

# Preventative and Preemptive Warfare Revisited

After lunch, debate opened on topic number one, Preventative Warfare. The resolution in question, Resolution 1-6, submitted by the delegate from Panama, (1) discusses forbidding the use of preventative warfare without the consent of the United Nations, (2) allows the use of economic sanctions or any other suitable punishments on uncooperative states, (3) suggests the creation of a subcommittee to discuss further definition of the differences between preventative and preemptive warfare, (4) encourages the

use of other non-violent means to resolve conflict between states, and (5) urges the international community to act through the United Nations to establish effective limitations on unnecessary preventative action and apply sanctions or any other necessary measures to any country that defies the dictates of international law.

The delegate from India once again was one of the loudest voices against passing this resolution. After some research, the delegate realized that the United Nations already has

definitions for preventative and preemptive warfare in place, which would render most of the resolution's operative clauses ineffective or redundant. The delegate also realized that the United Nations already requires any preventative warfare to be approved by the United Nations. With this idea presented to them, the committee proceeded to amend the resolution, changing certain bold wording to be slightly more acceptable (for example, the word "forbids" was changed to "advises against").

A resolution to strike an operative clause was presented. The resolution

was unfriendly, and therefore, discussion of this amendment was allowed. The clause reads "Strongly Advises against the use of preventative warfare without the explicit consent of the United Nations Security Council." The speaker's list quickly filled. The delegate from Greece was very much against striking this clause, as he stated that it puts the rest of the resolution in context. As expected, the delegate from India disagreed.

"Repetitive" seemed to be the word of the day, as delegate after delegate came up to state that the United Nations already had such a law in place. After

much debate, the operative clause was stricken, only to be re-added within five minutes with the use of a friendly amendment.

Once these amendments were in place, it became easy to see that all the delegates had formed their final opinions, and were ready to vote. The resolution passed, and discussion has moved on to a new topic.

By: SpecPol Reporter