ASSEMBLY OF NATIONS

Assembly of Nations 2025 Opens to Diplomatic Fervour and Electrifying Promise

Before a single placard was raised, the halls of Calcutta Boys' School buzzed with ambition. After a five-year hiatus, Assembly of Nations 2025 returned—bringing with it the sharp minds and sharper suits of students ready to tackle real-world crises through diplomacy.

The opening ceremony set the tone. The Secretary-General and Deputy Secretary-General addressed a packed auditorium with a powerful call to action: to engage not in theatrics, but in meaningful, solution-driven debate. They reminded delegates that while AON may be a simulation, the issues on the table—war, security, regulation—are deeply real.

Each committee chair received their gavel in a ceremonial handover, marking the official start of proceedings. The three committees—UNGA-DISEC, UNSC, and UNCTC—were now fully in session.

The event was further elevated by the Chief Guest's keynote address, which touched on the rise of non-state actors, digital threats, and the urgent need for youth-led global cooperation. It was a timely reminder that leadership in today's world must be informed, principled, and adaptable.

With that, the delegates dispersed to committee rooms—and diplomacy began in earnest. The silence of the last five years had ended. Assembly of Nations 2025 had officially begun.

"War Has Become Profitable for Russia," Alleges Ukraine as UNGA-DISEC Ignites

The first day of the Calcutta Boys' School Assembly of Nations 2025 saw UNGA-DISEC plunge into high-stakes debate over the regulation of Private Military and Security Companies (PMSCs). What began as a routine General Speakers' List quickly escalated into impassioned accusations, especially as the Russo-Ukrainian conflict took centre stage.

Iran opened with cautious support for countries resisting PMSC influence, but France stole the spotlight, dismissing further diplomacy as futile and branding PMSCs as "mercenaries for hire." The delegate condemned their alleged neo-Nazi links—an indirect nod to groups like Wagner—and demanded immediate global action.

India followed with a call for international legal frameworks, pushing for accountability and transparency. Ukraine then delivered a fiery attack, accusing Russia of weaponizing PMSCs and violating Article 2(4) of the UN Charter. Iran was also called out for its ties to Hezbollah. "War has become profitable for Russia," Ukraine declared—prompting a tense ripple of POIs.

ASSEMBLY OF NATIONS

The UK backed Ukraine but fumbled when questioned by Russia, UAE, and Burkina Faso about its own past use of PMSCs. The defense—claiming the group had s i n c e disbanded—did little to ease the c o m m i t t e e's skepticism.

Libya proposed regulatory frameworks and highlighted the need to restore stability in Africa. South Korea struck a balance between acknowledging PMSC utility and calling for stricter rules. Afghanistan warned of long-term damage from unregulated forces, while China delivered a vague defense of its own PMSCs and deflected criticism by q u e s t i o n i n g sources—eliciting visible doubt across the room.

By day's end, there was widespread agreement on the need for regulation—but no consensus on how. The day ended not with resolution, but with rising tension and the sense that Day Two would demand far more than speeches.

Private Guns, Public Rage: Day One's Caucus Erupts Over Lawless Contractors – UNGA DISEC

After a fiery General Speakers' List, UNGA-DISEC plunged into its first moderated caucus—an intense session proposed by Japan on the role of Private Military and Security Companies (PMSCs) in occupied territories. What followed was a whirlwind of emotion, policy, and power plays that laid bare the fault lines of international security.

New Zealand opened by citing torture and extrajudicial killings linked to PMSCs, calling for criminal accountability and a global framework. Iraq acknowledged their utility in logistics and training, but warned of the risks posed by their opacity. Poland went full-throttle—demanding GPS tracking, public disclosure, and strict international oversight.

Saudi Arabia questioned the very foundations of enforcement, stressing the absence of formal definitions for PMSCs, while Iran rejected military outsourcing altogether. Japan invoked Blackwater and Wagner, proposing a "pyramid accountability framework" based on breach severity. India's rhetorical strike—"The Rule of Law has been replaced by the Rule of Money"—hit hard, echoed by Canada's criticism of legal loopholes.

Ukraine sharply accused Russia and Afghanistan of international violations, while Somalia delivered a chilling line: "War is terrorism with a broader budget." North Korea went further, alleging black market crimes and proposing a total PMSC ban.

As the session closed for lunch, one thing was clear: PMSCs aren't just the topic—they're the faultline.

ASSEMBLY OF NATIONS

DISEC Fires Up Over PMSCs Oversight Battle

As delegates returned from lunch, UNGA-DISEC resumed with even more intensity. The remaining General Speakers' List interventions kept the room on edge. South Africa advocated a multilateral framework, while Australia reignited the morning's aggressive tone by urging immediate action over diplomacy. When asked about PMSCs in Australia, the delegate admitted it was precisely that threat which necessitated a global framework—sidestepping criticism with clever candor.

