FAIRGAZE MUN

UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL

AGENDA: *The Threat of Improvised Explosive Devices (IEDs), Especially During War Situations*

Mandate Of The UNSC

The United Nations Security Council (UNSC) stands as one of the foremost organs within the United Nations, entrusted with the vital responsibility of safeguarding international peace and security, facilitating the recommendation of new UN members to the General Assembly, and approving amendments to the UN Charter. Its jurisdiction extends to pivotal actions such as the establishment of peacekeeping operations, the imposition of international sanctions, and the authorization of military interventions. The UNSC stands as the sole UN entity vested with the authoritative capacity to issue binding resolutions upon member states.

Comprising fifteen esteemed members, including five permanent representatives hailing from China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States, the Security Council boasts unparalleled powers, as the permanent members possess the ability to exercise the right of veto, thus effectively impeding any substantive Security Council resolution. It is crucial to note that this veto prerogative does not extend to the proceedings or decisions of the General Assembly or its emergency special sessions. The remaining ten members are duly elected based on regional representation, serving a term of two years. Furthermore, the presidency of the Security Council gracefully circulates on a monthly basis amongst its esteemed members, ensuring equitable representation and leadership.

Introduction to the Agenda

Improvised Explosive Devices (IEDs) present a substantial and pressing menace, particularly in times of armed conflict. These devices, crafted or assembled using readily available materials, possess the potential to inflict severe damage and loss of life. Their cost-effectiveness, ease of construction, and ability to be deployed inconspicuously make them an enticing choice for insurgent groups and non-state actors.

The utilization of IEDs is prevalent in situations characterized by asymmetrical warfare, where one party possesses a marked military advantage over the other. In such scenarios, the weaker faction often resorts to unorthodox strategies, such as employing IEDs, to level the playing field. These devices can be remotely detonated or activated by individuals in close proximity, rendering them elusive and arduous to detect and defend against.The consequences of IEDs extend beyond physical devastation, as they inflict profound psychological harm upon those affected. Both military personnel and civilians are susceptible to injuries and fatalities resulting from IED attacks. Moreover, the constant fear instilled by these devices profoundly affects the mental well-being of individuals residing in war-torn regions.

To counter the menace of IEDs, military forces have diligently developed countermeasures encompassing specialized vehicles and equipment designed to detect and safely neutralize these devices. Training programs have also been established to equip soldiers with the skills to identify and evade IEDs while operating in the field.

It is imperative to recognize that although IEDs are predominantly associated with warfare, they can also be utilized in other contexts, including terrorism or criminal activities. Regardless of the circumstances, IEDs pose a substantial threat that demands diligent attention and necessitates the implementation of appropriate measures.

The History of IEDs

The peril presented by improvised explosive devices (IEDs) during times of war has persisted for decades, although their usage has notably increased in recent years. The term "IED" encompasses any type of explosive device not produced by recognized military or civilian entities.

Throughout history, various groups have employed IEDs in conflicts, but their prevalence has become particularly pronounced in the Middle East since the early 2000s. Notably, in the Iraq War, IEDs accounted for a significant portion of the casualties suffered by coalition forces.

The effectiveness of IEDs as a tactic in war situations has made them appealing to insurgent groups and non-state actors. Their relative ease of production, concealability, and strategic placement capabilities make them formidable tools to target military convoys, patrols, and other objectives. Furthermore, the psychological impact of IEDs is substantial, as the looming threat of attack can instill fear and disrupt military operations.

To combat the IED threat, military forces have developed a range of countermeasures. These encompass specialized vehicles and equipment engineered to detect and neutralize IEDs, as well as comprehensive training programs that educate soldiers on identifying and evading these devices in the field.

Despite concerted efforts to mitigate the menace of IEDs, they persist as a significant danger in war situations. Ongoing conflicts, such as in Afghanistan, continue to witness the extensive use of IEDs by the Taliban and other insurgent groups. Consequently, the threat of IEDs is expected to remain a pressing concern for military forces engaged in conflicts across the globe.

