



Disarmament and International Security Committee

Background Guide

- I. Cybersecurity and Cyber Warfare
- II. Weapons of Mass Destruction (Nuclear Arms and Biological Weaponry)
- III. Child Soldiers

Hyunjin (Jine) Jeong, Director
hyunjin.jeong@mail.utoronto.ca

Alefia Ghadiyali, Director of General Assemblies
alefia@utmun.org

HONOURABLE DELEGATES,

My name is Hyunjin Jeong, but you can call me Jine [Jin-ee]. I would like to welcome you to UTMUN 2015's Disarmament and International Security Committee (DISEC). The chairs, secretariats, and I have worked tremendously to deliver a Model United Nations conference that far exceeds your standards or expectations. With that said, I anticipate fruitful committee sessions and exciting debates. At the end of the day, my only hope is that you walk away with a memorable experience and great time while gaining valuable insights in regards to international affairs.

To briefly introduce myself, I am a third year student at the University of Toronto, St. George campus, pursuing an Honours Bachelor of Science, specializing in Biomedical Toxicology. Despite my heavy life science background, some of my other interests include films and advocacy for international justice. My passion for film encouraged me to pursue an additional minor in Cinema Studies, generally focusing on national cinema. My passion for international justice is demonstrated by my participation in Model UN. Since high school, I have participated in model UN and continued to engage in Model UN

once I entered university. I have helped organize UTMUN since first year and with an extensive background in Model UN, I will ensure that this year's UTMUN will be great.

For those who are new to UTMUN, my one advice to you is not to feel intimidated and do not shy away from speaking up! I strongly encourage those who are new to put up your placards and speak at least once per committee session as UTMUN (and model UN in general) will provide a friendly environment that will help you practise your public speaking ability and skills that are important when it comes to debating.

I cannot wait to meet all of you in February, and if you have any questions or concerns, do not hesitate to contact me. Until then, I wish you again the best of luck in your research and preparation.

Sincerely,

Hyunjin (Jine) Jeong
Director of DISEC
hyunjin.jeong@mail.utoronto.ca

INTRODUCTION

THE DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL Security Committee, commonly abbreviated as DISEC, is a committee concerned with disarmament (i.e. demilitarization) and problems that jeopardize international peace.

DISEC is one of the larger committees of the United Nations and has been pivotal in the discourse of problem solving in multidimensional topics. In hopes of achieving this, DISEC often sheds into various perspectives and formulates further ideas and actions for other UN committees.

This year, DISEC will approach contemporary problems that affect both developed and developing nations. The topics for DISEC this year are the following:

- 1. Cybersecurity and Cyber Warfare**
- 2. Weapons of Mass Destruction, focusing on nuclear arms and biological weaponry**
- 3. Child Soldiers**

TO DISEC

Recall that DISEC should not infringe a nation's sovereign policies nor can it mandate specific actions towards a state that violates. The collaborated efforts of DISEC and its multi-faceted discourse will help formulate resolution papers that will provide insight and encouragement for specific plans that higher, specialized United Nations committees can take.

Therefore, a general assembly such as DISEC plays a significant role in finding resolutions to conflicts and

formulating the foundations and principles for global action for international justice and peace.



Topic 1:

CYBERSECURITY AND CYBER WARFARE

Topic Background

IN THIS DAY AND AGE, common consumers, top corporations, and government agencies are heavily dependent on information technology (IT). The network of information is a great pool of resources that generates great attraction to many people. Although private information is protected, those who are unauthorized to access this information make an attempt to do so for monetary incentives or political agenda. These people, often known as **hackers**, are breaching **cybersecurity**.

Cybersecurity are protocols and protective measures implemented by an individual, organization, or agency that contributes to the prevention of threats of unauthorized access. There are risks and consequences of hacking but hackers choose to engage in these activities because most times, the pros outweigh the cons. The most extreme measure of violating cybersecurity is known as **cyber warfare** (or **cyberterrorism**). This occurs when information technology of an agency (specifically oriented to a nation's database) is hacked, granting hackers access to confidential information that can be used as a form of sabotage or espionage.

