

Security Council

Topic A: Nagorno-Karabakh Conflict

Topic B: Wartime sexual violence as a psychological
weapon

Letter From the Chair

Dear Delegates,

Welcome to the United Nations Security Council, we are all so excited to have you! My name is Miriam, and along with Lucas, I will be your co-chair, aided by our moderator Alexandra. Our identities and experiences in MUN vary, so you will find a bit about each of us as individuals below, but there are a few things I know I can say on behalf of the three of us. Firstly, we want you to have an enriching and intellectually stimulating ASFMUN experience, which is why we recommend that delegates in the UNSC have substantial prior MUN experience and prepare adequately. However, we also know that the only way to truly improve as a delegate is to put yourself out there and experience different conferences, which sometimes means taking that scary leap and signing up for a committee a bit above the difficulty level you are used to. Thus, please feel free to ask questions, take risks, and grow as both delegates and people in this committee. Do not be afraid of failure, because we believe in you all tremendously, and are incredibly excited to have you join us as part of the ASFMUN 2021 Security Council. Remember to come prepared, curious, and ready to be the best delegate you can be.

Best,

Miriam Specka (Co-chair) speckam@asf.edu.mx

Lucas de Gamboa Canon (Co-chair) degamboal@asf.edu.mx

Alexandra Saavedra (Moderator) saavedraa@asf.edu.mx

★ **Miriam:** Currently in my fourth year at ASF, I'm a senior who is passionate about global affairs and sociology, specifically topics regarding immigration and protecting refugees and asylum seekers, denuclearization, the Balkans, and feminist theory. I have been in MUN since 9th grade, and attended conferences such as Union and Peace, NAIMUN, and (my favorite of all, obviously) ASFMUN. In my free time you can find me binge watching Criminal Minds, spamming my "close friends" story on Instagram, and hopelessly trying to make my Spotify playlists perfect.

- ★ **Lucas:** I am currently in my second year at ASF. I am a senior that is really passionate about *raison d'etat*, foreign policy, political science, and law. I like to read books made by international relations scholars, constitutional law professors (from the U.S.), and important political leaders. Above all, I just hope you can have fun and learn about pressing international issues and diplomacy, as cheesy as that may sound. I'm also a Star Wars nerd (Legends is and will always be superior to Disney's canon). I am free if any one has any questions or doubts about the conference.

- ★ **Alexandra:** I'm a sophomore in my third year at ASF and in MUN. I'm interested in economic, social, and political issues, particularly the international affairs and public policy aspects of these issues. Lately, I have been researching sustainable development, with a special focus on social inclusion and gender equality. Outside of MUN, I enjoy watching Ted Talks, playing tennis, and binging That 70s Show. I look forward to seeing you all at the conference!

Table of Contents

Committee Overview	4
Participating countries	5
Topic A: Nagorno-Karabakh Conflict	
Topic A Background	6
Statement of the Problem:	6
Topic history	6
Past UN Action	8
Recent Developments:	9
Resolution Focus	10
Questions to Consider:	11
Key Players	12
Bibliography	14
Topic B: Wartime Sexual Violence as a Psychological Weapon	
Topic B Background	15
Statement of the Problem:	15
Topic History:	16
Past UN Action:	17
Resolution Focus:	20
Questions to Consider:	20
Key Players:	21
Key Terms:	21
Bibliography	23

Committee Policies:

Technology

Because ASFMUN will be run online this year, delegates will be required to use their laptops and computers to participate in committees. The only websites delegates are allowed to use during committee sessions are Zoom, Google Docs, which delegates will be writing their working papers and resolutions, and any other sources that the Chair permits. Unless there is an emergency, delegates should not be using cellphones or other electronic devices that will give them an unfair advantage. If there is a concern that a delegate is breaking these rules, please contact any member of the Secretariat.

Zoom Guidelines

All committees will use Zoom, and each committee will use the same Meeting ID and Passcode for every committee session. Delegates should never distribute the Meeting ID and Passcode to anybody else. In the meeting, delegates should change their display name to their position. For instance, a delegate representing Mexico should rename their display name to “Mexico”.

Moreover, delegates are expected to have their camera on at all times except when they are standing up, leaving a room, or having connection issues. While in moderated caucuses, delegates must keep their microphone muted until called on to speak.

Delegates should prepare their own placard in advance for roll call, points, motions, and voting. [This Google Drive folder](#) will have instructions on how to make your own placard.

