

AMERICAN MODEL UNITED NATIONS INTERNATIONAL ISSUES AT AMUN REPRESENTATIVE HANDBOOK

INTRODUCTION	3
I. THE UNITED NATIONS	
• Origins of the United Nations, Purpose of the United Nations, How the United Nations Seeks to Achieve Its Purpose, Structure of the United Nations.....	4
• Bloc Politics	5
II. THE SECURITY COUNCIL	7
• Issues in Africa.....	7
• Issues in Asia.....	11
• Issues in Europe.....	12
• Issues in the Middle East.....	13
• Other Issues	16
III. THE HISTORICAL SECURITY COUNCIL - 1967	17
• The Situation in Southern Rhodesia	18
• The Question of Palestine.....	19
• The Situation in the Republic of the Congo, The Situation in Vietnam.....	20
• Other Issues	21
IV. THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY	23
• The First Committee (Disarmament and International Security)	
• General and Complete Disarmament: Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction	23
• Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction	24
• The Second Committee (Economic and Financial)	
• Globalization and Interdependence: Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2001-2010	26
• Strengthening International Economic Cooperation for Development Through Partnership	27
• The Third Committee (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural)	
• Promotion and Protection of the Rights of Children: Protection of Children Affected by Armed Conflict.....	29
• International Drug Control.....	31
• The Sixth Committee (Legal)	
• Measures to Eliminate International Terrorism.....	32
• International Convention Against the Reproductive Cloning of Human Beings.....	33
V. THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS	36
• The Rights of Refugees.....	36
• The Right to Development.....	39
VI. THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL	42
• Coordination, Programme and Other Questions: Malaria and Diarrhoeal Diseases, in Particular Cholera.....	42
• Social and Human Rights Questions: Social Development	43
• High-Level Segment: The Role of the United Nations System in Supporting the Efforts of African Countries to Achieve Sustainable Development	45
• Operational Activities of the United Nations for International Development Cooperation: Economic and Technical Cooperation Among Developing Countries.....	46
• Report of the Commission on Human Rights.....	48
VII. THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE	49
• <i>Democratic Republic of the Congo v. Uganda</i> : Dispute Over the Armed Activities on the Territory of the Congo.....	49
• <i>Liechtenstein v. Germany</i> : Dispute Over the Reparation of Property Stemming from World War II.....	50
• <i>Spain v. Canada</i> : Fisheries Jurisdiction Case	51



2002 AMUN INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Secretary-General

Shannon Dunn

Under-Secretaries-General

Ryan Donovan, *Administration*

Dan Wright, *Publicity*

Matthew Corso, *Research*

President of the General Assembly

Stacy Short

Vice President of the General Assembly

Sarah Morse

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The 2002 American Model United Nations Conference would like to gratefully acknowledge the contributions of the following individuals, without whom this *Issues at AMUN Handbook* would not have been possible:

Editor-in-Chief:

Adam Wolfe

Editors:

Matthew Corso

Brian Endless

Background Writers:

Gregory Elias Adams

Marian Adly

Greg Amend

Jaclyn Burger

Don Carey

Matthew Corso

Brijeet Dhaliwal

Christina Drennon

Shannon Dunn

Brian Endless

Jason Fulp

Adam Goldstein

Timothy Grailer

Kathryn Guadreau

Allison Hassig

Lisa Hendrickson

Mitzi Heniff

Tim Hoppe

Kevin Ingram

Ryan Kennedy

Chandra Linton

Steve Majors

Lacy Parrish

Neil Ripley

Nadia Stoyanova

Teresa Woodard

A special thank you for the printing services provided by:

Harlan Aldort, Graphic Design & Printing, Chicago, Illinois

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, PLEASE WRITE OR CALL:

American Model United Nations International

5005 West Winona

Chicago, Illinois 60630

Phone: (773) 777-AMUN

Fax: (773) 777-1963

E-mail: mail@amun.org

Web: www.amun.org

© Copyright July 2002, by American Model United Nations, Inc.
Reproduction of any part of this handbook may be made only by written
consent of American Model United Nations, Inc.

ISSUES AT AMUN 2002

INTRODUCTION

The *Issues at AMUN Handbook* has been published to assist Representatives in their preparations for the American Model United Nations Conference. When utilized to complement the research students do on the nation they represent and the topics of discussion, this handbook provides Representatives with all the substantive information they will require to function effectively at the simulation. Its sister handbook, *AMUN Rules and Procedures*, provides an overview of the committee/council rules and conference logistics with which Representatives need to familiarize themselves for the simulation.

The following pages contain brief overviews of the topics to be discussed in the Committees and Councils at the 2002 Conference. These are intended as a guideline and basis for Representatives' further research of the issues involved. In keeping with this, each overview includes a bibliography to guide Representatives on appropriate sources of additional information.

The overviews give a brief background into each topic and state some areas of current United Nations and international activity on the topic. In many cases, the overviews will frame the topic in terms of a few, limited parts of a highly complex issue. For example, the general issue of "the Environment" may have dozens of sub-issues -- in such a case, the overview may provide direction for Representatives to concentrate their research on "Ozone Depletion" and "Limiting the Destruction of the Rain Forests," only two of the many smaller issues. This format allows Representatives to go into greater detail in their preparations, without the need to research all aspects of the multifaceted main issue.

Chapter I - The United Nations is provided as essential background to give all Representatives a common ground about the history of the UN. This section begins with the origins of the UN and covers some important points about the organization. Finally, focus is given to problems confronting the UN today.

AMUN's philosophy in providing these topic overviews is to give Representatives *direction* in their research, but to leave the work up to them. **These overviews are not intended to be the sole source of Representatives' research on the topics prior to the conference.**

USE OF THE INTERNET

Note that many of works cited in this *Issues at AMUN Handbook* are resources located on the World Wide Web. Full texts of many of AMUN's periodical sources are available to AMUN participants on-line. Feel free to visit AMUN's homepage at www.amun.org for a full list of recommended research links.

Three on-line sources of particular note are the United Nations homepage (www.un.org), *UN Wire* (www.unwire.org), a daily briefing on UN issues provided by the United Nations Foundation, and the *New York Times* on-line (www.nyt.com). These sources are heavily referenced throughout the issues briefings in this handbook. Additionally, the on-line copy of this handbook, also available from AMUN's homepage, contains direct links to all available documents cited in the *Issues* bibliographies.

For a more thorough discussion of on-line research sources, see "Utilizing the Internet" on page 14 of the *AMUN Rules and Procedures Handbook*.



CHAPTER I.

THE UNITED NATIONS

Representatives participating in American Model United Nations should be familiar with the history of the United Nations, as well as the rapidly changing role that the organization plays in international affairs. This section is intended to provide a brief background on the UN system and on some of the issues it faces today.

ORIGINS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The United Nations came into existence on 24 October 1945. On that day, the United Nations Charter became operative, having been signed by the fifty-one original members.

The concept of all nations' uniting together in one organization designed to settle disputes peacefully was born of the desire of civilized nations to avoid the horrors produced by the First and Second World Wars. The United Nations developed as a successor to the League of Nations, which represented the first attempts by nations to achieve this unity. The League failed in large part because the United States never joined as a member.

In 1942, President Roosevelt first coined the term "United Nations," when the Declaration of the United Nations was signed by forty-seven nations in support of the Atlantic Charter. In 1944, the United States, United Kingdom, USSR and China met in Washington, DC at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, where the first blueprint of the United Nations was prepared. In 1945, the final details for the United Nations were worked out at the Yalta Conference. Fifty-one nations gathered from 24 April through 26 June in San Francisco to draft the Charter of the United Nations, which was signed on 26 June 1945.

PURPOSE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The primary purposes for which the United Nations was founded are detailed in Chapter I, Article 1 of the Charter. These are:

1. To maintain international peace and security;
2. To develop friendly relations among Nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;
3. To achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of economic, social, cultural or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinctions as to race, sex, language and religion;
4. To be a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends.

HOW THE UNITED NATIONS SEEKS TO ACHIEVE ITS PURPOSE

Since 1945, the United Nations has established itself as a forum for the discussion of international disputes. Also, Member States recognize that the United Nations has an established machinery which can be utilized as the means of solving international problems.

The United Nations seeks, both through its principal organs and various subsidiary bodies, to settle disputes through peaceful means, without resort to the threat or use of force. It should be recognized that the United Nations is not a world government, nor does it "legislate." Rather, the actions of the United Nations, as evidenced by resolutions passed by its bodies, have a strong moral persuasive effect. The Member States frequently find it within their own best interests to follow UN recommendations.

STRUCTURE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The United Nations has six primary bodies:

The General Assembly (GA): The GA is the central organ of the United Nations. The GA has been described as the nearest thing to a "parliament of mankind," as all Member States are members of the GA, and each member has one vote. The GA makes recommendations on international issues, oversees all other UN bodies which must report to the GA annually, approves the UN budget and apportions UN expenses. On the recommendation of the Security Council, the GA elects the Secretary-General and holds the authority to admit and expel Member States. Voting in the GA is ordinarily by simple majority, although on "important questions" a two-thirds majority is required.



The Security Council (SC): The Security Council is charged with the primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security. It has the power to employ United Nations forces and direct action against threats to the peace. Fifteen members sit on the Security Council, including the five Permanent Members (China, France, Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States) along with ten “at-large” members who are elected by the General Assembly for two-year terms.

A majority in the Security Council consists of nine members voting “yes.” However, a “no” vote by any of the Permanent Members has the effect of vetoing or blocking motions.

Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC): ECOSOC is the primary body dealing with the economic, social, humanitarian and cultural work of the United Nations system. ECOSOC oversees five regional economic commissions and six “subject-matter” commissions, along with a sizeable system of committees and expert bodies. ECOSOC is composed of fifty-four Member States, elected by the GA for three-year terms.