Past Incident: Distributed Denial-of-Service (DDoS)

DISTRIBUTED DENIAL-OF-SERVICE (DDoS) ATTACK is a way of attacking a server by flooding its network with traffic. As a result, retrieving information becomes exponentially slowed down to the point of it being inaccessible to those who are authorized.¹

DDoS attacks are problematic due to many reasons. DDoS attacks are readily accessible by anyone and depending on the size of traffic and

duration, anyone can purchase a DDoS attack service costing from \$5 to \$1000 USD.² Furthermore, it is extremely difficult to trace the origin and source of the attack, and that there is no globally unified law that describes its punitive measures. Due to this ambiguity, not many cyberattacks are reported publicly. The ones reported are DDoS attacks that target industries, most commonly in the gaming industry such as the DDoS attack in December 2013 to the popular game, League of Legends.³

South Korea claimed that in July 2013, the cyberattacks targeted towards its banks and broadcasting agencies originated from an IP address that matched an IP address used previously in hacking attempts from Pyongyang, North Korea.⁴ Although this is strong evidence to accuse North Korea, not much international action has been taken place due to the lack of internationally unified legal bound conventions. Hackers are also capable of bypassing IP address traces, hence making it even harder to identify and prosecute cybercriminals.

To reiterate, not much action has been taken against the hackers due to the difficulty of detecting the source of these attacks. The anonymity of cyberattacks attracts potential hackers. In fact, some claim to cyberattack just for leisure, like the attack on League of Legends. This highlights several concerns with cybersecurity: attacks are readily accessible; these attacks can be targeted to a variety of organizations and agencies; and not much legal action can be taken because of the lack of legal reinforcement.

Current Situation

IT IS EVIDENT THAT, despite the increasing prevalence of hacking, there is a lack of international



effort for the prevention of cybersecurity violations. While a country's legislation can include cyberspace laws and protocols that are legally bound to prevent cybercrimes, little to no action is being taken place.

One problem with cybercrime laws is the lack of consistency. Each nation's cybercrime laws differ and can differ substantially; they can differ with regards to how a cybercrime is defined, and the degree of punishment for committing such crimes. For example, in Japan, the mandatory minimum sentence for the creation and distribution of a computer virus to any computer is three years.⁵ In United States, causing intentional damage to an authorized and protected computer, under the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act, depends on the cost of damage and its aftermath.⁶ As a result, there is a lack of consistency as to the definition and consequences of a cybercrime. Therefore, there is a crucial need for a unified attempt to

deal with this problem.

The **Budapest Convention on Cybercrimes** became a hallmark step to unifying cybercrime laws. In 2001, the Council of Europe had a convention in regards to cybercrime. Taking place in Budapest, Hungary, the Convention on Cybercrime aimed to define cybercrimes and harmonize member nations' laws on cybersecurity.⁷ With the members of the Council of Europe signing this convention, in addition to a few non-council state such as Japan, Canada, and United States, this marked a precedent and was a milestone for cybersecurity.

Case Study: IMPACT Alliance

WITHIN THE UNITED NATIONS, there exists a specialized committee known as the **International Telecommunication Union (ITU)**. The **International**

Multilateral Partnership Against Cyber Threats (IMPACT) is a key agency that plays a role in providing aid and prevention to countries that are being attacked with cyber threats.⁸ They believe that an international coalition and partnership should exist to abolish cyber warfare. The committee also believes that the defence from cyber threats should be an international effort, and not solely a domestic measure.

In 2007, the ITU launched the **Global Cyber-security Agenda (GCA)**.⁹ In the hopes of international collaboration and achievable measures, the GCA focused on five pillars: 1) legal framework; 2) technical measures; 3) organization structures; 4) capacity building; and 5) international cooperation.