Position Papers:

Position Papers are due on 11:59 pm of 2/22. Please send it in PDF format to speckam@asf.edu.mx, degamboa@asf.edu.mx and saavedraa@asf.edu.mx. More details can be found on the Conference Information section of [our website](#).

Pre-writing and Plagiarism

Pre-writing of clauses, language, working papers, and draft papers is strictly forbidden.

Delegates are welcome to use Google Drive to collaborate with other delegates when writing documents. However, they must not work on it outside of the conference.

Plagiarism is strictly prohibited and if any attempts are found, delegates will no longer be eligible for any awards.

Committee Overview

As one of the six primary organs of the United Nations, the Security Council is in charge of maintaining global peace and security. Any state, even if not a member of the UN, can bring an issue to which it is a party to the Council's attention. In response, the UNSC must first explore peaceful measures of addressing and settling the problem.

Functions and Powers of the UNSC:

- Maintain international peace and security according to the principles and aims of the UN
- Investigate disputes or situations which may lead to conflict
- Recommend methods and terms for settling disputes
- Devise plans to establish a system to regulate armaments
- Identify threats to peace and recommend further actions against such threats
- Call on Members to apply measures not involving the use of force
- Authorize military action, peacekeeping operations, and economic sanctions
- Recommend the admission of new Members to the UN
- Recommend the appointment of the Secretary-General to the General Assembly
- Elect Judges to the International Court of Justice alongside the General Assembly
- The UNSC is the only UN body where resolutions are **binding on all member states**

Originally the Security Council consisted of 11 member states, 5 permanent and 6 rotating, but in 1965 an amendment to the UN Charter increased the committee's membership. Thus, the UNSC is now composed of 15 member states: 5 permanent states and 10 non-permanent states which are elected to the Council for 2 year terms by the General Assembly. Because of their crucial roles in the establishment of the UN, the 5 permanent states hold the right to veto a resolution, which eliminates the possibility of it being passed. Further, the committee's presidency rotates between members every month, but for this Model UN simulation, there will be no president of the Council.

For a resolution to pass, it must receive an affirmative vote from nine members, and cannot be vetoed by any permanent member; permanent states are, however, able to abstain from voting on a resolution.

The members states in the ASFMUN 2021 Security Council are:

- French Republic
- Ireland
- Kingdom of Norway
- People's Republic of China
- Republic of the Niger
- Republic of Estonia
- Russian Federation
- Republic of India
- Republic of Kenya
- Republic of Tunisia
- Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
- Socialist Republic of Vietnam
- United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
- United Mexican States
- United States of America

Additional delegations for this committee:

- Federative Republic of Brazil
- Federal Republic of Germany
- Republic of Armenia
- Republic of Azerbaijan
- Republic of Serbia
- Republic of Turkey

Topic A: The Nagorno-Karabakh Conflict

Statement of the Problem:

Article I of the United Nations Charter outlines that the United Nation’s primary mission is “to maintain international peace and security” as well as “to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace.”¹ To that end, reaching a peaceful resolution to the Nagorno-Karabakh Conflict is of paramount importance to ensure that the horrors of war and conflict cease to affect the lives of the people of the Caucasus.

The Nagorno-Karabakh Conflict is an ethnic and territorial conflict in the Caucasus between the nation states of Armenia and Azerbaijan. The conflict revolves around the disputed region of Nagorno-Karabakh and seven districts around the region that Armenia has *de facto* control over. Under international law, these territories are recognized as *de jure* part of Azerbaijan.³ Since 1988, 30,000 people have been killed in the fighting and hundreds of thousands have been displaced, both forcefully and at their own discretion.² Dozens more have been killed and thousands injured in sporadic skirmishes since then.² Since 1988, there have been two large scale military conflicts, one in 1991 and another in 2020.³ The region of the Caucasus has historically been the focal point of competition between great and regional powers.⁴ As a result, the conflict has the potential to bring in powerful international players causing further bloodshed.³ In light of this situation, it is of paramount importance to bring a peaceful resolution to the conflict at hand.

