in defensive settings. Modern militaries rely on automated or highly automated protection systems because incoming threats arrive too fast for careful human deliberation. Examples often cited in LAWS discussions include active protection systems such as Russia’s Arena, Israel’s Trophy, and Germany’s AMAP-ADS, as well as missile and rocket defense systems like Iron Dome, which must detect threats, assess trajectories, and initiate interception within seconds. These systems illustrate why autonomy is attractive: speed can save lives and equipment. But they also illustrate why autonomy is risky: when decisions are compressed into milliseconds, meaningful human control can shrink into minimal supervision.

Research programs have also signaled how autonomy could extend beyond defense into coordinated strike missions. A widely cited warning is that autonomy becomes especially appealing in environments where communications are jammed or unreliable. Two DARPA programs frequently referenced in early debates are Fast Lightweight Autonomy (FLA) and Collaborative Operations in Denied Environment (CODE). FLA explored programming small aircraft to maneuver without direct human control in complex spaces such as urban areas and buildings. CODE aimed to develop teams of autonomous aircraft that can coordinate actions even when communications are degraded, moving toward systems that can execute multiple steps of a strike mission with reduced real-time human direction. (Nature, 2015)

Because of this trajectory, the ethical and legal debate focuses on how much human control remains. A commonly used framework (from Human Rights Watch) describes three levels: human-in-the-loop (a human must initiate an attack), human-on-the-loop (a human supervises and can abort), and human-out-of-the-loop (no human action is involved in selecting and engaging targets at the moment of attack). (Human Rights Watch, 2012) The core concern is that reducing human decision-making weakens accountability and reliability: when a system misidentifies a target or behaves unexpectedly in a complex environment, it becomes difficult to determine who is responsible and whether the outcome was preventable.

KEY TERMS

Disarmament:

The act of taking away or giving up weapons

Nuclear:

Relating to the nuclei atoms, or to the energy released when these nuclei are split or combined

Crisis:

A situation in which something or someone is affected by one or more very serious problems

Nuclear Proliferation:

The spread of nuclear weapons, nuclear weapons technology, or fissile material to countries that do not already possess them

International Security:

A collection of measures taken by countries, international organizations, and private entities to ensure their mutual safety, prevent future conflict, and maintain fruitful relationships

IAEA (International Atomic Energy Agency):

An independent intergovernmental, science and technology-based organization, in the United Nations family, that serves as the global focal point for nuclear cooperation

Artificial Intelligence (AI):

The application of computer systems able to perform tasks or produce output normally requiring human intelligence, especially by applying machine learning techniques to large collections of data

Hyperwar:

Algorithmic warfare, controlled by artificial intelligence, with little to no human decision-making

AI weaponization:

The development and use of AI technology in military, cyber, and social contexts to gain a strategic advantage over an enemy or rival

Lethal Autonomous Weapon Systems (LAWS):

A term used to describe unconventional weapon systems aided by AI. However, there are no comprehensive international laws truly defining LAWS

Human in the loop:

Systems where humans collaborate with automated processes, providing oversight, judgment, and training to improve AI performance, especially for complex tasks, ethical checks, or edge cases where machines struggle, creating a feedback loop for continuous learning and better outcomes than either humans or AI alone

TOPIC A: Nuclear Crisis and Security

Historical Context

Manhattan Project

During World War 2, the Manhattan Project was one of the many topics discussed in the United States and played a key role during the time. The Manhattan Project itself was considered to be a “Top-Secret Government Program”. Furthermore, the Manhattan Project was a plan to create atomic weapons that could be useful to the United States, to use during the war against Nazi Germany. The development of the project was scattered across the nations in different locations that include: Hanford, Washington; Los Alamos, New Mexico; and Oak Ridge, Tennessee.

[*\(National Park Service, What is the Manhattan Project?\)*](#)

Additionally, the main goal was to create an Atomic Bomb, this project brought both the world of scientific knowledge and military tactics together. Working in effort to fulfill the goals of this project. However, it also required the work of, “... tens of thousands of ordinary Americans...” to come together as well, working on this project. Overall, this project required the responsibility, knowledge, and commitment of many Americans in the United States. But, this project was not going to be completed on the basis of hard work alone. In addition, this project at its highest development required, “... 130,000 workers and, by the end of the war, had spent \$2.2 billion”.