Turkey declared PMSCs to be "power brokers," while the United States defended its private contractors as beneficial and tightly regulated—an assertion met with muted skepticism. Somalia again played the provocateur, targeting global "hypocrisy" and calling for PMSCs to be regulated like state militaries. North Korea rebutted, and Belarus added fuel with its demand for disarmament and a complete ban.

Japan then initiated a second moderated caucus on regulatory mechanisms with emphasis on the Russo-Ukrainian conflict. The session quickly became contentious. Japan proposed creating a standing international group to oversee PMSC conduct, while Iraq suggested digital monitoring and local oversight. Somalia dismissed these as "paper frameworks," arguing that nothing short of a ban would prevent bloodshed.

India proposed mandatory annual reports for PMSCs. Congo echoed historical warnings, calling for lessons to be learned. Israel pushed for sanctions, while Sudan introduced the idea of a victim compensation system. South Korea demanded legal liability across borders.

North Korea raised eyebrows with a cryptic remark: "If our foreign policy was adopted by others, it would be a simple remedy." Afghanistan returned to documentation. Saudi Arabia criticized Ukraine and the African Union, suggesting a corporate liability framework modeled on the Malabo Protocol.

Ukraine and Russia clashed yet again, with Ukraine citing breaches of the Budapest Memorandum. Heated back-and-forth followed, with the Chair forced to intervene multiple times.

By the session's end, no consensus had formed—only a broader rift. Tomorrow promises not de-escalation, but reckoning.

UNGA-DISEC: Committee Highlights – Day 1

The first day of UNGA-DISEC at Assembly of Nations 2025 opened with fierce debate and sharp diplomatic crossfire. Delegates tackled the agenda on regulating Private Military and Security Companies (PMSCs), with particular focus on the Russo-Ukrainian conflict.

France set an aggressive tone, demanding immediate global action and calling PMSCs "mercenaries for hire." Ukraine followed with forceful accusations against Russia, citing violations of Article 2(4) of the UN Charter and alleging war profiteering through the Wagner Group.

India and Japan pushed for structured accountability frameworks, while Somalia delivered one of the day's most memorable lines: "War is terrorism with a bigger and broader budget." Russia responded by accusing Ukraine of hypocrisy and using unregulated PMSCs itself.

North Korea proposed a complete ban, citing economic crimes. Saudi Arabia, Libya, and Canada emphasized legal gaps, transparency, and the lack of global oversight. Meanwhile, countries like South Korea and Syria raised concerns over field violations, including the use of torture and autonomous systems.

The committee saw rising tensions and little consensus, but what emerged clearly was a shared urgency: PMSCs can no longer operate in legal grey zones. The world is watching—and the committee must now deliver.

ASSEMBLY OF NATIONS

Between Firewalls and Firepower: UNCTC Confronts the Weaponisation of Modern Warfare

The United Nations Counter-Terrorism Committee (UNCTC) found itself navigating treacherous terrain as state representatives locked horns over the rapidly evolving nature of warfare — where lines between national defence and digital aggression have grown dangerously thin.

What began as a discussion on enhancing global counter-terrorism frameworks swiftly spiraled into a showdown over drone warfare, AI misuse, cyber espionage, and the misuse of international law. India took the lead with a strong appeal for peace, cross-border cooperation, and the sanctity of sovereign nations. But this peace was framed within a barbed critique — particularly aimed at Pakistan's actions in Jammu & Kashmir and its alleged violations of UNSC Resolution 1373.

Algeria offered a more structured contribution, citing its domestic Law 0501 and commitment to UN-aligned blueprints as effective measures against terrorism financing and drone support. Similarly, Egypt presented a robust legal foundation supported by Resolutions 1373, 2178, and 2196, and emphasized global financial security, judicial transparency, and anti-money laundering reforms.

But the committee's tone darkened with the arrival of more contentious actors. Iran defended its use of proxies and regional partnerships, calling out "selective amnesia" by Western powers and questioning the legitimacy of international pressure. Russia, meanwhile, emphasized Article 2(4) of the UN Charter, calling out others for what it described as 'collateral hypocrisy'. It urged the committee to consider a global ban on terrorism that goes beyond borders and beyond double standards.

Technological aggression became the flashpoint. Turkey criticized major powers for weaponizing AI and cyber tools to undermine weaker nations. China, while advocating for drone and biometric regulations under resolutions like 1373 and 2396, was itself accused of hosting paramilitary drone bases and leveraging surveillance infrastructure with opaque intent. Denmark highlighted the Copenhagen Process — a legal model for regulating autonomous systems — as a potential global template.