In this same forum, ITU and IMPACT Alliance worked together closely with the intention of forming a high-level group on cybersecurity (HLEG) where experts from sectors such as the government, industry, international organization, and academic institutes will analyze potential cyber threats and relay this to the ITU for further guidance and intervention.¹⁰

Stances of Some Countries

SIGNATORIES OF CONVENTIONS ON CYBERCRIMES (in support for unified cyber laws, thus ratified):¹¹

- France, Germany, Hungary, Luxembourg, Romania, Russia, Spain, United Kingdom (State members of Council of Europe)
- Australia, Japan, United States (Non-members of Council of Europe)

History of perpetrators of cyber crimes:

- China, India, Israel, North Korea

Questions and Points to Consider

1. The current situation and past incidents shed light on many different aspects as to how cyber attacks are problems that should be urgently discussed. How might the rapid development of IT and our increasing dependency affect the potential damage and malicious acts (in the case of cyberterrorism)?
2. How can DISEC mitigate the effect of cyberterrorism, with regards to prevention and re-percussive measures of cyber warfare?
3. How does a country's condition of IT regulation and the number of common IT users affect cybersecurity?
4. How might the different definitions and punitive measures by country affect rates of cyber-crimes? Is there a monitoring body for the prevention and detection of cyber threats that exist for a country? Are there any state legislative cyber laws or cybersecurity protocols?
5. How can there be unifying cyber laws? Is this a prime solution; what are countries' concerns with regards to privacy issues and over-surveillance by regulating bodies?

References

¹ Symantec Security Response. "The Continued Rise of DDoS Attacks." Security Response. Web. Nov. 2014. <http://www.symantec.com/content/en/us/enterprise/media/security_response/white-papers/the-continued-rise-of-ddos-attacks.pdf>.

² Ibid, 1.

³ BBC. "Hackers Knock League of Legends Offline." BBC News. 31 Dec. 2013. Web. 21 Nov. 2014. <<http://www.bbc.com/news/technology-25559048>>.

⁴ BBC. "North Korea 'behind Cyber Attack' on South Websites." BBC News. 16 July 2013. Web. 21 Nov. 2014. <<http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-23324172>>.

⁵ McMillan, Graeme. "Japan Criminalizes Cyber-crime: Make a Virus, Get Three Years in Jail." Time. Time, 17 July 2011. Web. 21 Nov. 2014. <<http://techland.time.com/2011/06/17/japan-criminalizes-cybercrime-make-a-virus-get-three-years-in-jail>>.

⁶ Cornell University Law School. "18 U.S. Code § 1030 - Fraud and Related Activity in Connection with Com-puters." Legal Information Institute. Web. 20 Nov. 2014. <<http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/18/1030>>.

⁷ Council of Europe. "ETS No. 185 - Convention on Cybercrime." Council of Europe - ETS No. 185 - Convention on Cybercrime. Web. 21 Nov. 2014. <<http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/EN/Treaties/Html/185.htm>>.

⁸ IMPACT - International Multilateral Partnership Against Cyber Threats. Web. 21 Nov. 2014. <<http://www.impact-alliance.org/home/index.html>>.

⁹ International Telecommunication Union. "A Framework for International Cooperation in Cybersecurity." ITU Global Cybersecurity Agenda (GCA). Web. 21 Nov. 2014. <http://intgovforum.org/Substantive_2nd_IGF/ITU_GCA_E.pdf>

¹⁰ Ibid, 9.

¹¹ Council of Europe. "Convention on Cyber-crime." Council of Europe. N.p., n.d. Web. 26 Nov. 2014. <<http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/Commun/ChercheSig.asp?NT=185&CL=ENG>>.



Topic 2:

WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION (NUCLEAR ARMS AND BIOLOGICAL WEAPONRY)



Topic Background

THE ISSUE ON WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION has been relevant for almost a century. In 1925, the **Geneva Protocol** was established and signed at a conference held in Geneva, prohibiting the use of chemical and biological weapons in wars.¹ Although the Geneva convention inhibits the use of these **weapons of mass destruction**, it does not inhibit production and possession. It was not until several decades later that nations began to collaborate for the elimination of destructive weapons. An international effort to disarm these weapons that posed threats to international security was made through treaties and conventions.

Despite great efforts, there has yet to be complete consensus about the possession and production of weapons of mass destruction. Specifically, **nuclear arms**, weapons that get their explosive energy through enriched radioisotopes, and **biological weaponry**, weapons that show significant harm through the use of toxicological agents, are the two classes that are of most concern to many nations.