Topic history:

The origins of this conflict can be traced back for centuries over competing influence between the Ottoman, Safavid, and Russian Empires,³ however, the modern aspect of this conflict traces its origins to the 1920s. The collapse of the Russian Empire in 1917 led to a period of unrest and violence. Nationalism within its former territories that were not ethnically Russian led to independence movements and conflicts. Armenia and Azerbaijan, both former territories of the Tzar’s Empire, were such regions and, once they declared formal independence, turned to conflict over a disputed region that both viewed as a significant cultural and historical site: Karabakh. Armenians were determined not to lose the region after so much conflict with the

Ottoman Empire (Karabakh's population was majority Armenian) while Azeris considered this region far too culturally important to lose.³

When the Bolsheviks won the Russian Civil War, however, Lenin quickly and forcefully sought to re-establish Moscow's hegemony over its neighboring regions whom Moscow viewed as its sphere of influence.⁴ Soviet troops then invaded both countries and incorporated them into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (the U.S.S.R.) as separate Soviet Republics.² The Bolsheviks tasked Joseph Stalin with settling the dispute. Stalin decreed that Karabakh, newly named Nagorno (meaning mountainous), an Armenian majority territory, would be placed under the jurisdiction of the Soviet Republic of Azerbaijan. Stalin did this because he understood that placing Karabakh under Azerbaijan's control would fuel conflict between the two republics, thus making it possible for Moscow to act as a mediator between the two.² With this position, Russia could play the republics against one another, extract concessions between them, and ensure Soviet/Russian hegemony over the region would last indefinitely.⁶ This Soviet initiative, also partly fueled by economic imperatives, temporarily solved the issue between the two Republics but the situation would change when the reform-minded Mikhail Gorbachev took power in the Kremlin.³ His policy of *Glasnost* (openness) reignited nationalist sentiment within Soviet Republics that were not ethnically Russian because the press was no longer restricted and nationalistic papers were allowed to voice their opinions.⁵ Many Armenians petitioned Gorbachev to allow Nagorno-Karabakh to be returned to Armenian control while Azeris insisted that the region belonged to them.³ In 1989, the Armenian Supreme Soviet passed a resolution that proclaimed the unification of Nagorno-Karabakh with Armenia.⁶ That same year, a Soviet Census was conducted that determined that 77% of the region's population was ethnically Armenian.²

These tensions and actions would lead to large-scale violence that rapidly spread across the region. Ethnic groups conducted pogroms against each other in an effort to assert their control over the disputed territory while the Soviets, who at the time were very weak, did not intervene.⁶ Consequently, when the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991, the violence between the two republics escalated into an undeclared full scale war. While a ceasefire was reached in 1994, Armenia was the clear victor of that conflict.³ They controlled the greatest percentage of Nagorno-Karabakh

territory at the time, expelled the Azeri population from their homes, and also established the Lachin land corridor connecting Armenia to Azerbaijan.⁶ As a result of this military action, Nagorno-Karabakh was placed under the control of the Republic of Artsakh, an Armenian supported government in Nagorno-Karabakh that is dependent on Armenia. Since then, the territorial gains made by Armenia has remained the *status quo* but internationally, Azerbaijan still has recognized sovereignty over the region. Armenia has taken steps to solidify its control over the territory while domestic pressures on the ruling elite of both nations have made it impossible for an agreement to be reached.² Late last year, however, in a coordinated and planned effort, Azerbaijan took unilateral military action to retake the territories lost to Armenia in 1994.⁷

Past UN and International Action:

[UNSC Resolution 822](#), passed in 1993, called for an “immediate withdrawal of all occupying forces from the Kelbajar district and other recently occupied areas of Azerbaijan,” reaffirming the international community’s position that Karabakh is Azerbaijani territory.⁷ [UNSC Resolution 853](#) reaffirmed the directives of UNSC 822 and also called upon Armenia to take assertive action in order to prevent further bloodshed by co-opting Artsakh into embracing peaceful means to settle the dispute. International action outside the UN has also been undertaken to address the Nagorno-Karabakh Conflict by the Minsk Group, which is the subject of [UNSC Resolution 874](#). Since 1992, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), under the subset of the Minsk Group which is co-chaired by France, the Russian Federation, and the United States, has been the main international mediator other than Russia.² [UNSC Resolution 884](#) reinforced the directives set out in the aforementioned Resolutions and also called upon both parties to accept the terms set by the OSCE.

Both Armenia and Azerbaijan have historically embraced uncompromising positions when referring to dialogue mediated by the OSCE. Armenia will not discuss a withdrawal of their military forces from Azerbaijani territories until Nagorno-Karabakh is recognized as independent, something Azerbaijan unequivocally rejects. Azerbaijan, on the other hand, argues that its complete territorial integrity comes first and demands the withdrawal of Armenian troops before it will discuss other matters.⁶ The Minsk Group proposed a “phased” approach plan in 1997. It

outlined an Armenian withdrawal from seven Azeri provinces occupied by the Armenian military. The withdrawal would be followed by a discussion of the final status of Nagorno-Karabakh.⁶ This plan was accepted by both Armenia and Azerbaijan but the Republic of Artsakh rejected it.⁶ It is important to highlight the fact that both sides do not have strong incentives to negotiate. Armenia considers itself vulnerable and wants complete security in the face of neighbors it views as hostile to it. To that end, it considers Nagorno-Karabakh essential for its national security as it provides defense in-depth. Azerbaijan, on the other hand, is concerned about the fact that about 20% of its legal territory is under foreign occupation.³ Moreover, strong domestic beliefs on the conflict would mean that to embrace peace would lead to political suicide within Armenia and Azerbaijan's elites, thus fueling the conflict further.⁶