Trusteeship Council (TC): In 1945 there were eleven Trust Territories, which were regions without their own governments. These eleven regions were placed under the TC, which helped them prepare for and achieve independence. With the admittance of Palau as a UN Member State in 1994, the TC has now completed its original mandate. The TC today is inactive, but is formally composed of the permanent Security Council members.

The International Court of Justice (ICJ): The International Court of Justice, or World Court, is the primary judicial organ of the UN, and decides international legal disputes. All UN members are automatically able to bring matters before the ICJ; however, States must agree to accept the jurisdiction of the ICJ before it can decide a dispute involving that state. Fifteen judges serving nine-year terms sit on the Court.

Secretariat: The Secretariat is composed of the Secretary-General and the United Nations Staff. Approximately 16,000 people are employed as the staff of the UN, one-third of whom work at the UN headquarters in New York City. The other two-thirds work for various subsidiary bodies of the United Nations. The Secretary-General serves a five-year renewable term.

In addition to the six main bodies, the United Nations includes a large “family” of specialized agencies and programs which the UN administers. Examples include the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Health Organization (WHO), and the UN Children’s Fund (UNICEF).

BLOC POLITICS

The system of “bloc politics” in the UN is one in which nations have organized themselves into groups based on areas of mutual interest. These blocs tend to be made up of nations with similar political, historical or cultural backgrounds. They are often formed on a geographic basis, but this is not exclusively the case. By organizing themselves with other nations that hold similar interests, bloc members hope to increase their influence above the level that they would have as a single nation in the General Assembly.

Bloc politics in the UN today is a misunderstood and rapidly changing phenomenon. The necessity of blocs in the UN was formally established in 1957, when four regional groups were endorsed by the General Assembly: the Latin American, the Asian and African, the Eastern European and the Western European and Others. Since that time, the bloc system has grown to encompass many of the political, economic and military organizations of the world. Examples of the major blocs include the Non-Aligned Movement, the Group of 77, the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN), the African Union (AU), the Organization of American States (OAS), the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) and the European Community (EC).

Major changes in the utilization of blocs at the UN have occurred within the past five years, as explained below. Please note, however, that these groups do not have “official” standing as caucus groups at the UN, but are rather groups that meet, depending on the circumstances, to attempt to reach a consensus on various issues.

Blocs are often thought of as “Voting Blocs,” but this is a definite misnomer. They can be more realistically seen as “Caucusing Blocs:” groups which discuss issues together based on areas of mutual interest, but that often do not reach full agreement on all issues. A key consideration is that every country in a bloc will have different priorities **based on its own national interests**. Countries will often discount bloc considerations and vote in their own best interest in these priority areas.



Blocs usually attempt to form a consensus among their members which will allow them to act as a cohesive group. The effectiveness of any given bloc in exerting its positions in the General Assembly will often depend upon its ability to form a consensus among its own members. These acts of compromise form the basis of UN politics, and often must occur within the various caucusing groups before they can begin to apply to the UN as a whole.

Bloc politics have changed considerably in the last few years. Their viability as a political tool is diminishing; blocs are falling out of use. The most historically cohesive bloc, the Warsaw Pact, has ceased to exist as a military and political unit. Several other blocs, including the Western, are undergoing structural changes that will have a profound effect on the future of UN politics. The more organized blocs at present are the African Union (formerly the Organization of African Unity), the Organization of American States, and the European Community.

One often misinterpreted area of bloc politics is that of the “Third World,” or developing bloc. A “Third World Bloc” has never existed. In actuality, several blocs of developing countries have existed. The Group of 77 (now consisting of 125+ nations) is the largest and is still sometimes thought of as the Third World Bloc. There are, however, developing nations which are not members of this organization, and many members also belong to several other organizations, particularly the Non-Aligned Movement.

Representatives should be aware that the state they represent may no longer actively participate in bloc politics, or may vote outside of their traditional bloc based on circumstances. For example, at the June 1992 Environmental Summit in Rio de Janeiro, several Group of 77 countries including India, a previous “leader” of the bloc, ignored bloc positions on environmental issues and followed their own national interests when participating at the Summit. The most accurate thing which can be said about bloc politics today is that they are in a state of flux. Many states are increasingly neutral on issues that they once held strong views on and that were shared with other members of their respective bloc. Other states are becoming increasingly independent on issues, or are concerned only with regional issues.

For the purposes of the AMUN Conference, blocs will not be treated as “official” bodies. Representatives are encouraged to caucus in their bloc groups **only when appropriate**. Please remember there are many issues which cross bloc lines and many opportunities to invite an “involved nation” to another bloc caucus in an effort to achieve a consensus.



CHAPTER II.

THE SECURITY COUNCIL

STATE MEMBERS

Bulgaria	Guinea	Russian Federation
Cameroon	Ireland	Singapore
China	Mauritius	Syrian Arab Republic
Colombia	Mexico	United Kingdom
France	Norway	United States

Representatives to the Security Council should note that the agenda provided is only provisional. The Security Council may discuss any international peace and security issue brought before it. For this reason, Representatives must have a broad base of knowledge on current events in the international community. Also, the overviews provided below are only current through the publication of this handbook. **Many of the topics listed below will change significantly before the Conference, and Representatives should be familiar with the up-to-date situations.** Periodicals are one of the best recommended sources available for day-to-day updates. These include among others: *New York Times*, *UN Chronicle*, *Christian Science Monitor*, *Foreign Policy*, *The Economist* and *Keesing's Record of World Events*. Also, the UN Foundation's on-line daily newsletter, the *UN Wire*, is an excellent resource for timely information. Whenever possible, AMUN recommends that Representatives familiarize themselves with the most recent report(s) published by the Secretary-General on each situation, along with other UN documents. These can be found on the UN homepage under the Security Council documents section (www.un.org/documents/scinfo.htm). Please note that the bibliographies for these topics focus primarily on UN sources, with some news sources provided for background on important aspects of the various situations.

Initial background research is provided below for each region, with one or two topics receiving a brief analysis. Security Council representatives are neither limited to the main topics discussed nor to any of the topics listed. Should world events move in a different direction from the topics provided in this handbook, the Security Council is welcome to discuss any peace and security matter which it desires.

Please note that resolutions should be written on the sub-topics of each regional area: i.e., resolutions would not be written about "Issues in Africa," but rather about "The Situation in Sierra Leone" or similar sub-topics within the region.

BACKGROUND RESEARCH

ISSUES IN AFRICA

The Situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo:

There have been a number of significant events recently in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) toward fulfilling the terms of the Lusaka Peace Process. An inter-Congolese dialogue was facilitated by the President of South Africa and held in Sun City, South Africa from February to April 2002. This session led to the adoption of more than 30 consensus resolutions, agreed upon by a broad range of delegations representing the various Congolese interests, on a variety of political, legal and economic issues. While an all-inclusive concluding document was not reached, many parties are hopeful that the dialogue will continue. At present, the government and the Mouvement de liberation du Congo (MLC) have agreed to a 30 month transitional period leading up to elections. The only major party not currently participating in the process is the Rassemblement congolais pour la democratie (RCD)-Goma.

There is still some ongoing, low-level conflict in the country, however, and a final resolution of this conflict is far from realized. Calls by various parties for ethnic- and nationality-based attacks unfortunately continue. In July 1999, the Lusaka

Ceasefire Agreement was signed by five regional States. In response to this, the Security Council set up the United Nations Observer Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC) in November 1999, incorporating UN personnel authorized in earlier resolutions. In February 2000, MONUC's size and mandate were further expanded to over 5000 military personnel. MONUC's mandate was extended in June 2002 to run through June 2003. Missions made up of Security Council members visited the DRC over the past two years, and reported that the Lusaka agreement was broadly supported by all parties in the DRC. The people desired peace, democratic institutions, the withdrawal of outside forces, and also wanted the rebel movements to lay down their arms.

Problems remain, however, in both the work of MONUC and in the presence of rebel and external forces. MONUC's work has been largely unfulfilled in much of the country, as the UN forces have met significant resistance from rebel groups and have been unable to deploy in many areas. Also, MONUC has yet to receive enough support from UN members to reach its full authorized strength of 5,537 troops, including observers. While Kisangani is technically demilitarized, some violence continues. Also, continued rebel activity in many rural areas, along with the continuing presence of some external troops (albeit in reduced numbers) from neigh-



boring Uganda and Rwanda, has kept the situation contentious.

Reports of human rights violations are also still a grave concern in the eastern part of the DRC, including the systematic rape of women and girls, mass killings, and the destruction of property.

The Security Council has recently called for renewed dialogue between the government, MLC and RCD-Goma, in the hopes of furthering the dialogue held in Sun City.

Questions to consider from your government's perspective on this issue include:

- How can the international community incent the various state parties now active in the DRC to cease operations and return to internationally recognized borders? Why are foreign troops still in the area?
- How can Member States be convinced to supply troops to provide for full implementation of MONUC?
- How can the international community assist in the implementation of the Lusaka Accords and in the ongoing inter-Congolese dialogue?

Bibliography:

"African Leaders Reach Agreement to Withdraw Troops." *UN Wire*, 9 Nov 2000.

"Annan Appeals for More Int'l Support to Congo," *UN Wire*, 31 May 2001.

"Annan Condemns Rebel Assault Against UN Mission," *UN Wire*, 18 Jun 2002.

"Annan Hopes Kabila Death Will Not Derail Peace Process." *UN Wire*, 19 Jan 2001.

"Annan, In D.R.C., Urges Rebels To Leave Kisangani," *UN Wire*, 3 Sep 2001.

Cauvin, Henri E. "Rwanda and Congo Sign Accord to End War." *The New York Times*, 31 Jul 2002.

"D.R.C., Rwanda Reach Peace Deal; MONUC, Annan Involved." *UN Wire*, 22 Jul 2002.

"Economist Examines 'Impossible' UN Missions." *UN Wire*, 7 Aug 2000.