Western countries were not spared. The USA defended its expansive surveillance and drone network as a direct consequence of 9/11. It maintained that it does not misuse sovereignty, and emphasized initiatives like the CTISP to plug crypto loopholes and tighten global accountability. The UK, citing the 7/7 attacks and 2017 Manchester bombings, laid out its four-pronged "Prevent, Pursue, Protect, Prepare" strategy while calling for tighter biometric tracking and adherence to Geneva provisions.

But perhaps the most revealing moment came not from speeches, but from accusations: China confronted the USA over Advanced Persistent Threats (APT-30, 33, 105), while the USA pointed to Pakistan's alleged involvement in the 2016 bombings, calling it a violation of the UN Charter. Argentina reminded the committee of Syria's death toll from drones. Meanwhile, Rwanda, citing the 2022 UNODC report, called terrorism a global threat requiring global solidarity — not political infighting.

The UNCTC's final resolution remains in flux — ambitious in vision but fragmented in support. What is certain is that terrorism no longer wears a uniform, speaks a language, or carries a flag. It is encrypted in code, embedded in drones, and buried in data leaks. And as firewalls begin to fail, it is clear that the new theatre of war is everywhere.

ASSEMBLY OF NATIONS

Of Drones and Discord: Nations Collide Over Cybersecurity and Sovereignty at UNCTC

From peace talks to pointed fingers, the UNCTC's session turned into a political minefield as delegates found themselves embroiled in heated debate over one of the 21st century's most volatile questions: who gets to police the new frontlines of war?

In what began as a conversation around counter-terrorism, countries quickly slipped into open disputes, with drone warfare, AI weapons, and national surveillance programs dominating the floor. India struck early, flagging Pakistan's involvement in drone-enabled attacks and violations of sovereignty in Jammu & Kashmir. The delegation demanded a UN-led cyber exchange and stricter measures to curb terrorism and cross-border strikes.

Algeria backed the need for hard law, presenting its enforcement of UNSC Resolution 1373 through domestic legal mechanisms and cyber blueprints. Turkey raised alarm bells over AI-enabled warfare, accusing larger states of targeting weaker nations and proposing the NCSS — its national cybersecurity strategy — as a model for defence and ethical governance.

The divide between "tech exporters" and "tech targets" became increasingly stark. China called for clarity and consensus on the use of drones and biometric surveillance, but was itself accused by the USA and others of harboring paramilitary drone bases. Accusations mounted further when China linked Western APTs (Advanced Persistent Threats) and private firms to destabilizing cyber activities — allegations that were met with visible discomfort.

Meanwhile, Denmark and France proposed the need to regulate AI weaponry and autonomous systems, citing UN Resolutions 2370 and 2396, while urging the world to update its war conventions to address drone misuse. The UK reiterated its commitment to border security, facial recognition, and post-7/7 counter-terror strategies. France echoed concerns over misuse of cyberspace, demanding a UN watchdog to govern jurisdiction in AI and cyber activity.

The more the conversation progressed, the more it morphed into a battlefield of blame. Pakistan accused France of interference in Syria, while Russia pointed fingers at "collateral tolerance" by NATO nations and called for a universal terrorism ban. Iran labeled Panama's alignment questionable, while China and Turkey questioned the USA's moral high ground, citing repeated drone strikes and their civilian toll.

The final flashpoint came with revelations of over 400 drone attacks in Syria since 2011 and tunnel networks involving child exploitation. Delegates referenced the Azov Regiment's role in Europe, and Rwanda cited the 2022 UNODC report as evidence that terrorism, in its current form, has no borders.

Despite calls for a united front, the atmosphere was anything but. The word "resolution" felt increasingly aspirational as power blocs clashed, agendas hardened, and accusations became policy. Yet, even amid the discord, a sobering truth emerged: no nation today is immune from the ripple effects of modern terror. Whether it arrives through a drone, a data leak, or a manipulated proxy, the enemy is often unseen — and increasingly, it wears no face at all.

ASSEMBLY OF NATIONS

UNCTC: Committee Highlights – Day 1

The United Nations Counter-Terrorism Committee at AON 2025 began its deliberations on the use of emerging technologies by terrorist organizations with immediate intensity. Day 1 quickly shifted gears from formal opening statements to high-voltage exchanges—especially surrounding the escalating role of drone warfare in global conflict.

Russia found itself at the center of controversy after being accused of contradicting its own foreign policy stance. Despite repeatedly citing Article 2(4) of the UN Charter to promote peace and non-intervention, the delegation struggled to defend its government's actions in Ukraine—particularly the alleged drone strikes on civilian zones. This inconsistency drew sharp criticism from multiple delegations.