In 2007, and later strengthened in 2009, the Minsk Group outlined the Madrid Principles. The following six points are the most important:

1. Return of the territories surrounding Nagorno-Karabakh to Azerbaijani control;
2. An interim status for Nagorno-Karabakh providing guarantees for security and self-governance;
3. A corridor linking Armenia to Nagorno-Karabakh;
4. Future determination of the final legal status of Nagorno-Karabakh through a legally binding expression of will;
5. The right of all internally displaced persons and refugees to return to their former places of residence;
6. International security guarantees that would include a peacekeeping operation:⁸

Neither Armenia, nor Azerbaijan, have accepted these principles despite strong pressure from the Minsk Group co-chairs, especially Russia, to do so.

Recent Developments:

In 2020, after 6 weeks of fighting Armenia and Azerbaijan agreed to a Russian brokered peace-deal.⁷ Under that peace deal, Azerbaijan will hold on to the territories it took during the conflict and Armenia is to withdraw from certain territories around the region.⁷ Per the deal,

Russia is to deploy nearly 2,000 peacekeepers to ensure that the peace is upheld alongside Turkey.⁷ These peacekeepers will also patrol the Lachin corridor, one of Nagorno-Karabakh's Artsakh Republic's most important territories.⁷ Most international scholars and observers view this peace deal as a victory for Azerbaijan and for Russia.

Resolution Focus:

Delegates should address current issues and propose measures ensuring this conflict does not erupt in the future. Below is a framework of helpful topics to focus and expand upon:

Sovereignty of the territory - To ensure that the conflict is finally resolved, resolutions should address the future of the territory and how it would be administered. To make a solution sustainable it is critical that Armenia and Azerbaijan can compromise and be satisfied with a viable arrangement.

Cease fire - This has been a long standing territorial dispute that burst as an armed conflict a number of times over the last decades, with many casualties on all sides. It is critical to find an enduring cease fire, with a sustainable mechanism that both countries Azerbaijan and Armenia can support.

Social relief - The conflict has left the need for reconstruction efforts and continuity of basic services. Under these conditions an adequate level of social relief is needed. This will require the participation of all involved, including external stakeholders.

Economic activity support - The conflict may lead to a disruption in economic activities and the impoverishment of the region. Resolutions should address the economic costs and ways to maintain the economy.

Refugees - Resolutions should address the issue of thousands of refugees and displaced people by the conflict. The solution may also require some initial transitory measures.

Stakeholders role - A sustainable solution requires the active participation of key country stakeholders on the issue. These include Russia, Turkey, and other countries (e.g., US and France). This may help in ensuring the fulfillment of commitments under a deal by the parts in conflict.

Remember, this committee is set *before* the Peace Deal of 2020 was negotiated.

Questions to Consider:

1. Historian Micheal Reynolds concluded in his *Shattering Empires* that the quest for absolute security is dangerous and an international impossibility no less fantastical than predicting the future. According to Reynolds, States that pursue such a policy are doomed to reactions and counter-reactions that will create greater security problems in the future. What role do you believe the concept of absolute security has had in the intransigence of both sides and what steps can be employed to address this issue?
2. Great Power relations play an important role in addressing geopolitical conflicts, particularly when said conflicts are within a said great power's immediate periphery. When great power's control over their periphery is threatened, the power in question tends to react strongly and unilaterally, often without direct consultation with the international community. The examples are plentiful from Russia in Crimea, China in the South China Sea, and the United States and the *Monroe Doctrine*. What role or policies can international organizations, and nation states with limited interests in the region in question, can embrace in order to address regional issues and assuage the fears of great powers?
3. The decline of the post-Cold War, American-led, unipolar world order has ushered in an era of multipolarity with rising states around the world increasing their geopolitical importance like India, Vietnam and Turkey. New technologies like drones make war cheaper, less costly in terms of human life, and more effective thus removing certain incentives to secure peaceful settlements to regional disputes. Moreover, the declassified U.S. National Security Strategy illustrates that the Pentagon officially believes that the United States has entered a new age of great power competition, with China and Russia being its main adversaries, which will only make proxy wars more likely. What historical

precedents from the Cold War can you take and apply to this particular conflict when addressing what seems to be the future of international relations in a post-American order?