"Government, Rwanda To Sign Peace Agreement Tuesday," *UN Wire*, 28 Jul 2002.

"Government Takes Rwanda To World Court Over Violence." *UN Wire*, 29 May 2002.

"Kinshasa, MLC Agree On Government; RCD Rejects Deal," *UN Wire*, 17 April 2002.

Lacey, Mark, "Congo Peace Accord Evokes Cautious Hopes," *The New York Times*, 6 Aug 2002.

Lacey, Mark, "Congo Tires of War, But the End is Not in Sight," *The New York Times*, 15 Jul 2002.

"Last Rebel Group Retreating, UN Mission Says." *UN Wire*, 7 Jun 2001.

Marquis, Christopher. "Congo Calls Global Response to Its Suffering 'Quite Slow'." *The New York Times*, 24 Jan 2002.

Onishi, Norimitsu. "Congo Peace Negotiations End Without Accord After 7 Weeks." *The New York Times*, 20 April 2002.

Onishi, Norimitsu. "Kinshasa Journal; Suspects by the Score

and, Oh, Such Disgressions!" *The New York Times*, 24 April 2002.

Rutsch, Horst, "Peacewatch: Democratic Republic of the Congo," *UN Chronicle*, Vol. XXXIX, No. 1, Mar-May 2002, p. 71.

Rutsch, Horst, "Peacewatch: Democratic Republic of the Congo," *UN Chronicle*, Vol. XXXIX, No. 2, Jun-Aug 2002, p. 72.

"Security Council Condemns Continued Resource Plundering." *UN Wire*, 20 Dec 2001.

"Security Council Heads to Africa to Push Peace Process." *UN Wire*, 15 May 2001.

"UN Council Calls For Demilitarization Of Kisangani," *UN Wire*, 1 May 2002.

"UN Offers To Assist In Implementing New Peace Deal," *UN Wire*, 30 Jul 2002.

"UN Panel Accuses Gov't, Rebels, Neighbors Of Exploitation." *UN Wire*, 19 Nov 2001.

"UN Says Some Rebels Can Stay to Run Kisangani; more." *UN Wire*, 14 Jun 2001.

"UN Sees Epidemic in Democratic Republic of the Congo." *UN Wire*, 5 Mar 2002.

"World Bank Head, Ministers Discuss Post-Conflict Recovery." *UN Wire*, 16 Jul 2002.

Wren, Christopher S. "UN Demands That Congo Rebels Withdraw From Seized City." *The New York Times*, 20 Mar 2002.

UN Documents:

S/2002/621, 5 Jun 2002 - Eleventh Report of the SG on the Democratic Republic of the Congo

S/2001/572, 8 Jun 2001 - SG Report on the Democratic Republic of the Congo

S/2001/521/Add.1, 30 May 2001, Report of the Security Council Mission to the Great Lakes region, 15-26 May 2001 / Addendum

S/2001/521, 29 May 2001, Report of the Security Council Mission to the Great Lakes region, 15- 26 May 2001

S/2001/373, 17 April 2001 - SG Report on the Democratic Republic of the Congo

S/2001/128, 12 Feb 2001 - SG Report on Democratic Republic of the Congo

S/2000/416, 11 May 2000, Security Council mission to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, 4-8 May 2000

S/Res/1417 (2002)

S/Res/1399 (2002)

S/Res/1376 (2001)

S/Res/1355 (2001)

S/Res/1341 (2001)

Additional Web Resources:

The "IRIN Weekly Roundup of Main Events in the Great Lakes Region" is an excellent source for that area. Provide by ReliefWeb, this can be found at www.reliefweb.int
www.un.org/Depts/dpko/monuc/monuc_body.htm



The Situation in Sierra Leone:

The current situation in Sierra Leone involves the UN's attempting to maintain a fragile, and sometimes nonexistent, peace in a country torn by war since 1991. In that year, the Revolutionary United Front (RUF) launched a war near the border with Liberia to overthrow the government. Support by the Liberian government in various forms for RUF efforts further complicates the situation. Current problems involve maintaining a fragile series of cease fires, allowing UN peace keepers to work unmolested in the country, and limiting the illicit trade of diamonds by the RUF (often through Liberia) which has financed the war efforts.

In 1991 Sierra Leone's army, with the support of the ECOMOG (the Military Observer Group to the Economic Community of West African States, or ECOWAS), originally defended the government against the RUF, but in 1992 the army overthrew the civilian government and took power. While RUF attacks continued, the UN, ECOWAS and the Organization of African Unity (OAU) negotiated a settlement which resulted in elections in February 1996. The army relinquished power at that time to elected President Alhaji Dr. Ahmed Tejan Kabbah. Strife continued, however, largely because the RUF did not participate in the elections. This was soon followed by another military coup d'etat in May 1997, this time led by joint army and RUF forces. Security Council actions in Sierra Leone began in October 1997, with the imposition of an oil and arms embargo and the authorization for ECOMOG to use troops in the area. Following several peace efforts by ECOWAS and others, in February 1998 ECOMOG launched a military offensive which overthrew the junta, expelled it from Freetown, and on 10 March returned President Kabbah to office. At this time the Security Council established the UN Observer Mission in Sierra Leone (UNOMSIL), beginning in June 1998. UNOMSIL, under the protection of ECOMOG forces, was tasked to disarm combatants and document ongoing atrocities and abuses against civilians. The key to recent events began in July 1999, with the signing of the Lome Agreement between the government and rebel forces. This agreement formally ended the hostilities and formed a government of national unity. This included eight cabinet positions controlled by the rebel leader, Foday Sankoh. Another key to the agreement, which was both very controversial and necessary for the peace to succeed, was the provision of complete amnesty to Sankoh for war crimes committed as part of the previous hostilities. Problematically, while RUF leadership at that time was supportive of the peace agreement, many RUF fighters remained uninformed in the field and continued accusations of RUF atrocities against the people of the country were common.

Further developments came on 22 October 1999, when the Security Council terminated UNOMSIL and established UNAMSIL. UNAMSIL's mandate is to cooperate with the government and the other parties in implementing the Lome Peace Agreement and assist in the implementation of the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration plan. On 7 February 2000, the Security Council revised this mandate and expanded its size to a maximum of 11,000 military personnel.

This force size was nearly doubled in April 2001 to 17,500 members, with its mandate extended through 30 September.

Despite the set backs and the continued rebel atrocities across the country that occurred throughout 2000 and the early months of 2001, the situation in Sierra Leone began to slowly improve with the resumption of the disarmament process on 18 May 2001. The Ministers of Foreign Affairs from Liberia, Sierra Leone and Guinea opened a dialogue between their separate governments in August 2001. The Ministers discussed the Mano River Union and the possibility of their respective Heads of State meeting sometime in the near future to discuss the security situation within the sub region. Subsequent meetings between the Foreign, Security and Defense Ministers were held in September and October, including a joint meeting with Secretary-General Kofi Annan in New York in November to discuss the progress made thus far. The Summit meeting took place on 27 February 2002 in Rabat. In the meantime, the overall security situation continued to improve as disarmament progressed in the later half of the year.

Prior to April 2001, one of the largest problems facing the UN was the implementation of the peace keeping force. With the public departure of a number of troop contributing countries (India and Jordan in 2000), the United Kingdom stepped up its operations in Sierra Leone to help stem the gap. In April 2001, Pakistan offered an additional 4,500 troops and by September total troop strength reached 16,600. With the subsequent deployment of the Nepalese battalion by the beginning of November, UNAMSIL reached its full troop mandate of 17,500. This achievement further improved the security situation throughout the country. On 17 January 2002, the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration program formally completed the disarmament process. Between May 2001 and January 2002, 47,076 combatants were disarmed, almost 16,000 assorted weapons were destroyed and two million rounds of ammunition were collected. In addition, the Sierra Leone police in conjunction with UNAMSIL initiated a special programme for the voluntary collection of shotguns and illegal arms.

Under this fragile but stable security atmosphere, the Government turned its attention to the schedule elections that took place on 14 May 2002. The state of emergency was lifted in March and the Sierra Leonean courts formally charged former RUF and AFRC/ex-SLA leaders and rebels. Following its commitments agreed to in the Abuja Agreement, the government took significant steps to aid the conversion of the RUF into a formal political party that fully took part in the national and provincial elections that occurred in May and June 2002. A total of nine political parties fielded presidential candidates while 11 parties took part in the Parliamentary elections. International monitors certified the elections as free, transparent and generally violence-free. President Kabbah was elected with over 70 percent of the vote. In addition, with cooperation from the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (UNHCHR), the government also began the establishment of a Truth and Reconciliation Commission as well as the establishment of a Special Court for Sierra Leone.

Although there has been considerable progress made in the



implementation of the Abuja Agreement following the free and fair elections in May, the ongoing civil conflict in Liberia remains a threat to the success achieved in the last 12 months. Escalating conflicts along the border have forced large numbers of Sierra Leonean refugees to return, followed by significant numbers of Liberian refugees seeking protection. Liberian military incursions have also threatened a renewal of the violence that has plagued the Mano River sub region since 1991. Continued support and vigilance by the international community will be required to ensure that the peace process in Sierra Leone is not destabilized by the Liberian conflict. On 28 March 2002, the Security Council recognized this growing concern and restructured the mandate of UNAMSIL to focus on sustaining a secure environment for the post-election period as outlined in the Secretary-General's report on 14 March 2002 (S/2002/267).

The Secretary-General also outlined a number of concerns that are paramount to sustaining peace in Sierra Leone. He underscored the need for more training and development of the Sierra Leone police and army to ensure that they can effectively assume responsibility for the nation's security once UNAMSIL begins to depart. With the Liberian conflict an ever-present threat, a concerted plan of action will be required before the UN can begin to withdraw the peacekeepers. Reintegration efforts have also been proceeding at a slow pace, primarily due to a lack of funds and the absence of service providers in key districts in the north and east of the country. Finally, significant support will be required to help the newly elected government develop the institutional capacity to subsume a large part of the traditional state governance roles formally carried out by the UN peacekeepers and observers on the ground. A long-term development plan that recognizes this need will be required if the new government is to remain afloat after the UN begins to withdraw the peacekeepers. Therefore, according to the Secretary-General, the UN must remain actively involved in Sierra Leone to address a number of priority needs that are critical for the stabilization and peaceful recovery of the country.

