

CLEIMUN19

“Collaboration in a Polarized World: Hope for the Future?”

A Research Report

COMMITTEE: DISEC

QUESTION OF: The Provision of Military Aid in Areas in Conflict

AUTHOR: Kyle Sminchak

Introduction & Background

One of the most highly controversial moves a country can make is providing foreign aid to a nation in conflict. This move influences the tides of a battle, as foreign influence can severely impact the success of one nation.

For instance, in 1967, the Six Day War between Israel and Egypt, Jordan, and Syria ended in six days due to Israel’s military superiority. This only came about due to one factor: Israel’s ties to the Western World, but most importantly the United States of America. If it were not for the United States providing Israel with high-tech equipment, training and vehicles, the war would not have been as dominant as it was.

Additionally, during World Wars One and Two, the United States of America sent armaments, resources and sometimes troops to aid the Allies based off of trade alliances previously established. This helped keep the Allies in both wars. The Germans in both wars caught wind of this trade happening, and attempted to seize United States ships entering Europe during wartime periods in an effort to slow down and halt Allied reinforcements. In both World

Wars, however, the Germans were the ones who were blamed and punished, as the Americans stated that their ships were “trade ships” or “passenger ships” exclusively. This begs the question of the proper labelling of wartime aid ships as opposed to simple trading ships being multipurpose.

While both examples provided are taken from a US perspective, they are not the only nation caught in this act - Russia sold weapons to and trained soldier of Ethiopia in order for Ethiopia to beat Italy in 1896. There are countless examples of this, but most are built around a smaller LEDC being picked on by an MEDC, where a third party has relations to the aforementioned LEDC, with the exceptions of the World Wars.

Can't Both Sides Get Military Aid from MEDCs, Thus Eliminating the Problem?

Possibly. MEDCs themselves can hardly get military aid from a nation more technologically advanced than them. Additionally, some nations - namely USA, Russia and China - are far more militarily advanced than any other MEDC, so it would create a world of three superpowers, and every other nation would then flock to fall behind one of them. This might also take away self determination of nations, as they don't have to protect their own borders since their “big brother” would be there to help them if something goes wrong.

However, this isn't necessarily bad. After World War Two, the USA took control of most of Japan's military in an effort to make sure they don't go imperialist again, but this had a few unintended side effects. Japan didn't have to invest in a military, so it invested fully in its economy. This caused Japan to boom economically.

Is Providing Armaments to One Side of a War an Act of Aggression?

Some nations may feel as if the act of over-arming one side of a war is almost as if the arming nation was declaring war on them - this is a serious issue that happened in the Middle East after the Yom Kippur War. Syria, Jordan, and Egypt all banned oil trade to the United States because they felt as if the USA caused them to lose.

Is Providing Armaments justified ever?

Is the arming of an allied nation necessarily that bad? Some, such as the United States, may argue that no, it is a viable tactic to keep the peace in warring nations, and to protect their assets and allies. Others, such as Egypt, would feel as if the trading of armaments during wartime is overly beneficial to one side, and creates an uneven war based off nothing the original warring nation had internally, and solely off outside interference.

Past Efforts To Solve This Problem

Most nations who lose to incidents like military aid from a third party feel as if the war wasn't a fair fight from the start, and typically end up declaring war again later. They feel as if they could still beat an objectively better military with their now antiquated tactics or armaments, whereas that could not be further from the truth. Past attempts to quell the problem have always ended in more bloodshed and even worse relations between all nations involved.

Possible Solutions

It may be in the interest of MEDCs to create a system where every LEDC is essentially dependent on them, and vice versa. However, if only one side of a war is positively affected by armament deals, then it creates a heavily unbalanced war. Nations would have to take alliances and trade deals into account when deciding how to handle this dilemma.

Works Cited

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/First_Italo-Ethiopian_War