

The last 7 years have been filled with calls for non proliferation of nuclear weapons, regulation of biological material, and even more preventative measures for cyber terrorism, but one item has been missing from that agenda, the call for limitations for non nuclear arms, namely conventional weapons.

Although the results of a nuclear, biological, and even a cyber attack are easily measures, the three things must be considered when weighting the impacts of conventional weapons. The first is the time frame. Attacks with standard WMD's are rare (1 use of nuclear weapons, isolated attacks with chemical weapons, no known deliberate biological attack) but the effects of conventional weapons is seen every day. In places like America, thousands of people are affected by crime that is either related to or committed by conventional weapons like firearms. In places like Kenya and the Sudan, these numbers increase exponentially. Every major and minor military action that has taken place has been done so with conventional weapons as the workhorse. Second, we must consider availability. Standard WMD's are hard to access and even harder to use, but conventional weapons are responsible for many of the atrocities of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Take for instance the genocide in Kosovo, the police action of the 1980's era China, and even violent riots in the United States. All of these happened with easily available weapons. As was said in the movie Lord of War, "There are over 550 million firearms in worldwide circulation. That's one firearm for every twelve people on the planet." The movie later stated, "Of all the weapons in the vast soviet arsenal, nothing was more profitable than Avtomat Kalashnikova model of 1947. More commonly known as the

AK-47, or Kalashnikov. It's the world's most popular assault rifle. A weapon all fighters love. An elegantly simple 9 pound amalgamation of forged steel and plywood. It doesn't break, jam, or overheat. It'll shoot whether it's covered in mud or filled with sand. It's so easy, even a child can use it; and they do. The Soviets put the gun on a coin.

Mozambique put it on their flag.” This may seem like Hollywood hogwash, the fact remains that conventional weapons are accessible. This leads into the third criteria of magnitude. Although thousands would theoretically die in a nuclear attack, conventional weapons are far more deadly. According to the Guardian in 2006, “British officials said yesterday the proposed UN treaty was designed to impose international standards and prevent illicit trade to countries, for example the Democratic Republic of Congo, covered by UN arms embargoes. Simon Gray, an Oxfam policy adviser, said: "If we are able to get a common set of standards that everyone adheres to when considering whether to authorise weapons exports it would lead to a decline in the amount getting through to conflict zones. "Small arms kill more people around the world than any other sort of weapons. The impacts are real.

The ban that has been proposed can be split into two theories. 1 would ban arms sales and tighten the rein on those illegal arms dealers. The second would limit the development of large non nuclear weapons such as the Mother of All Bombs currently built by the United States, the Dad of All Bombs currently built by the Russians, the Massive Ordnance Penetrator 15 ton bunker buster weapon currently development by the United States, development of anti matter weapons currently under development by France and the United States, and EMP weapons currently under development by China.

All possess to kill thousands if not millions when used, and all can be and have been classified as non nuclear weapons.

The threat posed by non nuclear weapons is great. Each day, thousands of people are affected by the use of weapons such as a handgun used in a village in Africa to a massive bomb dropped on a village to target a terrorist. These weapons have been used to the extent that they have come to be standard use. The idea of this subject is to draw attention to not just their use, but to the idea of massive casualties and the need for weapons such as these.

## Questions

1. The United States has developed some of the most dangerous conventional weapons in history. Voting on this measure would signal the end of the U.S conventional arms race. How can this ban of non nuclear weapons affect relations from other countries to that of the United States?
2. The veto members of the Security Council also are the largest arms dealers in the world. How would this ban affect their economies?
3. Does the UN have authority to ban what can be developed for war use even though it is not in the category of non nuclear?
4. Brain storm as a group how this action may affect future military and police action as well as future civil wars and internal conflicts.