Case Study: Nuclear Arms

IN RESPONSE TO THE NUCLEAR ARMS RACE during the Cold War, the **1968 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT)** was formulated to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons and promote disarmament of states that possessed nuclear arms (i.e. states recognized as nuclear-weapon states which currently include but are not limited to: China, France, Russia, United Kingdom, and the United States).²

The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty is understood to be founded on three pillars: 1) non-pro-

liferation; 2) disarmament; and 3) the right to use nuclear energy peacefully.

The non-proliferation aspect of the treaty is targeted towards the states that are recognized to be holding nuclear arms, known as **nuclear weapon states**. According to Articles I and II of the NPT, nuclear weapon states have agreed not to provide nuclear arms to non-nuclear weapon states or help manufacture nuclear arms.³ The signatories that are recognized as non-nuclear weapon states have agreed to have the **International Atomic Energy Agency** verify that their use of nuclear energy is directed towards peaceful usage, in accordance to Article III.⁴

The disarmament aspect of the treaty is reinforced in Article VI, such that “each of the Parties to the Treaty undertakes to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, and on a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control.”⁵

Lastly, the aspect with regards to peaceful nuclear energy use is discussed directly in Article IV.⁶ Nations are encouraged to exchange technological information for peaceful use of nuclear energy. In other words, using nuclear energy that is not for the purpose of weaponry is permissible.

The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty has a few weaknesses despite the multilateral effort for nuclear arm eradication. Firstly, not all nation states are signatories and hence have not all agreed nor are all legally obliged to the written articles. There are 187 countries that have agreed to this treaty; India, Pakistan, Israel, and Cuba are not among those, and North Korea withdrew from the treaty (Article X in the treaty states that countries are allowed to exercise their national sovereignty and

withdraw from the treaty). Secondly, the description of Article VI is incredibly vague, such that little to no progress or efforts have been made by the nuclear weapon states to disarm their arsenal. Thirdly, there are no consequences articulated in the case that a nation violates the articles in the treaty.

In 2003, Iran failed to comply with the safeguarding protocols implemented by the International Atomic Energy Agency.⁷ This roused suspicion that Iran’s nuclear program was also involved in the production and acquisition of nuclear arms. Hence in 2006, the United Nations Security Council requested Iran to suspend its activities and posed sanctions against Iran.⁸ With amendments made to the safeguarding protocol

and negotiations made with Iran and the Nuclear Weapon States (specifically, the United States), the International Atomic Energy Agency reports that Iran has made drastic improvements but a clear conclusion has not been made on whether or not the allegations are true. In recent reports, the International Atomic Energy Agency reported that suspicious activities have ceased, negotiation on lifting the sanctions are being undertaken, and continual inspections are being enforced.

Case Study: Biological Weaponry

THE BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION, signed in 1972, is a treaty that bans the development and



GRAPHIC: ATTA KENARE/AFP PHOTOS/GETTY IMAGES.

production of biological agents that can later be manifested into weaponry, or the transfer of biological toxins or weapons to other states.^{9, 10} This is a convention signed by 173 states that acts as a supplement to the 1925 Geneva Protocol. It deals with one of the biggest flaws of the Geneva Protocol by raising the issue of production and development, thereby strengthening the Protocol. To ensure compliance, states can file a complaint to the United Nations Security Council, and the United Nations Security Council will conduct an investigation. This creates accountability and incentive to comply with the treaty, addressing another failure of the Geneva Protocol. Other measures include exchanging data on research that specializes in permitted biological studies, and disease outbreak prevalence. This is so that biological studies in the discipline of virology, bacteriology, mycology, and toxicology can freely be conducted for peace and development. In addition, biological warfare studies are conducted for defensive measures.

There are a few concerns addressing this convention. Although the disarmament of biological weaponry has been commended to be one that is very successful, there are countries that have not yet signed this convention. In addition, countries are beginning to worry about the threats biological warfare may bring when possessed by terrorist groups. **Bioterrorism** is of utmost concern, especially when the international **biosecurity** is presently not at a stable status. Controversial suspicion was brought up in regards to the recent Ebola virus studies conducted by United States after noticing the unexplainable transmitted distance between the site of outbreak and site of viral origin.¹¹ For that reason, countries like India, urge for the need to strengthen the current Biological Weapons Convention, calling the Ebola virus “a threat to international peace and security”.¹²