[*\(U.S. Department of Energy, Manhattan Project Background Information and Preservation Work\)*](#)

Overall, the Manhattan Project brought further knowledge and commitment to the development of atomic weaponry even further. It was successful during World War 2 and brought it to an end. This project had a lasting impact on World War 2, and with the demands of technology advancing, it also had a lasting impact on the next war to come: the Cold War. Additionally, according to the *U.S. Department of Energy*, “... the Manhattan Project became the organizational model behind the remarkable achievements of American "big science" during the second half of the twentieth century”. Overall, leaving a lasting impact on the United States.

[*\(U.S. Department of Energy, Manhattan Project Background Information and Preservation Work\)*](#)

Cuban Missile Crisis

During October of the year 1962, was the Cuban Missile Crisis. The main parties included in this crisis were, the United States, the Soviet Union, and Cuba. This moment in time illustrates the horror of the involvement of atomic warfare. Causing destruction in multiple parts of the world. The Cuban Missile Crisis, is a prime example of the potential destruction caused by the involvement of atomic weaponry. Creating worry for all parties involved and the entire world. ([Office of the Historian, The Cuban Missile Crisis, October 1962](#))

The Cuban Missile Crisis was initiated by the Soviet Union. According to *Khan Academy*, “In October 1962, the Soviet provision of ballistic missiles to Cuba led to the most dangerous Cold War confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union and brought the world to the brink of nuclear war” (*Khan Academy*). With both the Soviet Union and the United States involved, it was crucial during this time for an agreement to be made, to prevent further damage. ([Khan Academy, The Cuban Missile Crisis](#))

Overall, the impact of missiles during this time was the main involvement in the start and end of this crisis. According to an article by the *Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation*, “The Soviets agreed to remove their offensive missiles from Cuba if the United States promised to remove its Jupiter missiles from Turkey, and not to invade Cuba. The next day, Khrushchev and President Kennedy announced the agreement separately, ending the crisis” (*Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation*). The impact of nuclear weaponry in this time was concerning. ([Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation, The Cuban Missile Crisis](#))

NATO “Dual-Track” Decision

The NATO “Dual-Track” Decision was a decision that occurred during 1979. According to an article by *War on the Rocks*, “The Dual Track Decision was built on “two parallel and complementary approaches” (*War on the Rocks*). It was first initiated by a meeting held by NATO allies on the discussion of new missile weaponry by the Soviet Union, at the time. The meeting focused on 1: the United States using their own missiles and 2: convincing the Soviet Union with “an arms control strategy” for the Soviets to stop their weaponry advancement. ([War on the Rocks, The Dual-Track Approach: A Long-Term Strategy for a Post-INF Treaty World](#))

Furthermore, a treaty was the outcome and helped against the situation at hand. The treaty is also known as the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Range Forces (INF) Treaty. The treaty focuses on the dismantlement of, “... all land-based missiles with ranges between 500 and 5,500 km”. (*War on the Rocks*). Overall, preventing the potential harm of atomic missiles to be used worldwide.

Past U.N Involvement

The United Nation's first involvement with Nuclear Crisis and Security first began with the creation of their very first resolution by the UN General Assembly, focused on disarmament. This resolution was created during the year 1946, focusing on removing weapons that have the potential to create extensive damage with the involvement of nuclear power. This resolution was the outcome of the catastrophic suffering of Hiroshima and Nagasaki that was the result of nuclear bombs. Which quickly killed 250,000 people on impact and 200,000 more people once the radiation that was considered lethal from the nuclear bombs became overbearing: overdose.

The aftermath of this, resulted in various treaties and solutions to be focused on by the United Nations to ensure that the impact of nuclear casualties will be drastically decreased. Furthermore, the United Nations Security Council had passed *Resolution 2231* in 2015, that focused on the *Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA)*. Additionally, the resolution focused on the Iranian nuclear concerns, more specifically, as stated in the resolution: "... Iran's nuclear programme will be exclusively peaceful..." (JCPOA). Further promoting international peace.