Questions to consider from your government's perspective on this issue include:

- How does the current situation in Sierra Leone reflect on your government's willingness to support, approve, fund or participate in future UN peace keeping efforts?
- Should UN peace keepers be more actively involved in rescue operations like the one staged in Sierra Leone? How should mandates with respect to the use of force be changed to keep up with similar situations?
- How can the UN best continue to assist in rebuilding efforts in Sierra Leone?

Bibliography:

"Brussels Conference Aims to Stem Illegal Gems." *UN Wire*, 26 April 2001.
 Crossette, Barbara. "Behave or Face a Diamond Ban, Security

Council Tells Liberians." *The New York Times*, 8 Mar 2001.
 "Liberian Accuses Britain of Stirring Regional War." *The New York Times*, 30 May 2001.
 "Liberian Fighters Crossing Border, Says UN" *UN Wire*, 10 Jun 2002.
 Onishi, Norimitsu. "War in Sierra Leone Loosens Its Grip on Child Soldiers." *The New York Times*, 26 May 2001.
 "Pakistan to Contribute 4,500 Troops; more." *UN Wire*, 6 April 2001.
 "President of Sierra Leone Wins Re-election by a Wide Margin." *The New York Times*, 20 May 2002.
 "RUF Returns More Weapons to UN Mission." *UN Wire*, 1 Jun 2001.
 "Security Council Praises Diamond Certification Plan." *UN Wire*, 18 Sep 2000.
 "Sierra Leone Fighters Turning in Weapons." *The New York Times*, 7 Jan 2002.
 "Thousands Flee Rebel Attacks in Liberia Zone." *The New York Times*, 30 Jan 2002.
 "UN Calls For Security, Police Reforms To Ensure Stability." *UN Wire*, 11 Jul 2002.
 "UNAMSIL Urges Liberia To Stop Cross-Border Incursions." *UN Wire*, 29 May 2002.
 "World Briefing | Africa: 3 Presidents in Search of Peace." *The New York Times*, 28 Feb 2002.
 "World Briefing | Africa: Sierra Leone: War Is Over, Both Sides Say." *The New York Times*, 19 Jan 2002.
 Onishi, Norimitsu. "Children of War in Sierra Leone Try to Start Over." *The New York Times*, 9 May 2002.
 Onishi, Norimitsu. "For Sierra Leone Ballot, Hope Trumps Despair." *The New York Times*, 13 May 2002.
 Wren, Christopher S. "Sierra Leone War Crimes Court to Begin Deliberations in Fall." *The New York Times*, 21 Mar 2002.

UN Documents:

S/2002/679, 19 Jun 2002 - Fourteenth SG Report on Sierra Leone
 S/2002/267, 14 Mar 2002 - Thirteenth SG Report on Sierra Leone
 S/2001/1195, 13 Dec 2001 - SG Report on Sierra Leone
 S/2001/857, 7 Sep 2001 - SG Report on Sierra Leone
 S/2001/627, 25 Jun 2001 - SG Report on Sierra Leone
 S/2001/513, 23 May 2001 - SG Report on Sierra Leone
 S/2001/228, 14 Mar 2001 -SG Report on Sierra Leone
 S/Res/1400 (2002) on the situation in Sierra Leone
 S/Res/1389 (2002) on the situation in Sierra Leone
 S/Res/1385 (2001) on the situation in Sierra Leone
 S/Res/1370 (2001) on the situation in Sierra Leone
 S/Res/1346 (2001) on the situation in Sierra Leone
 S/Res/1343 (2001) on the situation in Liberia

Additional Web Resource:

www.un.org/Depts/dpko/unamsil/body_unamsil.htm



The Situation in Afghanistan:

Afghanistan has seen major changes in its political structure over the past year, with the Taliban regime removed from power by a US-led international coalition. The United Nations, guided by Security Council action, has been and continues to be a leader in the rebuilding of Afghanistan.

UN efforts have focused primarily on three areas: rebuilding government capacity, security issues and humanitarian endeavors. International efforts to rebuild a functioning government in Afghanistan began in November 2001 with the Bonn Conference, where political and mediation efforts were carried out by the UN Special Mission for Afghanistan (UNSM). This conference established an interim administration, led by Chairman Hamid Karzai, and called for the convening of an Emergency Loya Jirga (meeting of traditional Afghan leaders) to establish a new government. The Loya Jirga met from 11-19 June 2002, leading to the election of Mr. Karzai as President of Afghanistan. While the current government has made significant early strides in areas such as drug control, education, and women's rights, a significant amount of work must still be done. In addition to continuing security concerns from Taliban and Al-Qa'idah elements who remain in hiding, internal power struggles among the various Afghan factions have made governing outside of the capital a difficult (and sometimes impossible) task. In early 2002, the government's Minister for Civil Aviation and Tourism was killed by a rival group, and on 6 July Vice President Haji Abdul Qadir was assassinated in Kabul. This assassination recently led to US troops taking over as security personnel for President Karzai. Disputed governorships have destabilized several provinces, and sporadic fighting among factions has occurred in seven provinces. The current administration has often been unable to quell military disturbances against regional governors it legitimately named.

In the interests of assisting in internal security issues, the Security Council authorized an International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) for Afghanistan, led originally by the United Kingdom with the support of numerous other countries. In April, Turkey assumed the leadership of the ISAF. The United States has also begun a training program for Afghan national security forces. While the ISAF has done a reasonably good job of keeping the peace inside of Kabul, it does not have the resources to provide broader security support across the country. The Interim Afghan administration estimated that an 80,000 person internal force, costing roughly \$300 million (US) per year, would be required to maintain peace and security in the country. At this time, neither the force nor the funding exist for this to become a reality.

The UN has also been very active in humanitarian and development issues, led by the UN Assistance Mission in Afghanistan (UNAMA). UNAMA faces a daunting task, with human rights abuses, refugees and displaced people, demining, food aid, health concerns, natural disasters and women's rights issues all immediate areas of concern. In addition, UNAMA and associated efforts are all taking place in a very

difficult security environment, both from internal disputes and continuing hostilities between the Taliban/Al-Qa'idah and international forces. All of these factors combine to make humanitarian aid and rebuilding a very difficult process.

One overarching concern for all of these UN activities is funding. While there were many promises of funding immediately following the removal of the Taliban, international monetary support has waned since that time. All of the above mentioned efforts will require significant ongoing funding over the course of many years, and without those funds Afghanistan is unlikely to move forward from its current situation.

Questions to consider from your government's perspective on this issue include:

- How can the United Nations better contribute to the ongoing humanitarian crisis and rebuilding efforts in Afghanistan?
- Is there any way for the UN to better encourage a peaceful settlement among the internal factions vying for power?
- How can funding be arranged and guaranteed for ongoing humanitarian and development efforts?
- What will happen in Afghanistan if the internal security situation does not improve, and if funding is not received?

Bibliography:

- "\$1.24 Billion Needed For Education, ADB Says," *UN Wire*, 30 Jul 2002.
- "Country Claims Progress In Anti-Drug Crop Efforts," *UN Wire*, 15 May 2002.
- Dao, James, "Afghan Officials Say Aid Has Been Too Slow," *The New York Times*, 25 Jul 2002.
- Gall, Carlotta, "In Rare Move, UN Reviews a US Attack On Afghans," *The New York Times*, 30 Jul 2002.
- Gall, Carlotta and James Dao, "A Buoyant Karzai is Sworn in as Afghanistan's Leader," *The New York Times*, 20 Jun 2002.
- "Human Rights Watch Warns About Factional Fighting," *UN Wire*, 6 May 2002.
- "ISAF Joins Qadir Assassination Probe," *UN Wire*, 8 Jul 2002.
- "Karzai Elected President, Said To Plan Truth Commission," *UN Wire*, 13 Jun 2002.
- "Otunnu Begins Visit, Speaks On Children's Issues," *UN Wire*, 21 Jul 2002.
- "Refugee Returns Continue; Quake Hits In North," *UN Wire*, 11 April 2002.
- Rohde, David, "Training an Afghan Army that can Shoot Straight," *The New York Times*, 6 Jun 2002.
- "Security Council Set To Approve New Civilian Mission," *UN Wire*, 26 Mar 2002.
- "Turkey Announces Assumption Of Command," *UN Wire*, 28 April 2002.
- "UN Says It Needs \$777 Million More For Reconstruction," *UN Wire*, 11 Jul 2002.
- "UN Envoy Says Western Bureaucracy Slows Aid," *UN Wire*, 4 Aug 2002.
- "UNHCR Responds To Critics Of Refugee Return Policy," *UN Wire*, 28 Jul 2002.



UN Documents:

- A/56/1000-S/2002/737, 11 Jul 2002, SG's Report on the Situation in Afghanistan
A/56/875-S/2002/278, 18 Mar 2002, SG's Report on the Situation in Afghanistan
S/2001/1217, 19 Dec 2001, Organization of the Interim Security Assistance Force
S/2001/1215, 18 Dec 2001, SG's Report on Humanitarian Issues in Afghanistan
S/2001/1157, 6 Dec 2001, SG's Report on the Situation in Afghanistan
S/2001/1154, 5 Dec 2001, The Bonn Agreement
S/2001/1086, 19 Nov 2001, SG's Report on Humanitarian Issues in Afghanistan
S/Res/1419 (2002)
S/Res/1413 (2002)
S/Res/1401 (2002)
S/Res/1390 (2002)
S/Res/1388 (2002)
S/Res/1386 (2001)
S/Res/1383 (2001)
S/Res/1378 (2001)
S/Res/1373 (2001)
S/Res/1368 (2001)

Additional Web Resources:

- Relief Web: www.reliefweb.int -- up-to-date information about relief efforts in Afghanistan
Assistance Afghanistan Site: www.pcpafg.org -- sponsored by the UNDP, Office of the UN Coordinator for Afghanistan and the FAO.