Key Players:

- **Armenia:** Armenia is really concerned about its security given how it feels surrounded by what it sees as hostile neighbors (Turkey and Azerbaijan). Nagorno-Karabakh, therefore, provides defense in depth and secures its desire for greater security. Armenia's population has lived for almost three decades with Nagorno-Karabakh under their *de jure* indirect control. As a result, the Armenian public is unlikely to support a peace deal and Armenian elites are unlikely to pursue one without significant foreign pressures.
- **Azerbaijan:** Azerbaijan, like Armenia, is concerned about its national security. Armenia occupies nearly 20% of the country and therefore poses a dramatic security threat to it. Like the Armenian public, Azerbaijan's populace has lived for three decades with revenge in mind after their defeat in 1994. As a result, Azerbaijan's public will probably not support any resolution that re-establishes the *status quo ante* and neither will its political leaders.
- **Russia:** Russia wants to consolidate its power over what it views as its sphere of influence in the Caucasus. Russia has sought to place peacekeepers in the region for years so it is unlikely to support resolutions that call for its recently deployed peacekeepers to be withdrawn. Russia also has a military base in Armenia and has traditionally seen Armenia as a reliable ally. Recent Armenian support for Western initiatives, however, has led it to pursue deeper ties with Azerbaijan with whom relations were always friendly even with Armenia being an ally. Russia's position as a military superpower in the region and its clout over its neighbors means it is by far the most important geopolitical player in the region and therefore, in the conference on this topic.
- **France:** The decline of American hegemony under President Donald Trump and his "America First" platform has led France to seek a renewed position of leadership in Europe and beyond. Consequently, it is likely that France wants to be seen as an

important player in European and Middle Eastern affairs, even if they don't directly affect their interests. It also has veto power over any resolution.

- **The United States:** Despite waning American leadership and influence in the region, America is still a co-chair of the Minsk Group and current U.S. Secretary of State Mike Pompeo has issued numerous statements advocating for peace. At the time of writing this background guide, President Trump is still in office but it is likely that President Biden will embrace previous Obama-era foreign policy imperatives. These called for the United States to be in a leadership position across many areas of the world solving conflicts evidenced by his tapping of Samantha Power to lead USAID and other Obama Era veterans. Though the region's significance to American interests is limited at best, Biden will most-likely attempt to position the United States in a leadership position when he comes to office. Being a permanent member of the Security Council, the U.S. also has veto power.
- **Turkey:** Turkey has always held deep ties with Azerbaijan. Under President Erdogan, Turkey is taking a far more assertive stance in the international stage, especially in its immediate periphery. The recently Russian brokered peace deal has many benefits for Turkey and it supplied weapons to Azerbaijan, particularly drones. These weapons played an important role in Azerbaijan's victory last fall. Turkey has tremendous animosity towards Armenia so it will never take a position supporting it. It is important to highlight that Turkey's Erdogan has domestic pressures to deal with as Turkey's public is strongly pro-Azerbaijan.

Bibliography:

1. “UN Charter (Full Text).” *United Nations*, United Nations, www.un.org/en/sections/un-charter/un-charter-full-text/#:~:text=To%20achieve%20international%20co%2Doperation,%2C%20language%2C%20or%20religion%3B%20and.
2. “Nagorno-Karabakh Conflict | Global Conflict Tracker.” *Council on Foreign Relations*, Council on Foreign Relations, www.cfr.org/global-conflict-tracker/conflict/nagorno-karabakh-conflict.
3. Waal, Thomas de. “No Compromise in Sight for Armenia and Azerbaijan.” *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 26 Oct. 2020.
4. Kissinger, Henry. *Diplomacy*. Simon & Schuster, 1994.
5. Lapidus, Gail W. “Gorbachev's Nationalities Problem.” *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 68, no. 4, 1989, p. 92., doi:10.2307/20044111.
6. Carley, Patricia. “Nagorno-Karabakh: Searching for a Solution.” *United States Institute of Peace*, United States Institute of Peace, 4 Nov. 2020, www.usip.org/publications/1998/12/nagorno-karabakh-searching-solution-0.
7. Guerin, Orla, and Yuri Vendik. “Armenia, Azerbaijan and Russia Sign Nagorno-Karabakh Peace Deal.” *BBC News*, BBC, 10 Nov. 2020, www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-54882564.
8. “A New Look at Old Principles: Making the Madrid Document Work.” *Caucasus Edition: Journal of Conflict Transformation*, 16 Feb. 2018, caucasusedition.net/why-nagorno-karabakhs-status-must-be-addressed-first/.