Another document that was passed by the United Nations was, the *Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (TPNW)*. An initiative focused on disarmament to, "... undertakings not to develop, test, produce, acquire, possess, stockpile, use, or threaten to use nuclear weapons" (United Nations). This treaty was adopted by the United Nations during a conference in New York in 2017, following up on *Resolution 71/258*. Moreover, preventing the development of nuclear warfare, that would cause immediate concern and impede international security.

Overall, the United Nations as a whole is working towards many goals to ensure that a nuclear crisis is diplomatically discussed. To prevent any concerns that could possibly arise from the development and possession of nuclear power. Which could incorporate into impacting international security. Raising more concerns on proliferation that would be threatening. Furthermore, having discussions on nuclear power is important to stay on track on technological developments that are tied to nuclear development. With the United Nations focus on this issue, more solutions could be promoted for a stronger international security against nuclear warfare.

TOPIC B: Combatting AI Weaponization

Historical Context

Second Nagorno-Karabakh War

The first recorded use of a fully automated weapon without human input was a Turkish-made Kargu-2 drone deployed amidst the Second Nagorno-Karabakh war, a conflict between Azerbaijan and Armenia. Till this day, experts agree that this was the first war where AI-enabled autonomous drones were decisive. (Arsalan Satti) Though artificial intelligence has already been part of civilian lives, it has never been put fully into use as decision making machines. Now, AI was reconstructing the conventional battlefield, making it faster, more precise, and immensely more dangerous.

The weaponization of Artificial Intelligence poses a significant threat to international security largely due to its reliance on AI to make important decisions humans have made in the past. Trained automated programs calculate the situation and respond directly to stimuli, significantly escalating conflicts while unregulated. In the Second Nagorno-Narabakh War, Azerbaijan employed mass numbers of unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), which allowed persistent surveillance on the Armenians and for the Azerbaijan military to rapidly target opposing armies and forces(War On The Rocks). This quickly ended the war with Armenia's defeat. However, because the drones were automated, it lowered the threshold for violence and decision loops were largely shortened, effectively cutting war time between Azerbaijan and Armenia. This equally proved the unaccounted danger of relying on automated military systems in war, as the lack of human-in-the-loop speeds military actions.

Thus, the Second Nagorno-Karabakh War was a critical turning point in modern warfare. It showed how AI-enabled systems can compress decision-making timelines beyond meaningful human control. As autonomous drones assumed surveillance, targeting, and strike coordination roles, traditional safeguards such as human judgment, proportionality assessments, and accountability mechanisms were increasingly sidelined. This automation-driven acceleration risks normalizing rapid escalation, miscalculation, and unintended civilian harm, particularly when such systems are deployed without clear international standards or binding regulations. In this sense, the conflict underscored a broader global concern: as states pursue AI to gain strategic and tactical advantages, the absence of robust governance frameworks may allow technological efficiency to override ethical restraint, posing long-term threats to international stability and security.

Russo-Ukraine War

When the Russo-Ukraine war began in 2022, it pushed AI-assisted warfare to an unprecedented level. This was the first large-scale warfare where AI was normalized as part of a state's military force. Both Russia and Ukraine relied heavily on persistent aerial surveillance to monitor the battlefield continuously, turning movement itself into a risk—because detection can be quickly translated into fire. (CSIS)

Ukraine also built networked digital battlefield tools that combine satellite imagery, drone feeds, radar/sensor inputs, and field reports into live maps shared across units, shrinking the gap between viewing and striking. Systems like DELTA were designed to integrate many data sources into a single operational picture, allowing faster coordination and faster targeting than traditional command chains. (NATO ACT; GMF)

On top of that, AI-enabled analytics have been used to accelerate targeting workflow, turning vast quantities of imagery and geolocated reports into actionable strike decisions. Reuters has reported Ukraine's use of Palantir's software for targeting support, and later reporting described Ukraine using AI to scan aerial/satellite imagery for targets and to assist with drone operations, illustrating how “decision support” becomes a battlefield multiplier. (Reuters, Feb. 2023; Reuters, Aug. 2025)