ISSUES IN EUROPE

The Situation in Cyprus:

UN peacekeeping troops have been present in Cyprus for almost all of the country's history as an independent nation. Today, 738,000 people live in Cyprus, of which 76% are Greek, 19% Turkish, and less than 5% Maronite, Armenian, Roman Catholic Latins and others. Communal violence between the Greek and Turkish communities began even while the United Kingdom still occupied the island before 1960. At the time, many Greek Cypriots supported union (enosis) of the entire island with Greece, while many Turkish Cypriots supported a partition of the island (taksim) to permit a union of Turkish Cypriots with Turkey.

Upon achieving independence in 1960, the country's constitution specified elaborate power sharing arrangements intended to mollify the Turkish minority. These arrangements provided for a Greek Cypriot President and Turkish Cypriot Vice-President, each elected by their own community. The Treaty of Alliance between the Republic of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey provided for defense of the island; Greece and Turkey were designated as the guarantors of the country's independence, and 950 Greek and 650 Turkish soldiers were assigned to defend the island.

When the Greek Cypriot President proposed a revision of

the constitution in 1963, violence erupted, and Turkish Cypriots withdrew from national institutions and created their own administrative structure. In response, the Security Council created the United Nations Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) through Security Council resolution 186 (1964) of 4 March 1964. UNFICYP was directed to prevent a recurrence of violence between the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities and to contribute to the restoration of law and order and stability. UNFICYP became operational on 27 March 1964.

Further violence followed in 1967. In both 1964 and 1967, mediation and pressure from European powers, including Greece and Turkey's NATO colleagues, prevented explicit Turkish military intervention. In 1974, the military junta in control of Greece at the time sponsored a coup to install a hardline Cypriot government in favor of enosis with Greece. In response, Turkey sent its armed forces to seize 36% of the island, citing its obligations under the Treaty of Alliance of 1960.

The Security Council reacted to the hostilities of 1974 by adopting a number of resolutions which expanded the mandate of UNFICYP. The UN forces were now charged with supervising a de facto ceasefire, which came into effect on 16 August 1974, and maintaining a buffer zone between the lines of the Cyprus National Guard and of the Turkish and Turkish Cypriot forces.

In 1983, the Turkish Cypriot leader declared the independent "Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus" (TRNC). The TRNC has been recognized only by Turkey. In the absence of a political settlement to the Cyprus problem, UNFICYP continues its presence on the island.

Starting in 1977, there have been numerous efforts designed to bring the two sides together. Despite these talks, the sides have remained apart. Greek Cypriots envision a "bizonal, bicomunal federation" of the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities. Turkish Cypriots insist on a looser "confederation" concept, intending for the two communities to remain sovereign nations, linked by some institutions, but essentially separate.

Starting in the late 1990s, the talks took on a new urgency as the European Union began planning to invite Cyprus to join the EU, whether or not a settlement is reached between Greek and Turkish Cypriots. This move has increased the stakes for the Turkish Cypriot leadership and Turkey proper. Should Cyprus join the EU prior to a settlement, it would isolate the Turkish Cypriot community to an even greater degree. Turkish Cypriot leaders would likely face unrest from a population that is already frustrated with the slow pace of economic development in the Turkish-held region of Cyprus. The Government of Turkey would also face obstacles to its goal of membership in the EU if European leaders saw Turkey as an obstacle to a settlement in Cyprus. Yet the two sides remain apart on how to achieve a solution.

The European Union is expected to invite Cyprus formally to join the EU in late 2002. With that deadline looming, face-to-face talks under UN auspices were renewed in earnest in early 2002. But as of July 2002, six months of intermittent talks appeared to have yielded little progress toward a settle-



ment.

The Secretary-General visited Cyprus in May 2002, and met separately and jointly with the President of Cyprus and the Turkish Cypriot leader. The Secretary-General asked them to focus on the core issues of governments (meaning structures and powers), security, territory and property. He said that, "between now and the end of June they can resolve all the core issues provided they go about their task decisively and with the necessary political will," adding, "I don't say that by the end of June, they will have a signed and sealed agreement." Annan looked to Greece and Turkey for sustained and constructive support. Turkish Cypriot Leader Rauf Denktash contended that "it is impossible to finish everything by June." On 17 May, the two leaders resumed talks and Denktash reported that they were trying to accelerate the process, but maintained that there was still time until December.

Questions to consider from your government's perspective on this issue include:

- What role do human factors (human rights, refugees, property) play in finding a solution to the Cyprus conflict?
- What role would the UN play in guaranteeing an eventual Cyprus settlement?
- What might be some of the consequences if the EU proceeds with Cyprus accession in the absence of a settlement?
- What role can Security Council Member States play to encourage the settlement process?

Bibliography:

- "Annan Calls On Rival Leaders For Decisive Progress In Peace Talks," *UN Wire*, 14 May 2002.
- Frantz, Douglas, "Cypriot Leaders Agree to First Talks in 4 Years on Reunification," *The New York Times*, 17 Jan 2002.
- Frantz, Douglas, "Cyprus Still Split by a Zone Where Time Stands Still," *The New York Times*, 22 Jan 2002.
- "Leaders Of Divided Island Agree To Meet Regularly," *UN Wire*, 15 Jan 2002.
- "Peacewatch: Cyprus," *UN Chronicle*, Vol. XXXIX, No. 1, Mar-May 2002, p. 73.
- "Rival Leaders Accept Annan Invitation To Sep Talks," *UN Wire*, 31 Jul 2002.
- "Turkey Threatens To Annex Northern Cyprus; UN Envoy Responds," *UN Wire*, 4 Nov 2001.

UN Documents:

- S/2002/590 (30 May 2002): Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus
- S/Res/1250 (1999) on the situation in Cyprus
- S/Res/939 (1994) on settlement of the Cyprus question including implementation of confidence-building measures between the 2 communities
- S/Res/361 (1974)
- S/Res/360 (1974)
- S/Res/359 (1974)
- S/Res/358 (1974)
- S/Res/357 (1974)
- S/Res/355 (1974)

- S/Res/354 (1974)
- S/Res/353 (1974)
- S/Res/349 (1974)
- S/Res/193 (1964)
- S/Res/186 (1964)

ISSUES IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The Situation in Iraq:

Iraq has once again become a primary focus of the Security Council in 2002. Sanctions, weapons inspections and the possibility of a renewed military campaign against Iraq are the central points of discussion. In the area of sanctions, the Council passed a revised sanctions regime on 14 May 2002. The "smart sanctions" described in Resolution 1409 revise the Goods Review List and allow greater flexibility in the goods which Iraq may purchase. The compromise which formed this resolution followed months of debate on the subject, with a number of states calling for the complete lifting of the sanctions. Over the past decade, much of the international community has come to the conclusion that the sanctions are causing significant distress to the general Iraqi populace.

More significantly, the United States has recently begun a campaign which many believe will lead to the eventual renewing of a full-scale military campaign against Iraq, at least by the US and possibly including other states. While the Security Council as a whole is unlikely to approve renewed hostilities, the US often cites the original resolutions against Iraq as justification for Member States to take "all means necessary" to limit Iraqi aggression. In the current case, the US administration has accused Iraq both of supporting terrorism, and of continuing to pursue programs to develop weapons of mass destruction. The US argues that these issues justify military action against Iraq, with the intent of removing Saddam Hussein's regime from power. While there has been significant resistance in the international community to the US perspective, including from close US allies and most Middle Eastern states, discussions and planning for eventual action are continuing at this date.

An offshoot of this situation involves continuing discussions over the return of weapons inspectors to Iraq. Since the inspectors were removed at the request of the Iraqi government, negotiations have continued to allow them renewed access. While the Iraqis have generally not accepted any possibility of inspectors returning, a flurry of proposals and negotiations was attempted in early August 2002. This started with an Iraqi proposal to allow the inspectors to return, apparently as a rebuttal to US arguments about Iraq's continuing weapons program. Both the US and UN sources rejected this request as an apparent political ploy, and several days later Iraq both withdrew the offer and declared that the inspectors' job is finished, and that the UN should no longer consider inspections an option.

Meanwhile, the humanitarian situation in Iraq continues to deteriorate. Infant mortality rates are among the highest in the world, and almost half of the population has very little access to clean water or many other necessities. The Red Cross has



also noted that the Iraqi health care system is very run-down, and UNDP has reported that major rehabilitation will be needed in the Iraqi power supply system before power can be fully restored.

The situation in Iraq is one of the most volatile in the world at this point, and Representatives should pay careful attention to current reports on the situation in this area. Changes occur daily, and it is possible that open hostilities could resume some time in the near future.

Questions to consider from your government's perspective on this issue include:

- What role should the Security Council have in any renewed actions against Iraq? Does your country support a specific side on this issue?
- Should sanctions be lifted as Iraq continues to comply with the current demands of the Security Council?
- Is it still possible, or desirable, to restore the inspections mission in Iraq? If not, what additional steps should be taken?

Bibliography:

"Annan Says No Plan For More Talks; Inspector Issue at Stalemate," *UN Wire*, 24 Jul 2002.

Associated Press, "Iraqi: Weapons Inspectors Not Needed," *The New York Times*, 12 Aug 2002.

"Baghdad Invites UN Inspectors, Reversing Past Refusal," *UN Wire*, 1 Aug 2002.

Crossette, Barbara, "Annan Reaffirms UN Role in Iraq Weapons Inspections," *The New York Times*, 7 Aug 2002.