Examples of wars in recent history where the use of improvised explosive devices (IEDs) has been prevalent include:

1. Iraq War (2003-2011): Various insurgent groups, notably al-Qaeda in Iraq (AQI) and later the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS), heavily utilized IEDs during the Iraq War. These devices targeted coalition forces, Iraqi security forces, and civilians, inflicting significant casualties and damage.

2. Afghanistan War (2001-present): The ongoing conflict in Afghanistan has witnessed a sustained deployment of IEDs by the Taliban and other insurgent factions. IEDs have been employed to target coalition forces, Afghan security forces, and civilians, resulting in substantial casualties and disruption.

3. Syrian Civil War (2011-present): Multiple groups involved in the Syrian Civil War, including the Syrian government, opposition groups, and extremist organizations like ISIS, have extensively employed IEDs. These devices have been directed at military and civilian targets, leading to significant loss of life and destruction.

4. Yemeni Civil War (2015-present): The Yemeni Civil War has witnessed substantial utilization of IEDs by Houthi rebels and other factions. IEDs have been deployed to target both military and civilian objectives, resulting in significant casualties and disruption.

Security Threat Caused By IEDs

The internal security threat posed by Improvised Explosive Devices (IEDs) is a grave concern for nations worldwide. These nefarious devices have the potential to inflict significant harm, damage critical infrastructure, and endanger the lives of both security forces and civilians. The destructive power of IEDs, coupled with their ease of concealment and deployment, makes them a favored tool of various non-state actors and insurgent groups.

Different countries express varied sentiments regarding the threat of IEDs based on their experiences, geographical locations, and security situations. For nations affected by ongoing conflicts or terrorism, the threat is a paramount concern that demands constant vigilance and dedicated efforts to counter it. These countries often allocate substantial resources towards enhancing intelligence capabilities, fortifying security measures, and training their forces to effectively combat IED attacks.

Countries facing internal security threats from IEDs recognize the need for a multi-faceted approach. They focus on intelligence gathering and analysis to identify potential threats, dismantle networks involved in IED manufacturing and deployment, and disrupt the financial channels supporting these activities. Emphasis is also placed on strengthening border security and sharing intelligence and best practices with international partners to enhance collective efforts against IEDs.

The impact of IEDs on internal security is far-reaching. These devices not only cause physical harm but also create an atmosphere of fear and instability within societies. The psychological toll on individuals living in areas plagued by IED attacks is significant, leading to anxiety, trauma, and an erosion of trust within communities.

Countries differ in their countermeasures and strategies to mitigate the internal security threat posed by IEDs. They invest in research and development to develop sophisticated technologies and specialized equipment for detecting and neutralizing these devices. Additionally, countries collaborate through international forums and organizations to share expertise, intelligence, and lessons learned, fostering a collective effort to combat the IED menace.

Governments understand the need to invest in comprehensive training programs for security forces to enhance their skills in IED detection, handling, and response. These programs focus on increasing situational awareness, teaching effective search techniques, and disseminating knowledge on the latest IED trends and tactics employed by threat actors.

In summary, the internal security threat posed by IEDs is a significant concern for nations globally. Countries adopt diverse approaches based on their specific circumstances, but the consensus remains that a multi-dimensional strategy encompassing intelligence sharing, technological advancements, robust security measures, and comprehensive training is crucial to mitigating this threat and ensuring the safety and security of their populations.

The Use of IEDs in the Russia-Ukraine Conflict

The utilization of improvised explosive devices (IEDs) has been prominently observed in the ongoing conflict between Russia and Ukraine, which commenced in 2014. Both sides have employed IEDs as a strategic warfare tactic, resulting in substantial casualties and significant damage.

Notably, separatist groups in Ukraine, believed to receive support from Russia, have extensively utilized IEDs. These groups have strategically targeted Ukrainian military convoys, patrols, and other objectives using IEDs, leading to significant casualties among Ukrainian soldiers and civilians.