AI has also expanded into identification and intelligence screening. Ukraine has publicly discussed using facial recognition tools (including Clearview AI) to identify dead soldiers and support wartime verification and counter-intelligence screening—showing how the war's AI layer extends beyond weapons into population-level identification systems. (Reuters, Mar. 2022; Reuters, Mar. 2022)

This war shows how AI compresses the kill chain and increases escalation pressure—not necessarily by removing humans, but by pushing humans into machine-paced confirmation, where speed outcompetes deliberation and errors scale with volume. (GMF; CSIS)

Israel–Palestinian Conflict

In October 2023, after the Hamas-led attacks on October 7, Israel launched an intense bombing campaign in Gaza, and airstrikes quickly became the main way the war was fought from the sky. Gaza's dense neighborhoods meant that a single strike could hit not only a suspected militant site, but also nearby apartments, shelters, and essential services—so the speed and scale of bombing raised constant concerns about civilian harm.

In this context, AI was not introduced as a single “autonomous” weapon—it was used as a decision accelerator. Reporting described Israel using an AI-enabled system known as Habsora (“the Gospel”) to help “produce targets at a fast pace,” turning intelligence into bombing recommendations faster than human analysts traditionally could. That matters because the bottleneck in modern war is often not firepower, but selection: who counts as a target, how confident the identification is, and how quickly an operation can move from suspicion to strike. When AI tools increase the volume of proposed targets, they can shift warfare toward a

throughput model—more targets, shorter review windows, and stronger pressure to trust the machine’s confidence score. (The Guardian, Dec. 2023; Lieber Institute at West Point, June 2024)

Investigations also reported the use of AI decision-support tools focused on people rather than sites—most prominently a system described as “Lavender,” which allegedly helped flag individuals as suspected militants and feed them into targeting pipelines. These reports are disputed and politically charged: the Israeli military has emphasized human involvement and legal compliance, which is exactly where the risk lives—because even when humans remain “in the loop,” AI can still compress judgment into fast confirmation, especially under operational urgency and mass output. In other words, the threat isn’t only autonomy; it’s automation of pace, where oversight becomes procedural rather than substantive. (+972 Magazine, Apr. 2024; Lieber Institute at West Point, June 2024)

AI-linked infrastructure has also been reported on the intelligence side: surveillance at scale, pattern-finding, and even the development of model-assisted tools designed to sift enormous volumes of intercepted communications—expanding what can be monitored, how quickly analysts can generate leads, and how easily error or bias can scale when the system becomes a trusted filter. That creates long-term security consequences beyond the immediate war, because systems built for conflict can normalize high-intensity surveillance as an everyday governance tool. (The Guardian, Mar. 2025; AP News, 2025)

Past U.N Involvement

Past UN Involvement

AI weapons were only developed in recent decades. In 1980, the international community adopted the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW), a foundational treaty restricting weapons considered excessively injurious or indiscriminate (United Nations). However, at this time, LAWS did not exist yet, so although CCW later became the central forum for LAWS regulation, it was not created as binding regulation for LAWS, and could not serve as a legally binding framework for regulation.

Then, in 2013, the international community made another attempt to push for the regulation of AI weapons, marked by the UN Human Rights Council “Lethal Autonomous Robotics” Report by Christof Heyns (Autonorms). It was the first official UN document to warn that autonomous weapons may violate human rights and international humanitarian law. This called for a moratorium on fully autonomous weapons and introduced the concept of “meaningful human control,” a predecessor to what we now call “human-in-the-loop.” The creation of this document soon triggered CCW adoption of the LAWS issue the following year. Experts held the first CCW informal meeting on LAWS, making it the first multilateral diplomatic meeting on autonomous weapons (World Federation of United Nations Associations). This meeting established CCW as the primary UN forum for LAWS regulation and became the basis for further discussions on AI weapon regulations.

The next significant development came in 2016, when the CCW established the Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on LAWS (Autonorms). The GGE was expected to study the legal, ethical, and technical dimensions of autonomous weapons and to recommend possible regulatory pathways. Debates centered on topics such as the definition of “meaningful human control,” accountability for autonomous decisions, the dual-use nature of AI, and whether fully autonomous weapons should be prohibited completely. However, progress within the GGE remained slow, mostly due to the CCW’s consensus rule and resistance from major global powers with a focus in national defense such as the United States, Russia, and Israel to binding restrictions.