Crossette, Barbara, "Iraqis, Reversing Course, Ask to Meet with UN Arms Inspectors," *The New York Times*, 3 Aug 2002.

Crossette, Barbara. "UN Sanctions Didn't Stop Iraq From Buying Weapons." *The New York Times*, 18 Jun 2001.

"Former UN Aides Say Sanctions Amount to Genocide." *UN Wire*, 18 Jun 2001.

Frantz, Douglas. "At Iraq's Backdoor, Turkey Flouts Sanctions." *The New York Times*, 30 Mar 2001.

"Hussein Says OK To Inspections; US Focuses On Regime Change," *UN Wire*, 11 Aug 2002.

Rutsch, Horst, "Peacewatch: Iraq," *UN Chronicle*, Vol. XXXIX, No. 1, Mar-May 2002, p. 72.

"Security Council Calls For Continuing UN Talks With Baghdad," *UN Wire*, 8 Jul 2002.

"Security Council Approves "Smart Sanctions," To Take Effect May 30," *UN Wire*, 13 May 2002.

Sengupta Somini, "Security Council Tries to Ease Tensions Between US and Iraq," *The New York Times*, 23 May 2002.

Sengupta Somini, "UN Broadens List of Products Iraq Can Import," *The New York Times*, 15 May 2002.

UN Documents:

S/2002/664, 13 Jun 2002, SG Report on Iraq/Kuwait

S/2002/419, 15 April 2002, SG Report on Iraq/Kuwait

S/2002/323, 28 Mar 2002, SG Report on the Iraq/Kuwait Observer Mission

S/2001/582, 12 Jun 2001, SG Report on Iraq/Kuwait

S/2001/505, 18 May 2001, SG Report on Iraq

S/2001/287, 28 Mar 2001, SG Report on Iraq-Kuwait

S/2001/186, 2 Mar 2001, SG Report pursuant to paragraph 5 of resolution 1330 (2000) - Iraq

S/Res/1409 (2002) -- includes revised sanctions procedures

S/Res/1360 (2001)

S/Res/1352 (2001)

S/Res/1330 (2000)

S/Res/1302 (2000)

S/Res/1293 (2000)

S/Res/986(14 April 1995)

S/Res/687 (3 April 1991)

S/Res/661 (6 Aug 1990)

Additional Web Resources:

The Global Policy Project: www.globalpolicy.org -- excellent information on the Iraqi situation, as well as many other Security Council activities.

UNMOVIC: www.un.org/Depts/unmovic/index.htm

The Situation in the Middle East:

The situation between Israel and Palestine has significantly worsened throughout 2002, with the parties now further away from the peace table than at any time in recent history. Terrorist bombings of Israeli civilians are now a weekly occurrence, with several extreme bursts of violence including almost daily bombings. On the other side, Israel has engaged in a number of retaliatory and preemptive strikes against Palestinian targets, including the Palestinian Authority and the headquarters of Yassir Arafat on several occasions. Large scale Israeli efforts began early in this year with "Operation Defensive Shield," which led to numerous allegations of human rights abuses in the city of Jenin and other areas. Israeli military activities have continued throughout the year in response to Palestinian bombings, including a near complete military occupation of the major Palestinian towns in the West Bank. Each side continues to blame the other for the escalating hostilities, with neither group willing to back down.

While the Security Council has discussed various actions and condemned the ongoing violence on both sides, it is unable to take any lasting action on the situation due to continuing Israeli objections, along with the United States' unwillingness to allow active Council action on the issue. One very significant Council action occurred in March, when for the first time the Council called for the creation of a Palestinian state as an integral part of the long term peace process. Like Iraq, this situation is extremely active as this handbook goes to press, and Representatives should be familiar with recent news reports on the issue.

Questions to consider from your government's perspective on this issue include:

- What role can the international community play in supporting a peaceful resolutions to the problems in the Middle East? Is there a way to bring the parties back to the negotiating table given the current violent situation?



Bibliography:

"Allies Discuss Terrorism and the Middle East: Bush and Blair on Policy." *The New York Times*, 7 April 2002.

"Arafat Lobbies Security Council for Peacekeepers." *UN Wire*, 13 Nov 2000.

Barak, Ehud. "Israel Needs a True Partner for Peace." *The New York Times*, 30 Jul 2001.

Bennet, James and Bumiller, Elizabeth. "Israelis Approve Plan to End Siege and Free Arafat." *The New York Times*, 29 April 2002.

Bennet, James. "Israel Attacks Arafat Compound in Swift Response After Palestinian Suicide Bombing Kills 17 in Bus." *The New York Times*, 6 Jun 2002.

Bennet, James. "Israelis Strike Arafat's Bases; Accuse Him Of 'A War Of Terror'." *The New York Times*, 4 Dec 2001.

Bennet, James. "Rash of New Suicide Bombers Exhibit No Patterns or Ties." *The New York Times*, 21 Jun 2002.

Brinkley, Joel and Todd S. Purdum. "Palestinian Goal of Statehood Vs. Israeli Aim of Cease-Fire." *The New York Times*, 31 Mar 2002.

"Bush Calls For New Palestinian Leadership, Statehood; More." *UN Wire*, 24 Jun 2002.

"Bush Mentions 'Palestine' In Speech To General Assembly," *UN Wire*, 11 Nov 2001.

Cowell, Alan. "Exile Agreement Appears To Settle Bethlehem Siege." *The New York Times*, 9 May 2002.

Gordon, Michael R. "US Puts Onus On Palestinians To Stop Terror." *The New York Times*, 30 Mar 2002.

Hoge, Warren and Suzanne Daley. "Mideast Turmoil: London; Europe's Unease With US Alters Britain's Middleman Role." *The New York Times*, 4 April 2002.

"Israel Completes Withdrawal From Reoccupied Areas; More." *UN Wire*, 18 Mar 2002.

"Israel Holds Fence Groundbreaking; More." *UN Wire*, 16 Jun 2002.

"Israel Retaliates; UN Warns Of Warlike Situation." *UN Wire*, 2 Dec 2001.

"Israeli Occupation Illegal, General Assembly Says." *UN Wire*, 4 Dec 2000.

"Mideast Turmoil: Diplomacy; New Strategy Set By US And Saudis For Mideast Crisis." *The New York Times*, 1 May 2002.

"Mideast Turmoil: Fighting; Israel Continues Sweep of Cities, Taking Hebron." *The New York Times*, 5 April 2002.

"Mideast Turmoil; 2 Resolutions 'Expressing Solidarity with Israel'." *The New York Times*, 3 May 2002.

"Military Has No Limits In Responding To Attacks, Sharon Says," *UN Wire*, 28 May 2002.

"Rapporteur Calls for Middle East Peacekeepers." *UN Wire*, 26 Mar 2002.

Rutsch, Horst, "Peacewatch: Middle East," *UN Chronicle*, Vol. XXXIX, No. 1, Mar-May 2002, p. 72.

Rutsch, Horst, "Peacewatch: Middle East," *UN Chronicle*, Vol. XXXIX, No. 2, Jun-Aug 2002, p. 66.

Sciolino, Elaine, "The World: In Mideast Diplomacy, Few Secrets or Solutions," *The New York Times*, 16 Jun 2002.

"Security Council Hears Support For Saudi Peace Plan," *UN Wire*, 26 Feb 2002.

"Security Council Passes Measure Calling For Palestinian State," *UN Wire*, 12 Mar 2002.

Sontag, Deborah. "And Yet So Far: A special report. Quest for Mideast Peace: How and Why It Failed." *The New York Times*, 26 Jul 2001.

"The President's Words of Warning, 'Things Must Change in the Middle East'." *The New York Times*, 25 Jun 2002.

Tyler, Patrick E., "Mideast Turmoil; Peace Process; Bush is Said to Tell Saudis He Will Offer Plan For Creation of Palestinian State," *The New York Times*, 14 Jun 2002.

Tyler, Patrick E. "Mideast Turmoil: Prospects; Popular Arab Anger: A Long-Term Threat to the Foundations of Peace." *The New York Times*, 8 April 2002.

"UN Council Calls For Cease-Fire; Annan Warns Both Sides," *UN Wire*, 4 April 2002.

"UN Report on Jenin Blames Both Sides for Violations." *UN Wire*, 1 Aug 2002.

"UN To Hold Special Session On Middle East; More." *UN Wire*, 3 April 2002.

"US Veto Blocks West Bank Force." *The New York Times*, 28 Mar 2001.

UN Documents:

S/2002/746, 12 Jul 2002 - SG Report on UN Interim Force in Lebanon

S/2001/714, 20 Jul 2001 - SG Report on UN Interim Force in Lebanon

S/2001/499, 18 May 2001 - SG Report on the UN Disengagement Observer Force - Israel/Syria

S/2001/423, 30 April 2001 - SG Report on the UN Interim Force in Lebanon

S/2001/66, 22 Jan 2001 - SG Report on the UN Interim Force in Lebanon

S/Res/1428 (2002) on the situation in the Middle East

S/Res/1415 (2002) on the situation in the Middle East

S/Res/1405 (2002) on the situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question

S/Res/1403 (2002) on the situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question

S/Res/1402 (2002) on the situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question

S/Res/1397 (2002) on the situation in the Middle East

S/Res/1391 (2002) on the situation in the Middle East

S/Res/1381 (2001) on the situation in the Middle East

S/Res/1365 (2001) on the situation in the Middle East

S/Res/1351 (2001) on the situation in the Middle East

S/Res/1337 (2001) on the situation in the Middle East

S/Res/1328 (2000) The situation in the Middle East

S/Res/1322 (2000) on the situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question

S/Res/1310 (2000) on the situation in the Middle East

S/Res/1300 (2000) - Middle East

SG2077 (2002) - Press Release: SG Report on Jenin

SC/6847 (2000) - Press Release: Lebanon Withdrawal

Additional Web Resource:

Secretary-General's report on Jenin: www.un.org/peace/jenin/index.html



OTHER ISSUES

Threats to International Peace and Security Caused by Terrorist Acts:

Prior to the events of 11 September 2001, the Security Council was not actively involved with terrorism as a distinct topic. Previous actions tended to focus on specific terrorist acts, as opposed to the broader topic of terrorism as a threat to international peace and security. With the events of 11 September, however, the Council became actively involved in the topic, and Resolution 1373 established the Counter-Terrorism Committee of the Security Council with British Ambassador Jeremy Greenstock as its first Chairperson. This committee has held frequent meetings on the topic since that time, including issuing its first report in October 2001.