Topic B: Wartime Sexual Violence as a Psychological Weapon

Statement of the Problem:

What sets modern day armed conflicts apart is the targeting of civilians by combatants, and sexual violence is one of the common ways this is done. It is considered as a psychological weapon because its use as a war tactic dehumanizes and destabilizes communities, and it is often used for wider purposes, such as displacing people, spreading HIV, or changing the ethnic makeup of a population. As stated in a report by the Outreach Programme on the Rwanda Genocide and the UN, “Even after conflict has ended, the impacts of sexual violence persist, including unwanted pregnancies, sexually transmitted infections and stigmatization. Widespread sexual violence itself may continue or even increase in the aftermath of conflict, as a consequence of insecurity and impunity. And meeting the needs of survivors – including medical care, HIV treatment, psychological support, economic assistance and legal redress – requires resources that most post- conflict countries do not have.” In this committee you will be considering the effects of wartime sexual violence on victims and communities, scrutinizing the motivations and intentions that support the use of sexual violence during armed conflict, and presenting solutions to this issue.

Forms of sexual violence in war include, but are not limited to:

1. Sexual slavery
2. Forced sterilizations or abortions
3. Forced exposure to pornographic materials
4. Forced pregnancy
5. Forced marriage
6. Rape

Topic History:

Because the use of sexual violence in war has been prevalent throughout history, we cannot isolate this topic to a single time or place. We can, however, look at specific instances when wartime sexual violence has been used as a psychological weapon in order to better understand the efforts that must be taken in response to the issue.

Rwandan Genocide:

- Between 250,000 and 500,000 women were raped.
- Hundreds of thousands of survivors ended up having to battle HIV/AIDS and other STIs.
- Victims of the deliberate spread of STIs also included men, although to a lesser extent. In some cases it was reported that Tutsi men were forced to have sex with Tutsi after contracting these diseases.
- Hutu men gang raped Tutsi women in order to render them infertile and end the Tutsi bloodline.

Guatemalan Civil War (1991-96):

- Indigenous population targeted as victims of sexual violence during the civil war.
- The perpetrators (which were in large part government forces) wanted to spread fear and demoralize the Mayan population.

The former Yugoslavia:

- Up to 60,000 raped.
- Rape was used in Bosnia and Herzegovina as a tool of genocide.
 - Forced impregnation used to alter the ethnic makeup of a population.
- Rape camps set up, mostly by Serb forces, at locations including Keraterm, Vilina Vlas, Manjača, Omarska, Trnopolje, Uzamnica and Vojno.
- Impunity for soldiers committing these acts led to them being widespread.

The Democratic Republic of Congo:

- At least 200,000 people have been raped since 1998.

- A 2010 study stated that 22% of men and 30% of women in Eastern Congo reported wartime sexual violence.
- Atul Khare, the current Under-Secretary General for Operation Support apologized in 2010, stating that UN Peacekeepers had failed to protect the local population from sexual violence as a weapon of war.

Past UN Action:

For a long time, wartime sexual violence was considered unavoidable, including by the UN, which noted in a 1998 report that armies have always considered rape a “legitimate” spoil of war. Only in 1992 did the UNSC declare that “massive, organized and systematic detention and rape of women, in particular Muslim women, in Bosnia and Herzegovina” needed to be addressed in response to widespread wartime sexual violence in the former Yugoslavia. Thus, the Statute of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia included rape as a crime against humanity, and in 2001 the Tribunal became the first international court to find a person guilty of rape as a crime against humanity.

The International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda also named rape as a crime against humanity, and became the first international court to find someone guilty of rape as a crime of genocide (when used with the purpose of furthering genocide, and in the case of Rwanda used by destroy the Tutsi ethnic group).

In 2002, the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court went into force and included sexual violence in the form of things including rape, forced prostitution, sterilization, forced pregnancy, and sexual slavery as a crime against humanity when committed on a large scale or in a systematic way.

In 2007 UN agencies combatting sexual violence were organized into a single umbrella: the UN Action Against Sexual Violence in Conflict. UN Action has since supported the creation and implementation of the Comprehensive Strategy on Combatting Sexual Violence in the

Democratic Republic of the Congo and the Joint Government-UN Programme on Sexual Violence in Liberia.