In 2019, CCW adopted the 11 guiding principles on lethal autonomous weapons. This became the first internationally agreed set of norms on autonomous weapons (Autonorms). However, they were only nonbinding guidelines and could not be used for regulation. The international community needed a better, more binding, enforceable regulatory framework. Finally in 2024, the UN general Assembly passed Resolution A/RES/78/241, the first resolution dedicated solely to LAWS (ASIL).

Although debate on LAWS regulation continues, the primary forum for international discussion has largely remained within the CCW, an outdated and non-legally binding framework; therefore, the next necessary step should be to push for the development of a legally binding treaty, one that

establishes clear prohibitions, accountability mechanisms, and enforceable standards for the use of autonomous weapons.

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER - Topic A

Q1:

Nuclear power as well as weaponry will continue to exist and be advanced as time goes on.

However, what are ways that nuclear power can be used to a country's overall advancement?

Q2:

Are there any ways that the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs can help divert the threat that nuclear weapons hold on other countries, that can instead strengthen foreign relations?

Q3:

What strategies can be created or further developed to ensure a safer tactic around the implementation of nuclear power, that will create a stronger international security all around?

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER - Topic B

Q1:

Currently there is not yet a universally accepted definition of Lethal autonomous weapons systems, which makes regulation attempts difficult. How should the international community address this standing issue?

Q2:

Although the weaponization of artificial intelligence is and will continue to be increasingly dangerous in the future, other AI applications for civilian use are still extremely useful and productive. Where could the line be drawn?

Q3:

All existing humanitarian-law treaties (e.g. CCW) that could affect the regulation of AI weaponization were created before wide-spread utilization of AI and autonomous systems, creating a situation where no legally-binding treaties exist on this matter. In what ways can we use non-legally binding guiding principles to settle an internationally recognized legally-binding treaty?

SOURCES CITED

- Arms Control Center. "The Cuban Missile Crisis." *Arms Control Center*, www.armscontrolcenter.org/the-cuban-missile-crisis/.
- ASIL. "Governing Autonomous Weapons: The UN General Assembly's First Resolution on LAWS." *ASIL Insights*, vol. 29, no. 1, 2025, American Society of International Law, www.asil.org/insights/volume/29/issue/1.
- Autonorms. "Regulation and Prohibition of Autonomous Weapons Systems: A Future Outside the CCW." *Autonorms*, 2023, www.autonorms.eu/regulation-and-prohibition-of-autonomous-weapons-systems-a-future-outside-the-ccw.
- Britannica, The Editors of Encyclopaedia. "Nuclear Proliferation." *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, www.britannica.com/topic/nuclear-proliferation.
- Cambridge Dictionary. "Disarmament." *Cambridge Dictionary*, dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/disarmament.
- Collins Dictionary. "Nuclear Crisis." *Collins Dictionary*, www.collinsdictionary.com/us/dictionary/english/nuclear-crisis.
- EBSCO. "Nuclear Proliferation Overview." *EBSCO Research Starters*, www.ebsco.com/research-starters/military-history-and-science/nuclear-proliferation-overview.
- Energy.gov. "History of Nuclear Energy." *U.S. Department of Energy*, www.energy.gov/ne/articles/history-nuclear-energy.
- Energy.gov. "Manhattan Project Background Information and Preservation Work." *U.S. Department of Energy*, www.energy.gov/lm/manhattan-project-background-information-and-preservation-work.
- Human Rights Watch. *Stopping Killer Robots: Country Positions on Banning Fully Autonomous Weapons*. Human Rights Watch, 10 Aug. 2020, www.hrw.org/report/2020/08/10/stopping-killer-robots/country-positions-banning-fully-a-utonomous-weapons-and.
- International Atomic Energy Agency. "About Us: Mission." *IAEA*, www.iaea.org/about/mission.
- International Atomic Energy Agency. *International Atomic Energy Agency*, www.iaea.org/.
- International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons. "Nuclear Arsenals." *ICAN*, www.icanw.org/nuclear_arsenals.