Resolution 1373 and subsequent documents laid out the broad mandate for Security Council action on this topic, primarily focused on utilizing the Council's legal authority to request and compel action from the Member States. Actions to date have dealt with the funding of terrorism, with providing support to any entities or persons involved in terrorist acts, and with taking the necessary steps to prevent the future commission of terrorist acts. In addition, the Council authorized "all necessary measures" by Member States to deal with terrorist threats, leading directly to the US led action in Afghanistan against the Taliban regime and Al-Qa'idah.

The primary responsibility of the Committee is to enforce the Council's various resolutions on the terrorism. This has come in the form of receiving reports on the progress made by states in implementing Council mandates, in coordinating information from various experts in the field, and in beginning to create a list of best practices for dealing with terrorist threats. The Committee has been particularly effective in providing a point of contact for states to effectively share information on terrorism. The Committee is also charged with exploring ways in which states can be assisted in their own counter-terrorism efforts, especially for those states which lack the technology or financial ability to successfully implement their efforts without outside assistance.

In addition to the work of the Committee, a rare Ministerial level meeting of the Council in November 2001 led to the implementation of the "Declaration on the Global Effort to Combat Terrorism." This document, adopted by both the Security Council and the General Assembly, unequivocally condemns all acts of terrorism and stresses the need for all states to sign on to the relevant treaties and legal documents dealing with international terrorism.

Questions to consider from your government's perspective on this issue include:

- Does your government fully support all of the Security Council mandates already in existence? Should additional steps be required of member states to combat terrorism?
- How can states be better incented to comply with the existing Council resolutions on this subject?
- How active should the Council be in allowing military actions by member states to combat terrorism in the future?

Bibliography:

- "Annan Urges Security Council To Implement Its Resolutions," *UN Wire*, 31 Mar 2002.
- "A Comprehensive Action Against Terrorism," *UN Chronicle*, Vol. XXXIX, No. 1, Mar-May 2002, pp. 64-66.
- "Counterterrorism Committee Extended As It Enters Phase Three," *UN Wire*, 15 Apr 2002.
- "Europeans Concerned About US Stance," *UN Wire*, 27 Jun 2002.
- "Lubbers Warns Against Making 'Scapegoats' In Anti-Terror War," *UN Wire*, 7 Feb 2002.
- "Pakistan, Others Support UN Action Against Terror," *UN Wire*, 16 Sep 2001.
- "Security Council Begins Evaluating Counterterror Measures," *UN Wire*, 17 Jan 2002.
- "Security Council OKs Terror Resolution; General Assembly Meets," *UN Wire*, 30 Sep 2001.
- "Symposium Aims To Channel UN Efforts To Fight Scourge," *UN Wire*, 3 Jun 2002.
- "UN, International Conferences Debate Prevention Measures, US," *UN Wire*, 28 Oct 2001.

UN Documents:

- S/2001/986, Report of the Counter-Terrorism Committee
S/PRST/2002/10, 15 Apr 2002
S/Res/1377 (2001), Declaration on the global effort to combat terrorism
S/Res/1373 (2001), Establishment of the Counter-Terrorism Committee
S/Res/1368 (2001)

Additional Web Resources:

- Security Council Counter-Terrorism Committee: www.un.org/Docs/sc/committees/1373/
UN Action Against Terrorism: www.un.org/terrorism/



CHAPTER III.

THE HISTORICAL SECURITY COUNCIL - 1967

STATE MEMBERS

Argentina	Denmark	Mali
Brazil	Ethiopia	Nigeria
Bulgaria	France	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Canada	India	United Kingdom
China	Japan	United States

The 2002 American Model United Nations Historical Security Council (HSC) will simulate the events of the world beginning on 1 January 1967. Historically, the key international security concerns at this time revolve around the situations in Africa, including Southern Rhodesia, the Congo and South Africa. Peacekeeping questions are of significant concern at this time, especially surrounding the UNEF operation between Egypt and Israel, and the USSR's unwillingness to pay for certain peacekeeping operations. The war in Vietnam is also a key underlying factor in world politics, although it received limited formal attention in the Security Council. Continued disputes over recognition issues between the two Chinas is also a significant issue. Additionally, the Cold War struggles between the United States and the Soviet Union are a constant undercurrent in the world of international politics.

In 1967, U Thant was the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Lyndon Johnson the US President and Leonid Brezhnev the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The Shah's government was in power in Iran and the Republic of China (on Formosa/Taiwan), rather than the mainland Peoples Republic of China, was officially represented in the United Nations. Cold War tensions were progressively growing at this time, and many of the "developing" countries were stressing their non-aligned status and forming a power bloc within the United Nations.

AMUN's HSC is unique not only in its topics, but also in its treatment of those topics. History and time are the HSC's media and those media are flexible. In the simulation, the HSC will preempt history from the time the Council's simulation is assigned to begin. History will be as it was written until the moment the Council convenes. From that moment forward, however, *Council members exercise free will based on the range of all the choices within their national character and upon the capabilities of their governments.*

Effective role-playing for an HSC Member State will be not just a rote replay of national decisions as they evolved in 1967. Indeed, the problems of the era may not transpire as they once did, and this itself will force active evaluations - and reevaluations - of national policies. Beyond this, it cannot be said that the policy course a government made in 1967 was necessarily the most wise. While rote replays must by definition be in character, it is not a sure thing that - given a second opportunity to look at events - any given national government would do things exactly the same way twice in a row. History is replete with the musings of foreign ministers and heads of state pining for "second chances."

It will be the job of Council Representatives to actively involve their country's national policies and national capabilities in solutions to the problems and issues which may not have had adequate contemporary resolutions. There is almost always more than one alternative choice in any situation.

In particular, the international community has often chosen not to actively involve itself in many regional disputes or political crises where it might have shown greater involvement. The UN itself has often been but a bystander to regional or international conflict. This inability or unwillingness to actively work toward solutions to crises was rarely more evident than during the late years of colonialism and early years of the Cold War. Representatives will need to decide what changes, if any, could have been made to the Security Council's posture on the various issues.

While national governments often did not want international "meddling" in what they felt to be national policies or disputes, this in no way lessens the responsibility of Council members to make the effort and find ways to actively involve themselves in crisis solutions. This task must, however, be accomplished without violating the bounds of the Member States' national characters. This year's simulation will have the dichotomy of many regional crises being treated as "internal" by the superpowers, and other crises which are so global in nature that the UN must become involved.

Representatives should approach these issues based on events through the final days of 1966, and should do their research accordingly. In studying their role playing assignments, *it is strongly recommended that research be done on these topics using timely materials.* The world has changed dramatically in the past 35 years, but none of these changes will be evident within the chambers of the HSC. While histories of the subject will be fine for a general overview, Representatives should pursue periodicals from mid-



to-late 1966 to most accurately reflect the world view at that time. Magazines featuring an overview of that year may give a particularly good feel for the international mood in which the simulation is set. Periodicals contemporary to the period, which can be easily referenced in a *Readers Guide to Periodical Literature* or the *New York Times Index*, should provide a much better “historical perspective” and “feel for the times” than later historical texts, which can also be useful for general information.

The HSC simulation will follow a flexible time line based on events as they occurred, and modified by the Representatives’ policy decisions in the Council. The Secretariat will be responsible for tracking the simulation and keeping it as realistic as possible.

In maintaining realism, Representatives must remember that they are role playing the *individual* assigned as their nation’s Representative to the UN. They may have access to the up-to-the-minute policy decisions of their countries, or they may be relatively “in the dark” on their countries’ moment-to-moment actions in the world.

In this area, the AMUN Home Government organization will frequently consult with HSC members. Representatives are welcome and encouraged, as their nation’s spokesperson, to make whatever **declarative statements** they like. Declarative statements would include any comments or actions (including real or implied threats or deals) that an individual at the UN could normally make.

Representatives **must**, however, **always** consult with the Home Government organization before making **ANY operational statements**. Operational statements would include announcements of the movements or actions of military forces, as well as any other actions which would have an effect **outside** of the UN. In these cases, Home Government would be equated with the actual “home office” of the involved nation(s).

OTHER INVOLVED COUNTRIES

From time-to-time, other countries will be involved in the deliberations of the HSC. Delegations representing these countries will be notified in advance by the Secretariat, and should have one or more Representatives prepared to come before the HSC at any time. Because these countries will not be involved in all issues, it is **highly recommended** that the Representative(s) responsible for the HSC also be assigned to another Committee/Council, preferably with a second Representative who can cover that Committee/Council while they are away. A floating Permanent Representative would also be ideal for this assignment. These delegations will be asked to identify their Representative(s) to the HSC at registration, and to indicate where they can be reached if/when needed.

Some of the delegations which may be called before the HSC during the 1967 time frame include: Israel, Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, South Africa, Democratic Republic of the Congo and Angola, among others.

BACKGROUND RESEARCH

The following are brief synopses of the main international situations facing the Security Council on 1 January 1967. The prominent events of late 1966 are discussed, as well as some questions which may face the Security Council in early 1967. This research is intended merely as a focal point for Representatives’ continued exploration of the topics.

