



1st Disarmament and International Security Committee

President: Aidan Caleb Piña Guadarrama.

Moderator: Sebastián Martínez Sánchez.

Conference Officer: Antonio Morales Monroy.



WELCOME LETTER TO DELEGATES

Delegates, it is our pleasure to be your chair for this Model United Nations; we are keen on making great memories with all of you.

The objective of the MUN is to educate students about international issues, public speaking, critical thinking, research, negotiation, and leadership. We want to make this model one that can be remembered throughout your life, not only for the things you'll learn, but also for the friends you'll make, the jokes you'll hear, and the stories you'll have to tell your friends.

We want you to have a great time during this model. We want all of you to learn new things and have new experiences, to learn from new cultures, meet new people, find solutions to problems, make decisions, develop critical thinking and be able to understand the situations which we experience globally.

We offer you our constant support with every doubt, every inconvenience, everything that bothers you; we will help you to the best of our ability.

Don't be shy to contact us or ask for help; our job is to make sure you all are happy and comfortable.

Sincerely,

President: Aidan Caleb Piña Guadarrama.

Moderator: Sebastián Martínez Sánchez.

Conference officer: Antonio Morales Monroy.



ABOUT THE COMMITTEE.

The Disarmament and International Security Committee (DISEC) is the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly. The committee concerns itself with questions of international importance regarding the security and demilitarization throughout all countries and regions, while ensuring that citizens around the globe remain protected. In particular, DISEC is concerned with the regulation of all member states' armaments, with particular care taken to work towards the UN's goal of total disarmament.

DISEC was established in 1945 alongside the United Nations itself, following the devastation of the Second World War. It emerged from a paramount need to promote disarmament and prevent the scourge of war through multilateral diplomacy. Its mandate and work are rooted in the UN Charter's goals of saving "succeeding generations from the war" and promoting "international peace and security."

The committee's primary goal is to deliberate on a wide range of security challenges, including nuclear non-proliferation, the regulation of conventional weapons, the impact of emerging technologies on warfare, and the prevention of an arms race in outer space. It fosters dialogue among all 193 UN Member States to build consensus on resolutions and norms aimed at reducing global threats.

A key function of DISEC is to develop and recommend draft resolutions on disarmament and international security matters to the plenary of the General Assembly for adoption. These resolutions provide critical policy direction and can lead to the negotiation of legally binding instruments, such as the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

This year, the thematic topic of DISEC will be focused on the ways in which warfare has evolved in the 21st century and how the UN can modernize to utilize and regulate these tools to protect civilians.

DISEC meets annually during the General Assembly's main session. Its work is supported by the UN Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA). All member states participate, and decisions are made through a voting process, reflecting the diverse perspectives of the international community on complex security issues.

Through its multilateral and inclusive nature, DISEC provides an essential platform for the international community to confront shared security threats, build confidence among states, and advance the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament.

References:

1. United Nations. (n.d.-a). First Committee (Disarmament and International Security). Retrieved October 26, 2023, from <https://www.un.org/en/ga/first/>
2. United Nations. (n.d.-b). History of the UN. Retrieved October 26, 2023, from <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/history-of-the-un>
3. United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs. (n.d.). First Committee of the General Assembly. Retrieved October 26, 2023, from <https://www.un.org/disarmament/first-committe>

Topic A: The growing threat of Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems (LAWS) weapons capable of selecting and engaging targets without human intervention.

Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems (LAWS), commonly referred to as “killer robots”, are weapons capable of independently identifying, selecting, and engaging targets without direct human intervention. Unlike traditional remote-controlled drones, LAWS operate with varying degrees of autonomy, raising difficult questions about where to draw the line between “assisted” and “fully autonomous” use of force. Their emergence poses critical legal, ethical, and security challenges. From a legal perspective, LAWS may struggle to comply with the principles of International Humanitarian Law (IHL), particularly the requirements of distinction (differentiating civilians from combatants) and proportionality (ensuring collateral damage is not excessive), while also being able to follow an ROE (Rules of Engagement). Who should be held responsible when such systems commit unlawful acts?—the programmer, the military commander, the manufacturer, or the state.

On the ethical front, critics argue that delegating life-and-death decisions to machines undermines human dignity and removes moral judgment from the battlefield. Strategically, there is also concern that the deployment of LAWS could accelerate global conflict by lowering the threshold for the use of force, triggering an AI-driven arms race and increasing the risk of proliferation to non-state actors. Ongoing UN negotiations under the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW) have highlighted these issues, yet consensus has been slow due to divergent national interests. Some states push for strict regulation or outright bans, while others argue that technological development should not be hindered. As a result, delegates are now tasked with grappling with whether to pursue comprehensive regulatory frameworks, targeted restrictions, or binding prohibitions in order to preserve human agency, uphold humanitarian principles, and prevent destabilizing escalation.