- Khan Academy. "The Cuban Missile Crisis." *Khan Academy*,
www.khanacademy.org/humanities/us-history/postwarera/x71a94f19:the-cuban-missile-crisis/a/the-cuban-missile-crisis.
- National WWII Museum. "Making the Atomic Bomb: The Trinity Test." *The National WWII Museum*,
www.nationalww2museum.org/war/articles/making-the-atomic-bomb-trinity-test.
- National WWII Museum. "The Manhattan Project." *The National WWII Museum*,
www.nationalww2museum.org/war/topics/manhattan-project.
- "NATO Double Track Decision, 1979." Ruhr-Uni-Bochum.de, 2026,
www.ruhr-uni-bochum.de/gna/Quellensammlung/11/11_natodoubletrack_1979.htm.
 Accessed 10 Jan. 2026.
- Nature. "Autonomous Weapons: An Open Letter from AI and Robotics Researchers." *Nature*,
 vol. 521, 2015, pp. 415–418, www.nature.com/articles/521415a.
- National Park Service. "The Manhattan Project." *NPS*,
www.nps.gov/mapr/learn/manhattan-project.htm.
- Nuclear Innovation Alliance. "Global Security." *Nuclear Innovation Alliance*,
nuclearinnovationalliance.org/global-security.
- Online Programs at ECU. "What Is International Security?" *East Carolina University*,
onlineprograms.ecu.edu/blog/what-is-international-security/.
- Reaching Critical Will. "Report on the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW): Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems." *Reaching Critical Will*, 2025,
reachingcriticalwill.org/disarmament-fora/ccw/2025/laws/ccwreport/17475.
- Stanford University, Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies. "Lethal Autonomous Weapons: The Next Frontier in International Security and Arms Control." *Stanford FSI*, 2025,
fsi.stanford.edu/sipr/content/lethal-autonomous-weapons-next-frontier-international-security-and-arms-control.
- Stop Killer Robots. "156 States Support UN General Assembly Resolution on Killer Robots." *Stop Killer Robots*, 2025,
www.stopkillerrobots.org/news/156-states-support-unga-resolution.
- United Nations. "Disarmament." *United Nations*, www.un.org/en/global-issues/disarmament.
- United Nations. "National Security versus Global Security." *UN Chronicle*,
www.un.org/en/chronicle/article/national-security-versus-global-security.

United Nations. “The Role of the United Nations in Addressing Emerging Technologies in the Area of Lethal Autonomous Weapons.” *UN Chronicle*, 2023, www.un.org/en/un-chronicle/role-united-nations-addressing-emerging-technologies-area-lethal-autonomous-weapons.

United Nations. “Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons.” *UN Office for Disarmament Affairs*, disarmament.unoda.org/en/our-work/weapons-mass-destruction/nuclear-weapons/treaty-prohibition-nuclear-weapons.

United Nations. “What Is Nuclear Disarmament?” *United Nations Peace and Security*, www.un.org/en/peace-and-security/what-nuclear-disarmament.

United Nations General Assembly First Committee. *First Committee (Disarmament and International Security)*, www.un.org/en/ga/first/index.shtml.

United Nations Security Council. “Resolution 2231 (2015): Background.” *United Nations*, main.un.org/securitycouncil/en/content/2231/background.

United Nations Security Council. *Letter Dated 20 July 2015 from the Secretary-General*. United Nations, 2015, docs.un.org/en/S/2015/544.

War on the Rocks. “The Dual-Track Approach: A Long-Term Strategy for a Post-INF Treaty World.” *War on the Rocks*, Apr. 2019, warontherocks.com/2019/04/the-dual-track-approach-a-long-term-strategy-for-a-post-inf-treaty-world/.

War on the Rocks. “The Middle East’s AI Warfare Laboratory.” *War on the Rocks*, Apr. 2025, warontherocks.com/2025/04/the-middle-east-s-ai-warfare-laboratory/.

World Federation of United Nations Associations. *Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems (LAWS): Background Guide*. WFUNA, Oct. 2023, wfuna.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/GA1-LAWS-background-doc.pdf.