Stances of Some Countries

FEW COUNTRIES ALLEGED to be possessing biological weapon:¹³

- China, Cuba, Egypt, Iran, Israel, North Korea, Pakistan, Russia, Syria

Non-signatory states of Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty:

- India, Israel, North Korea (withdrew), Pakistan, South Sudan

Five recognized nuclear-weapon states under Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty:

- United States, Russia, United Kingdom, France, China

Other states declared to have nuclear arms:

- India, Pakistan, North Korea

Questions and Points to Consider

BOTH NUCLEAR ARMS AND BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS threaten international peace; hence disarming should be a priority of DISEC. Nevertheless, there are nations that are not part of one or both conventions, leaving a concern of how an international effort can be made without the collaboration of the few that decided not to sign.

1. As India has pointed out, the **Biological Weapons Convention** is far weaker in comparison to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, such that there is an international non-governmental agency that acts as a regulating and auditing body. How can the Biological Weapons Convention be strengthened?

2. Is there a Western dominance in these disarmament treaties that should be taken into precaution?
3. How will nuclear and biological disarmament impact a nation’s sovereignty, military history, and present international relations?
4. Is the International Atomic Energy Agency’s method a fair way of evaluating? How else can weapon development be prevented?

References

¹ “UNODA - 1925 Geneva Protocol.” UN News Center. UN. Web. 19 Nov. 2014. <<http://www.un.org/disarmament/WMD/Bio/1925GenevaProtocol.shtml>>.

² “UNODA - Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).” UN News Center. UN. Web. 20 Nov. 2014. <<http://www.un.org/disarmament/WMD/Nuclear/NPT.shtml>>.

³ International Atomic Energy Agency. Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Web. 21 Nov. 2014. <<http://www.iaea.org/sites/default/files/publications/documents/infcircs/1970/infcirc140.pdf>>.

⁴ Ibid, 3.

⁵ Ibid, 3.

⁶ Ibid, 3.

⁷ Kerr, Paul. “Arms Control Today.” The IAEA’s Report on Iran: An Analysis. Web. 21 Nov. 2014. <http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2003_12/IAEAreport>.

⁸ Security Council. “Security Council Demands Iran Suspend Uranium Enrichment by 31 August, or Face Possible Economic, Diplomatic Sanctions.” UN News Center. UN, 31 July 2006. Web. 21 Nov. 2014. <<http://www.un.org/press/en/2006/sc8792.doc.htm>>.

⁹ Arms Control Association. “Fact Sheets & Briefs.”

The Biological Weapons Convention (BWC) At A Glance. Web. 21 Nov. 2014. <<http://www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/bwc>>.

¹⁰ United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs. “Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction.” UNODP. Web. 21 Nov. 2014. <<http://disarmament.un.org/treaties/t/bwc/text>>.

¹¹ “#EbolaVirus Developed by US Bio-warfare Lab, Says US Don.” The NEWS. 22 Oct. 2014. Web. 21 Nov. 2014. <<http://thenewsnigeria.com.ng/2014/10/22/ebolavirus-developed-by-us-bio-warfare-lab-says-us-don>>.

¹² Big News Network (IANS). “India Calls for Stronger Action against Biological Weapons.” 25 Oct. 2014. Web. 21 Nov. 2014. <<http://www.bignewsnetwork.com/index.php/sid/227023019>>.

¹³ Arms Control Association. “Chemical and Biological Weapons Status at a Glance.” N.p., n.d. Web. 24 Nov. 2014. <<http://www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/cbwprolif>>.



Topic 3:

CHILD SOLDIERS

Topic Background

IN 1977, THE AMENDMENT MADE to Protocol I of the 1949 Geneva Convention addresses, in Article 77, that recruiting children under the age of fifteen from hostility and armed conflict should be refrained.¹ They were not very clear instructions and as a result, additional international treaties and conventions were formed to protect children’s freedom and rights. The **2002 Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict** was formed to address the vagueness of the 1977 amendment. States that agree to this optional protocol abide to the additional responsibility to

not recruit children under the age of eighteen into the armed forces and send them off to warfare and currently there are 158 countries that have ratified this optional protocol.^{2, 3}