In response to the threat, the Ukrainian military has implemented various countermeasures to detect and neutralize IEDs. These encompass the deployment of specialized vehicles, equipment, and the establishment of training programs to enhance the skills of soldiers in detecting and handling IEDs.

The Russian military has also faced allegations of employing IEDs in the conflict. In 2018, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) reported instances where Russian-backed separatists used IEDs to target OSCE monitors in eastern Ukraine, further highlighting the widespread use of these devices.

The prevalence of IEDs in the Russia-Ukraine conflict has contributed to a significant number of casualties and perpetuated ongoing instability in the region. The persistent threat of IEDs remains a critical concern for both sides involved in the conflict, emphasizing the need for continued efforts to detect, neutralize, and prevent the use of these dangerous devices.

Question a Resolution Must Answer

1. What are the potential risks and challenges associated with implementing the proposed course of action, and how will they be addressed?
2. What is the timeline for implementing the proposed course of action?
3. How will the proposed course of action take into account the safety of civilians and non-combatants in the war zone?
4. What is the scope and severity of the IED threat in the specific war situation being addressed?
5. What strategies and tactics have been employed so far to address the IED threat, and how effective have they been?
6. Who will be responsible for implementing the proposed course of action, and what resources will be required?
7. How will the proposed course of action be evaluated for its effectiveness?
8. What additional measures or resources are needed to address the IED threat effectively?

The Use of IEDs in the Russia-Ukraine Conflict

Evidence or proof is from the following sources will be accepted as credible in the committee:

1. News Sources:

a) Reuters (http://www.reuters.com/) – Any Reuters' article which clearly makes mention of the fact stated or is in contradiction of the fact being stated by another delegate in council can be used to substantiate arguments in the committee.

b) State operated News Agencies – These reports can be used in support of or against the State that owns the News Agency. These reports, if credible or substantial enough, can be used in support of or against any country as such but in that situation, they can be denied by any other country in the council.

Some examples are:

i. Russia: RIA Novosti (http://en.rian.ru/)

Iran: RNAI (http://www.irna.ir/ENIndex.html)

iii. China: Xinhua News Agency and CCTV (http://cctvnews.cntv.cn/)

2. Government Reports: These reports can be used in a similar way as the State Operated News Agencies reports and can, in all circumstances, be denied by another country. However, a nuance is that a report that is being denied by a certain country can still be accepted by the Executive Board as credible information.

Some examples are:

i. Government Websites like the State Department of the United States of America (http://www.state.gov/) or the Ministry of Defense of the Russian Federation (http://www.eng.mil.ru/).

ii. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of various nations like India (http://www.mea.gov.in/) or People's Republic of China (http://www.fmprc.gov.cn/). iii. Permanent Representatives

to the United Nations Reports (http://www.un.org/). iv. Multilateral Organizations like the

NATO (http://www.nato.int/), ASEAN (http://www.aseansec.org/), OPEC (http://www.opec.org/), etc.

3. UN Reports: All UN Reports are considered credible information or evidence for the Executive Board.

i. UN Bodies like the UNSC (http://www.un.org/) or UNGA (http://www.un.org/). ii. UN Affiliated bodies like the International Atomic Energy Agency (http://www.iaea.org/), World Bank (http://www.worldbank.org/), International Monetary Fund (http://www.imf.org/), International Committee of the Red Cross (http://www.icrc.org/), etc. iii. Treaty Based Bodies like the Antarctic Treaty System (http://www.ats.aq/), the International Criminal Court (http://www.icc-cpi.int/).

NOTE: Under no circumstances will sources like Wikipedia, Amnesty International, or newspapers like the Times of India, etc. be accepted as PROOF/EVIDENCE. But they can be used for better understanding of any issue or even be brought up in debate if the information given in such sources is in line with the beliefs of a Government.