In 2008, former Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon started UNiTE to End Violence against Women with the purpose of eliminating violence against women in both times of war and peace.

UNSC resolutions addressing wartime sexual violence:

- Resolution 1325 (2000): Recognized that war disproportionately affects women and girls. Called on UN members to increase women’s participation in the “prevention and resolution of conflicts” and “maintenance and promotion of peace and security.” Called on parties involved in war to respect international laws that protect civilians, especially women and girls, and adjust policies and procedures to protect them from wartime sexual violence. Called for a gender perspective when addressing war and post-conflict scenarios.
- Resolution 1820 (2008): Condemns sexual violence as a weapon of war and stated that “rape and other forms of sexual violence can constitute war crimes, crimes against humanity or a constitutive act with respect to genocide.” Urged an end to the use sexual violence against women and girls as a weapon of war and ensure perpetrators are held accountable. Requested the Secretary-General and the UN to protect women in UN-led security initiatives such as refugee camps. Called on the UN and Members to invite the participation of women in all aspects of peace processes.
- Resolution 1888 (2009): Detailed measures to further protect women and children from sexual violence in conflict situations, such as asking the Secretary-General to appoint a special representative to lead and coordinate the UN’s work on the issue, to send a team of experts to situations of particular concern, and to mandate peacekeepers to protect women and children. Following this resolution, the Secretary-General appointed Margot Wallström as the Special Representative of the Secretary-general on Sexual Violence in Conflict.

- Resolution 1889 (2009): reaffirmed resolution 1325. Condemned current sexual violence against women in conflict. Called on Member States to consider the importance of protecting women and girls in post-conflict reconstruction and planning.
- Resolution 1960 (2010): Called on the Secretary-General to name the parties suspected of perpetuating sexual violence in situations on the Council's agenda. Called for the establishment of analysis and reporting specific to conflict-related sexual violence.
- Resolution 2106 (2013): Called for stronger monitoring and prevention of wartime sexual violence.
- Resolution 2122 (2013): Reaffirmed the need for women to be involved in conflict prevention, resolution and peace-building,
- Resolution 2467: Called on parties to armed conflict to implement tangible and time-bound commitments to combatting wartime sexual violence. Urged national authorities to strengthen laws to ensure perpetrators of wartime sexual violence are held accountable. Recognizes that those who become pregnant by wartime sexual violence will have specific needs that have to be met in the post-conflict process. Calls for a survivor-centered approach to combating wartime sexual violence. To prevent the United States from vetoing the resolution, members removed references to sexual and reproductive health services, so it would be useful for the delegate of the USA to consider where a Biden-Harris administration will stand on such things in comparison to Trump's administration, which was in power at the time of the resolution's passing.

** Preparation tips: Above are brief descriptions of these UNSC resolutions, and we suggest you research them further to understand their specific clauses and calls to action. Further, we recommend you investigate where your delegation stands on each resolution (Did they ratify it? Voted against, for, or abstain?)*

Resolution Focus and Questions to Consider:

Looking at past UNSC resolutions, you will find that the topic of sexual violence as a wartime psychological weapon is quite broad and past actions taken to address and combat it have ranged greatly. However, some recommendations for addressing the topic in our committee include looking at what past measures have worked, and in what instances perpetrators were held accountable or not. Alongside using past actions to determine what models of combatting wartime sexual violence are effective, you can create resolutions that seek to hold perpetrators from past conflicts accountable if your delegation finds that they have not been.

Questions to consider:

- What makes rape a widespread occurrence in conflict?
- What are the societal and psychological motives and effects of using sexual violence as a weapon of war?
- In what instances or through which models have wartime sexual violence been effectively combatted? For instance, consider that in WWII all sides were accused of mass rapes, but neither the court set up in Tokyo or in Nuremberg recognized or addressed sexual violence as a crime. Why, and what could have been done differently?
- Sexual violence in one of the most under-funded UN humanitarian programs, receiving less than 1% of assistance in 2020. Would your delegation be in favor of or against a proposal to increase the amount of aid allocated to combatting this issue?

Alongside changing international and national laws to recognize and prosecute wartime sexual violence, there also has to be a change in attitudes towards victims of these crimes. An option is for your resolution to aim to reintegrate victims of wartime sexual violence in their respective communities, since they tend to be stigmatized following the events. Denis Mukwege stated that “Beyond laws, we have to get social sanction on the side of the woman. We need to get to a point where the victim receives the support of the community, and the man who rapes is the one who is stigmatized and excluded and penalized by the whole community.” Further, children conceived through wartime rape are often stigmatized and excluded; how could your resolution address this and ensure they are given the opportunity to live dignified lives?