The **International Labour Organization** also addresses children for the use of armed conflict in the **1999 Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention**.⁴ Those who ratify this convention follow the guidelines and definition of the worst forms of child labour (including child soldiers) and commit to the abolishment of unjust statuses of living for children. With many international humanitarian laws addressing child soldiers, it is still a suppressing issue that hinders the world’s call for international justice and peace. Other relevant conven-

tions such as the **Convention on the Rights of the Child** outline the mandate for the prevention of recruitment of those who are younger than the age of fifteen for armed conflict.⁵

It is speculated that a child becomes armed and unlawfully participates in warfare in two cases: either voluntarily or without consent. The children who are forced to join the military unlawfully do so due to abduction or threats. This is effectively because children are easier to intimidate and manipulate than adults while at the same time, children can be kept in the military for a much longer time before being discharged compared to adults. It is common that armed groups pass through villages and threaten citizens to join as a form of recruitment but in essence, these are cases of children being forcibly abducted. On the other hand, children volunteer to join armed groups and the military because they are left abandoned and desire a sense of community. It is often the case that child soldiers are orphans or children who once had family but were later separated due to political climates. Although each child soldier has a unique story, regardless of how a child becomes armed with a weapon, a child’s right to standard of living, education, and protection is jeopardized and its psychological effect is evident.

Current Situation

CURRENTLY MUCH EFFORT IS BEING PLACED to mitigate the use of child soldiers in the battlefield. This is only possible by the dual collaboration of the state and non-governmental interventions. There are non-governmental organizations that focus on humanitarian efforts such as Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch. More specifically, there are non-profit charities such as **War Child** that focus on the use of children for military purposes. War Child is a non-governmental

organization that promotes education for children and opportunities in war torn countries as well as advocating for justice for victims of violations of international humanitarian laws.⁶

War Child and the IKEA Foundation are collaborating to implement an operation that will assist children separated from their parents in South Sudan, a country that is in deep peril due to its long history of conflicts. The project will include vocational training programmes for young adults to gain skills, provide children with literacy classes and recreational activities, and ensure that trained caregivers and child-protection services are in place.⁷ Despite these efforts, South Sudan is reported to have more than 9,000 child soldiers fighting in the national civil war in 2014 alone.⁸ Without a stronger mandate towards child soldiers, humanitarian efforts are only a temporary solution.

Case Study: Myanmar and the Recruitment of Child Soldiers

MYANMAR IS A STATE THAT HAS NOT SIGNED the 2002 Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict, but have ratified the Convention on the Rights of the Child.⁹ Despite that, state law enforces 18 years of age as the minimum age to be part of the military due to its unresolved civil war and history of internal conflicts. The use of child soldiers is prevalent in many of these political armed insurgencies. The internal conflicts are due to the many ethnic and political armed groups. These armed opposition groups include the Democratic Karen Buddhist Army, Kachin Independence Army, Karen National Union and Liberation Army, Karenni National Progressive Party and Army, Shan State Army, and United Wa



State Army — all of them reportedly claimed to be using children for armed purposes.

Although many child soldiers are volunteers, the reason for doing so is mainly due to poverty. In some instances, military officials request for national registration cards but when a child does not have one, they are often given the choice to join the army or face prison time for not possessing a card.¹⁰ This has also caused trust-issues between the military and the nation's local citizens.

After years of negotiations, the government of Myanmar and the United Nations signed a landmark plan of actions to demilitarize armed children in June 2012. This involves the release of child soldiers and a monitoring and reporting body led by the United Nations.¹¹ Since then, progress has been made to release children by Myanmar's armed forces. In February 2013, 24 children were released and in August 2014, 91 children were released.^{12, 13} Although there are signs of change, Human Rights Watch fear that these results will not have long-term reformation due to its ethnic conflicts and lack of preventive measures.¹⁴ Nevertheless, the physical, emotional, and mental health of these child veterans remain broken until adulthood. Little to no provision or aid are provided for support, and it becomes a more difficult situation when most of these children have no families to return to.

