



# CRESMUN

EMINENCE EDITION  
CHAPTER II

---

Study Guides

# UNSC

## Agenda 1:

### **The Weaponization of Artificial Intelligence and Autonomous Weapons Systems (Laws)**

- **Introduction & Definition**

Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems (LAWS) are weapon systems that, once activated, can select and engage targets without further human intervention. Powered by rapid advances in artificial intelligence (AI), machine learning, and neural networks, these systems mark a fundamental shift in modern warfare. While proponents argue they reduce friendly casualties and react faster than humans, critics raise profound ethical, legal, and operational concerns.

- **Key Sub-Topics & Controversies**

The "Human-in-the-Loop" Debate: Distinguishing between human-in-the-loop (systems that require human approval to fire), human-on-the-loop (systems supervised by humans who can override them), and human-out-of-the-loop (fully autonomous systems).



\* **Accountability & International Humanitarian Law (IHL):** Under IHL (specifically the Geneva Conventions), military commanders and combatants are held accountable for war crimes. If an AI system acts unpredictably or commits a war crime, assigning responsibility becomes legally ambiguous (e.g., the programmer, the commanding officer, or the manufacturer).

\* **Strategic Stability & Escalation Risks:** Algorithms operate at machine speed, meaning automated retaliation or defensive responses could trigger accidental escalation, flash wars, or cyber-kinetic cascades before human operators can de-escalate.

## **Bloc Positions & Perspectives**

\* **Major Powers (e.g., USA, China, Russia):** Investing heavily in military AI to maintain strategic parity. While they recognize ethical concerns, they generally resist a total blanket ban, preferring regulatory frameworks or codes of conduct.

\* **Middle Powers & Humanitarian Coalition (e.g., Austria, Brazil, New Zealand):** Strong advocates for a legally binding treaty prohibiting fully autonomous weapons that lack meaningful human control over the use of force.

\* **Non-Aligned Movement (NAM):** Often emphasize the risk of technology proliferation to non-state actors and terrorists, alongside concerns over the widening technology gap between developed and developing nations.



# UNSC

## Agenda 2:

### **The Militarization of Commercial Low-Earth Orbit (LEO) Megaconstellations and Space Debris Governance**

#### **Introduction & Definition**

Low-Earth Orbit (LEO) has become the new frontier for both commercial enterprise and strategic competition. With the rapid deployment of commercial megaconstellations (such as SpaceX's Starlink or OneWeb) numbering in the tens of thousands, orbital space is increasingly congested. Concurrently, dual-use technologies—where commercial communication and earth-observation satellites are co-opted for military intelligence, reconnaissance, and resilient tactical communication—blur the line between civilian infrastructure and legitimate military targets.

#### **Key Sub-Topics & Controversies**

\* **Dual-Use Dilemma:** The integration of commercial LEO constellations into military command networks (e.g., battlefield communication in Ukraine) raises questions about whether these commercial assets constitute lawful military targets under international law.



\* **Kessler Syndrome & Space Debris:** As more satellites are launched, the risk of orbital collisions multiplies exponentially. Anti-satellite (ASAT) weapons testing further exacerbates this, creating persistent debris fields that threaten all global space assets.

\* **Regulatory Vacuum:** The foundational Outer Space Treaty of 1967 was drafted during a bipolar space race and fails to adequately address modern commercial privatization, mega constellation, or active debris removal operations.

### **Bloc Positions & Perspectives**

\* **Space-faring Nations with Advanced Commercial Sectors** (e.g., USA, EU nations): Emphasize responsible behaviors, transparency, and voluntary norms of behavior in space rather than restrictive new treaties that could stifle commercial innovation.

\* **Rising Space Powers & Adversaries** (e.g., Russia, China): Express deep concern over the weaponization of commercial infrastructure and advocate for legally binding treaties on the prevention of an arms race in outer space (PAROS).

\* **Global South & Developing Nations:** Argue that congested orbital slots and debris risks threaten their future access to space (often referred to as orbital equity), demanding equitable sharing of orbital real estate.



## Recommended UNSC Action Points & Resolution Framework

When drafting resolutions for these agendas, delegates should consider incorporating the following measures:

1. **Establish Clear Thresholds:** Define mandatory levels of meaningful human control for LAWS to ensure adherence to IHL proportionality principles.
2. **Transparency & De-confliction:** Implement mandatory orbital registration protocols and communication channels for LEO satellite operators to prevent accidental military escalation or kinetic collisions.
3. **Moratoriums:** Propose targeted moratoria—such as bans on destructive direct-ascent ASAT missile tests and fully autonomous strike systems lacking human oversight.