Lastly, many current conflicts still have instances of sexual violence as a weapon of war. Your resolution could address wartime sexual violence as a whole, or focus on a specific instance or region.

Key Players and Terms:

- **Pramila Patten:** Pramila Patten is the Under-Secretary-General and Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Sexual Violence in Conflict. Patten is a lawyer focusing on sexual and gender-based violence and is a Member of The Committee on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women.
- **Nadia Murad:** Nadia Murad received the Nobel Peace Prize in 2018 for her actions towards ending the use of sexual violence as a weapon of war and armed conflict. Murad is a UN Goodwill Ambassador for the Dignity of Survivors of Human Trafficking and is an activist against sexual violence, human trafficking, and genocide.
- **Denis Mukwege:** Denis Mukwege is a gynecological surgeon and Nobel Peace Prize Laureate for his efforts with Nadia Murad against conflict-related sexual violence. Mukwege founded the Panzi Hospital and Foundation in the Democratic Republic of Congo in 1999 to provide medical care for survivors of sexual violence in his country and has treated over 50,000 victims.
- **Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Sexual Violence in Conflict**
- **UN Action Against Sexual Violence in Conflict:** A cross-UN initiative made up of 15 UN entities that aim to address sexual violence in conflict, and headed by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Sexual Violence in Conflict.
- **Psychological warfare:** the use of non-combat techniques in a war to intimidate or frighten an opponent.
- **Spoil of war:** Profits extracted by one side as a result of being victorious in military activity.

Recommended resources:

1. [Charter of the United Nations](#)
2. [UNSC Frequently Asked Questions](#)
3. [UNSC Resolutions Pertaining to this Topic](#)
4. [Addressing the Use of Sexual Violence as a Strategic Weapon of War](#)
5. [Rape as a Continuing Weapon of Psychological Warfare, Suppression & Subjugation](#)
6. [UN News: Wartime sexual violence a ‘psychological weapon’, sets back cause of peace](#)
7. [The fallout of rape as a weapon of war: The life-long and intergenerational impacts of sexual violence in conflict](#)
8. [Rape and Sexual Violence Used as a Weapon of War and Genocide](#)
9. [Rape as a Weapon of War and Genocide: An Examination of its Historical and Contemporary Tactical Uses, Effects on Victims and Societies and Psychological Explanations](#)
10. [Wartime Sexual Violence: Misconceptions, Implications, and Ways Forward](#)
11. [E-IR: Sexual Violence as a Weapon of War](#)
12. [Psychological Warfare of Sexual Violence](#)
13. [Sexual violence as a weapon of war? Perceptions, prescriptions, problems in the Congo and beyond: Female soldiers in Sierra Leone: Sex, security, and post-conflict development](#)

Bibliography

- The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica. "History." *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Encyclopædia Britannica, Inc., www.britannica.com/topic/United-Nations-Security-Council/History.
- "Functions and Powers Security Council." *United Nations*, United Nations, www.un.org/securitycouncil/content/functions-and-powers.
- Outreach Programme on the Rwanda Genocide and the United Nations, *Sexual Violence: a Tool of War*, www.un.org/en/preventgenocide/rwanda/assets/pdf/Backgrounder%20Sexual%20Violence%202014.pdf.
- Peltola, Larissa. 2018, *Rape and Sexual Violence Used as a Weapon of War and Genocide*, core.ac.uk/download/pdf/159483418.pdf.
- "UN Action against Sexual Violence in Conflict - United Nations Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Sexual Violence in Conflict." *United Nations*, United Nations, www.un.org/sexualviolenceinconflict/about-us/un-action/.
- "UN Resolution on Sexual Violence in Conflict Disregards Girls' Rights." *Plan International*, 25 Apr. 2019, plan-international.org/press-release/2019-04-25-un-resolution-sexual-violence-conflict-disregards-girls-rights.
- UNSC. *UN Security Council Resolution 2467 (2019)*. 23 Apr. 2019, documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N19/118/28/PDF/N1911828.pdf?OpenElement.
- "Wartime Sexual Violence a 'Psychological Weapon', Sets Back Cause of Peace || UN News." *United Nations*, United Nations, news.un.org/en/story/2020/07/1068631#:~:text=UN%20Podcasts-,Wartime%20sexual%20violence%20a%20%27psychological%20weapon%27%2C,sets%20back%20cause%20of%20peace&text=Wartime%20sexual%20violence%20is%20a,and%20the%20cause%20of%20peace.