Pakistan delivered one of the day's standout moments, openly condemning Russia's drone operations over Ukrainian territory. The intervention electrified the committee, intensifying the atmosphere and prompting a wave of follow-up questions. Despite its attempts to advocate for peaceful technological regulation, Russia's lack of a strong rebuttal left many delegates visibly unsatisfied.

The rest of the committee navigated broader discussions on AI, surveillance tech, and global cyber norms—but the shadow of real-world conflict loomed large. If Day 1 proved anything, it's that regulating terrorism-linked tech in today's world means confronting not just non-state actors—but major powers too.

"No Neutral Ground": The Middle East Erupts in Debate at UNSC

On the 17th of March, 2025, the United Nations Security Council reconvened in New York to deliberate the increasingly fragile situation in the Middle East. The objective: to form an extension to the now-expired ceasefire between Hamas and the State of Israel. What was expected to be a diplomatic exercise quickly turned into a theatre of rising tension, sparked by the announcement of a significant and disturbing development.

An American merchant vessel en route to the Israeli port of Bal Mandeb had been hijacked by Ansar Alla—a known non-state actor. The ship's cargo reportedly included weapons-grade uranium and, more alarmingly, two Israeli civilian hostages. The timing of the hijack, coinciding with the committee session, added a dramatic layer of urgency and underscored the volatility of the region.

Tensions reached a new high when a representative from the Hamas Special Envoy addressed the committee with unabashed aggression. The delegate did not mince words, claiming sole authority as the representative of Palestine. In a striking dismissal, he referred to the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) as nothing more than a puppet regime, allegedly manipulated by Israel. The boldness of this assertion stunned many in the room—though surprisingly, no formal objections were raised regarding security concerns.

As delegates attempted to navigate the shifting landscape of alliances and accusations, the nature of the discussion teetered between diplomacy and disarray. The day ended with few resolutions but much to reckon with, as the Security Council grappled with a ceasefire not just expiring—but imploding.

ASSEMBLY OF NATIONS

UNSC: Uranium, Hostages, and Hollow Speeches

The Security Council may have opened with urgency, but by the end of Day 1, it became clear that urgency and direction are not always synonymous.

Following the shocking update of an American merchant vessel hijacked en route to Bal Mandeb—its cargo including weapons-grade uranium and two Israeli civilians—the room stirred. What should have triggered immediate coordinated deliberation on nuclear threat containment and the implications of civilian hostage crises instead saw delegates tap-dancing around the elephant in the room.

Questions loomed. Why was the United States shipping weapons-grade uranium to Israel, particularly in light of its track record with deploying nuclear assets in NATO ally territories? While this move by a state actor drew quiet suspicion, what truly demanded—and deserved—front-row attention was the acquisition of such a material by a Non-State Actor. That, and the use of civilians as political pawns by the Houthi rebels.

These issues remained conveniently untouched through most of the day's discourse, receiving due attention only towards the backend of the session. Yet amidst the stalling, the Council did finally recognize the pressing nature of the situation. With diplomacy proving inadequate in the face of escalating risk, the UNSC approved the deployment of state-respective Special Forces through formal Action Orders.

The committee also bore witness to another kind of detonation: that of foreign policy coherence. Several delegates fumbled their national stances, delivered pre-planned speeches detached from the ongoing crisis, and ignored vetted caucus agendas. One could be forgiven for wondering if the room was populated by sentient algorithms rather than sharp diplomatic minds.

As Day 2 approaches, one thing is certain—the room needs fire. The conflict is real. The stakes are high. It's time for delegates to drop the scripts and bring the storm.

UNSC: Committee Highlights – Day 1

Day 1 of the UNSC opened with explosive updates—both figuratively and literally. The committee gathered to discuss the fragile ceasefire between Hamas and Israel, only to be met with a crisis: an American merchant vessel carrying weapons-grade uranium and two Israeli civilian hostages had been hijacked by Ansar Alla, a Non-State Actor. This revelation sent ripples across the room, but many delegates initially tiptoed around the nuclear implications.

Amidst the tension, the delegate of the Hamas Special Envoy made waves by proclaiming sole representation of Palestine, dismissing the PLO as an Israeli puppet. The statement drew sharp attention—but curiously, no objections on security grounds were raised. What followed was a somewhat erratic debate. Some delegates veered off-topic, failing to engage with the urgency of the update. Others stuck to rehearsed scripts, ignoring the evolving crisis. A few, however, rose to the challenge. As discussions finally shifted toward real solutions, the committee reached consensus on deploying respective Special Forces through Action Orders—an aggressive but necessary measure given the stakes.

From nuclear material falling into the wrong hands to diplomatic posturing and misplaced rhetoric, Day 1 of the UNSC was chaotic, tense, and unfinished. Day 2 promises reckoning.

-Publications Committee, AON 2025