Stances of Some Countries

COUNTRIES REPORTED TO USE CHILD SOLDIERS:¹⁵

- Afghanistan, Central African Republic, Colombia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Iraq, Myanmar, Philippines, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Yemen

Non-governmental organizations assisting affairs on child soldiers:

- Child Soldiers International (based in the United Kingdom), The Roméo Dallaire Child Soldiers Initiative (based in Canada), War Child (branches in the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and Canada), Human Rights Watch (based in the United States, branches in the Netherlands, Lebanon, Germany, Belgium, Switzerland, South Africa, Russia, France, Japan, and Canada)

Questions and Points to Consider

THERE ARE BOTH VOLUNTARY AND FORCED RECRUITMENT of child soldiers around the world and for various reasons. With regards to the international relations of a particular country, it may be difficult to ratify to the commitment to forfeit the use of child soldiers. However, both types of recruitments need to be addressed for proper demilitarization of children.

1. For countries that do not have a stable socio-political environment, what can be done to prevent the use of children in warfare?
2. Countries that are not signatories of these additional conventions and protocols may not be legally bound to commit to the demilitarizing child soldiers. Nevertheless, how else can countries that are not signatories ensure children's rights?
3. Are there any non-governmental organizations that are offering humanitarian aid to war torn countries? How well is the operation working and how well is it received?

References

¹ International Committee of the Red Cross. "Article 77 - Protection of Children." Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and Relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts (Protocol I), 8 June 1977. Web. 21 Nov. 2014. <<https://www.icrc.org/ihl/INTRO/470>>.

² United Nations Human Rights - Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. "Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child." Web. 20 Nov. 2014. <<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/OPACCRC.aspx>>.

³ United Nations Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict. "The Optional Protocol on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict | United Nations Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict." United Nations Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict. Web. 21 Nov. 2014. <<https://childrenandarmedconflict.un.org/our-work/opac/>>.

⁴ International Labour Organization. "C182 - Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 (No. 182)." Web. 21 Nov. 2014. <http://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=NORMLEX-PUB:12100:0::NO::P12100_ILO_CODE:C182>.

⁵ United Nations Human Rights - Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. "Convention on the Rights of the Child." Convention on the Rights of the Child. Web. 21 Nov. 2014. <<http://www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/crc.aspx>>.

⁶ War Child. "What We Do." War Child. Web. 21 Nov. 2014. <<http://www.warchild.ca/whatwedo>>.

⁷ War Child. "IKEA Foundation Supports Children in South Sudan." War Child. 25 July 2014.

Web. 21 Nov. 2014. <http://www.warchild.ca/news/detail/ikea_foundation_supports_children_in_south_sudan/>.

⁸ UNICEF. "South Sudan Child Soldiers." Press Centre. May 2014. Web. 26 Nov. 2014. <http://www.unicef.org/media/media_73457.html>.

⁹ Child Soldiers International. "Myanmar." Child Soldiers International. Web. 21 Nov. 2014. <http://www.child-soldiers.org/country_reader.php?id=4>.

¹⁰ "Report to the Committee on the Rights of the Child in Advance of the Examination of Myanmar's Report on the Convention on the Rights of the Child." Coalition to Stop the Use of Child Soldiers: Myanmar. May 2011. Web. 21 Nov. 2014. <http://www.child-soldiers.org/user_uploads/pdf/myanmarshadowreportfinalmay20116435831.pdf>.

¹¹ UNICEF. "Myanmar and UN Sign Landmark Plan of Action to Release Children from Armed Forces." UNICEF. Web. 21 Nov. 2014. <http://www.unicef.org/media/media_65180.html>.

¹² UN News Centre. "Myanmar: UN Welcomes Release of Child Soldiers by National Armed Forces." 18 Feb. 2013. Web. 21 Nov. 2014. <<http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=44164>>.

¹³ UN News Center. "Myanmar: UN Welcomes Release of Child Soldiers, Commitment to Get Them Educated." 1 Aug. 2014. Web. 21 Nov. 2014. <<http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=48394>>.

¹⁴ Human Rights Watch. "World Report 2012: Burma" Human Rights Watch. Web. 21 Nov. 2014. <<http://www.hrw.org/world-report-2012/world-report-2012-burma>>.

¹⁵ Child Soldiers International. "About the Issues." N.p., n.d. Web. 26 Nov. 2014. <<http://www.child-soldiers.org/faq.php>>.