Why This Matters for DISEC

The Disarmament and International Security Committee (DISEC) plays a central role in framing how the international community addresses emerging security threats. While the technical negotiations on LAWS take place in the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW). The issue of autonomous weapons is not only a matter of arms control but also of international security, human rights, and global stability—all core concerns of DISEC. By debating this topic, DISEC can build consensus on whether LAWS threaten international peace and security, set guiding principles for meaningful human control, and recommend pathways for future treaty-making. This makes the committee’s work critical for preventing an AI-driven arms race and ensuring that advances in military technology remain consistent with humanitarian law and ethical standards.

Key Questions:

1. How should LAWS be defined and categorised in treaty language?
2. Who bears accountability when LAWS are used unlawfully?
3. Do LAWS inherently violate International Humanitarian Law?
4. What are the broader consequences of LAWS proliferation?
5. How do ethical and dignity concerns influence the legitimacy of LAW

References:

1. Boffey, D. (2025, June 25). *Killing machines: how Russia and Ukraine's race to perfect deadly pilotless drones could harm us all*. The Guardian; The Guardian. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2025/jun/25/ukraine-russia-autonomous-drones-ai>
2. Docherty, B. (2018, August 21). *Heed the Call | a Moral and Legal Imperative to Ban Killer Robots*. Human Rights Watch. <https://www.hrw.org/report/2018/08/21/heed-call/moral-and-legal-imperative-ban-killer-robots>
3. *DOCUMENT: Ethics and Autonomous Weapon Systems: An Ethical Basis for Human Control?* | Arms Control Association. (n.d.). www.armscontrol.org. <https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2018-07/features/document-ethics-and-autonomous-weapon-systems-ethical-basis-human-control>
4. Horowitz, M. (2016, September 21). *The Ethics & Morality of Robotic Warfare: Assessing the Debate over Autonomous Weapons* | American Academy of Arts and Sciences. www.amacad.org. <https://www.amacad.org/publication/daedalus/ethics-morality-robotic-warfare-assessing-debate-over-autonomous-weapons>
5. O'Connell, M. E. (2023). Banning Autonomous Weapons: A Legal and Ethical Mandate. *Ethics & International Affairs*, 37(3), 287–298. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0892679423000357>
6. Poidevin, O. L. (2025, May 12). Nations meet at UN for “killer robot” talks as regulation lags.
7. Reuters. <https://www.reuters.com/sustainability/society-equity/nations-meet-un-killer-robot-talks-regulation-lags-2025-05-1>

Topic B: Should European nuclear arsenals be included in the U.S.-Russia disarmament negotiations?.

The future of global nuclear disarmament largely depends on U.S.–Russia relations, as these two states hold over 90% of the world’s nuclear weapons. Past agreements such as the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) and the New START Treaty have been strictly bilateral, leaving out other nuclear powers. This raises an important question: should European nuclear arsenals—specifically those of France and the United Kingdom—be incorporated into such frameworks?

France maintains an independent deterrent called the *force de frappe*, while the United Kingdom possesses the Trident submarine-based system. Compared to the U.S. and Russian arsenals, these stockpiles are small but still militarily and politically significant. Russia has repeatedly argued that any future talks should cover all NATO nuclear forces, while the United States has resisted broadening the scope, fearing it might complicate or delay negotiations.

From a non-proliferation perspective, the decision carries major implications for the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). Some argue that expanding negotiations would demonstrate stronger global commitment to disarmament, while others warn it might weaken fragile U.S.–Russia cooperation. Ultimately, whether European nuclear forces should be included reflects broader questions about fairness, credibility, and the future of international arms control.

Why This Matters for DISEC:

Although DISEC does not negotiate treaties directly, it shapes the global political environment where disarmament is debated. Discussing this issue allows all UN members to weigh in on whether a truly multilateral approach is necessary for lasting security, or whether U.S.–Russia bilateralism remains the most pragmatic path. DISEC can help clarify principles, build consensus, and reinforce commitments under the NPT.

Key Questions:

1. Should arms control talks remain bilateral or expand to other nuclear states?
2. How would including France and the UK affect NATO’s security strategy?
3. Would broader negotiations help or hinder global non-proliferation goals?
4. How should DISEC promote inclusivity in future disarmament frameworks?

References:

1. NATO. (2025). *NATO's nuclear deterrence policy and forces*. NATO. https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_50068.htm
2. *UNODA – United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs*. (2024). Unoda.org. <https://disarmament.unoda.org>
3. *New START at a Glance | Arms Control Association*. (2024). Armscontrol.org. <https://www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/new-start-glance>
4. de, M. (2025). *Francia Diplomacia*. Francia Diplomacia - Ministerio Para Europa Y de Asuntos Exteriores; Francia Diplomacia. <https://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/es/>

Upload your position paper via the following link. Deadline: October 8th.

 Position paper.

Table Contact: A01773875@tec.mx

Aidan Caleb Piña Guadarrama - President