THE SITUATION IN SOUTHERN RHODESIA

On 11 November 1965, the minority government of Southern Rhodesia, led by Ian Smith, made a unilateral declaration of independence from the United Kingdom, sparking an intense political conflict. Southern Rhodesia had been a self-administered (by white colonists) territory of the United Kingdom for over 40 years. This declaration was in direct violation of the 1961 decolonization agreement signed between the UK and Southern Rhodesia, in that it ignored the majority black population of Zimbabwe. The Council requested on 20 November 1965 that all UN members make a voluntary break in diplomatic and economic relations with Southern Rhodesia. On 16 December of that year, a follow-up resolution imposed selected mandatory economic sanctions.

In April of 1966, following months of failed diplomatic efforts driven mainly by the UK, that government requested a

Council meeting to consider the incident of a Portuguese oil tanker which was attempting to make a delivery of much needed oil to the Southern Rhodesian government. The UK had been given broad latitude by its Council allies to attempt a diplomatic solution to the problems caused by its former colony, and bringing this issue before the Council marked a new stage in the conflict. At the UK’s request, the resolution eventually passed allowed for use of force by the UK to prevent shipments covered under the previous embargo from reaching Southern Rhodesia. Several African nations spoke before the Council on this issue, requesting much stronger measures up to and including the authorization of Chapter VII enforcement against Rhodesia. The United States and France joined the UK, however, in opposing Chapter VII action and allowing the UK to lead any enforcement measures.

On 10 May, 32 African nations requested a Council meet-



ing to again discuss the Southern Rhodesian issue. These nations noted that, to date, Council measures had been ineffective in removing the minority government, and made a further push for UN intervention, including Chapter VII authorization. The request noted that economic sanctions were clearly failing as not all states were enforcing these sanctions, and some states were still investing in Southern Rhodesia. In discussions on the issue, the USSR specifically accused the UK of trying to reach an agreement with the Smith regime at the expense of the Zimbabwean people. A resolution, sponsored by the African bloc and reflecting its concerns, failed by a vote of six in favor, one opposed and eight abstentions.

Similar discussions continued throughout the year on these issues, leading up to an eventual request by the UK for another Council meeting in December. At this time, the UK was prepared to call for additional measures against Southern Rhodesia, including stronger economic sanctions. During the debate on the subject, other states criticized UK enforcement efforts. Further, the refusal of the UK to use force, as it had been partially authorized to do at its own request, was criticized by a number of speakers. It was at this point increasingly obvious that the UK's goal was not to attack Rhodesia or destroy the Smith regime, but instead to come to some kind of agreement with Smith. Significantly, the Western powers by this point seemed to realize that the situation was becoming more intractable as time went on, and an amendment sponsored by the African states which noted that the situation constitutes a "threat to international peace and security" was included in the text of the final resolution. This Chapter VII language had been staunchly opposed by the UK and its allies in past discussions. The final resolution on the subject passed by a vote of 11 in favor, none opposed and four abstentions.

This is the point at which the situation stands in early 1967.

Questions to consider on this issue from your country's perspective include:

- Does your country support greater enforcement measures to remove control from the minority-led government in Southern Rhodesia? How far should these measures go, how would such measures be carried out, and by whom? How would these measures be financed?
- Does your country still trade with or invest in Southern Rhodesia? If so, does your government plan to comply with Security Council-passed sanctions and cease any illegal trading?
- How can a smooth transition to a majority led, post-colonial government best be accomplished in Southern Rhodesia?

THE QUESTION OF PALESTINE

The Security Council considered actions taken from the Israeli, Syrian and Jordanian sides of the Armistice in the Palestine region throughout 1966. Repeated border incursions and military incidents continued to lead to heightened tensions in the region throughout the year. Syria and Jordan frequently accused Israel of violating the Armistice by attacking into their respective territories, and Israel accused Syria of continued attacks from the Golan Heights, and both Syria and

Jordan of military activities across various border regions. Israel also accused both countries of harboring pro-Palestinian El-Fatah and El-Asefa terrorists, who frequently conducted terrorist activities across the Israeli border, and accused Syria of arming and training these groups, suggesting that their status was more in line with irregular troops directed by the Syrian government, rather than independent organizations.

On 25 February a military coup in Syria returned Nureddin Atassi to power, and from February to October numerous incursions occurred across the Syrian-Israeli border. Israel accused Syria of numerous actions taken against Israeli settlements, frequently from fortified positions on the Golan Heights, and apparently in an effort to disrupt the daily lives of farmers and fisherman. In recent activities, a report was made in August that Syrian forces fired on an Israeli patrol boat, with Israeli retaliation for this action resulting in the downing of two Syrian jet fighters. In September, there was a report of Syrian forces firing on an Israeli fishing boat, and reports in October that four Israeli border policemen had been killed by a Syrian mine, and that a tractor driver had been fired on by Syrian artillery. In each case, Israel used the situation to justify military reprisals, while Syria argued that the original "attacks" were fabrications, and that subsequent Israeli attacks were clear violations of the 1948 Armistice Agreements.

On the Israeli-Jordanian border, a number of smaller border incursions culminated in a 13 November invasion by Israeli forces, reportedly at brigade strength, into the southern Hebron region of Jordan. Israeli forces attacked a number of villages in this region, in what Israeli officials called reprisals for Jordanian cross-border interventions and sponsorship of El-Fatah forces, and what Jordan called an unprovoked attack. This was the only event in the region throughout 1966 resulting in formal Security Council action, as Resolution 228 (28 November) criticized the large scale and carefully planned military action on the territory of Jordan by Israeli armed forces, and further censured Israel for its actions. While some states had expressed condemnation of Israel verbally, this was not formally stated in the final resolution.

In other Council actions, the various belligerents in the region were called to speak before the Council several times as hostilities occurred throughout 1966, including Israel, Syria, Jordan, Iraq, the United Arab Republic of Egypt (UAR), and Saudi Arabia.

Several other recent issues contributed to the heightening of tensions surrounding the Palestine issue. On 19 May, a sale of military jet fighters and bombers by the US to Israel was, for the first time ever, publicly disclosed. Additionally, on 4 November, Syria and the UAR concluded a mutual defense treaty, which also provided for joint control of armed forces in case of war or aggression against either party.

On 29 November, Jordan, with a significant Palestinian-Arab population not always friendly to the government, accused the Soviet Union of heightening tensions in the region through its rhetoric and actions. Most recently, Arab unity was further shaken when this was followed by a 7 December call by Syria - to Jordanians and Palestinian Arabs



within Jordan - for the ouster of King Hussein of Jordan. This call was accompanied by an offer to provide arms to any parties involved in the uprising.

Questions to consider from your country's perspective on this issue include:

- Is your country closely allied with one or more countries involved in the Palestine question? How is this involvement reflected in both your country's public statements and private actions with regard to the region?
- What actions can be taken to better ensure compliance with the 1948 Armistice Agreements by all sides? What actions can be taken to reduce the rising tensions on all sides within the region?
- What can the Council realistically do when Armistice violations occur? Is UN military action an option in this conflict?

THE SITUATION IN THE REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO

Following its independence from Belgium in 1960, the Republic of the Congo (hereafter referred to as "Congo" in this paper) went through four years of civil war with significant United Nations and international intervention. This included the ONUC (Operation des Nations Unies au Congo) peacekeeping effort, which lasted from July 1960 to June 1964. While the UN forces departed peacefully after the internal Congo situation had settled in 1964, interactions between the Congo and the Portuguese colony of Angola bordering it brought that country to the Council's attention again in the fall of 1965.

On 21 September, the Congolese government accused Portugal of supporting former (now exiled) Congo Prime Minister Tshombe through allowing the use of its territories in Angola and Cabinda as a base for insurgent activities into the Congo. In an apparent response to these insurgencies, the Portuguese embassy in Kinshasa was attacked on 24 September, with Congolese radio responsible for inciting much of the violence.

The Security Council, at the Congo's request, considered this matter from 30 September through 14 October. The Congo argued that Portugal was supporting these rebels because the Congolese government had recognized *du jure* the Angolan government in exile, while Portugal denied any support for the insurgents.

On 14 October, the Council passed Resolution 226, urging Portugal not to allow foreign mercenaries to use Angola as a base of operations into neighboring countries. While the political negotiations involved in this resolution appear to have quieted the area, it is possible that renewed conflict could emerge in the future.

An additional issue in the Congo complicating the situation at this time is the coup in November which established military rule and firmly placed Joseph Mobutu in control of the country.

Questions to consider from your country's perspective on this situation include:

- What incentives can be given to prevent further cross-border interventions in this area?

- If incentives and Council resolutions are not successful, what actions can and should the Council take to bring a peaceful resolution to the simmering potential for renewed conflict in and around the Congo?

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

The early 1960s saw North Vietnam's involvement in the two-year civil war in neighboring Laos, as well as increased North Vietnamese incursions into South Vietnam. While United States advisors had first entered the country in 1959, the US started to build up significant ground forces in 1964, leading to significantly increased tensions in the region. Throughout 1966, the US picked up the military pressure against Vietcong forces in South Vietnam, but talks of how to bring about a peaceful solution continued.

In January of 1966 the US reported taking new steps toward achieving peace in Vietnam. While the US continued to stress the importance of South Vietnamese self-determination, they also suggested that it would be ideal for all parties to agree on and to implement the 1954 and 1962 Geneva Accords. The Vietnam issue had never previously been discussed by the Security Council, but in an effort to bring the international political arena to bear in this direction, the US called for a meeting of the Security Council to discuss this issue on 31 January. At this meeting, the US argued that a new dimension in peace was possible, and suggested that the Council assist in brokering an attempt to arrange a new conference to apply the Geneva Accords.

This US attempt to work through the Council was opposed on many sides. Secretary-General U Thant specifically opposed open debate of the issue before the Council, noting the problematic nature of US influence in Council involvement. Thant suggested that, since the original Geneva Accords were negotiated outside of a United Nations context, that any new negotiations based on these accords were not properly within the purview of the UN. The USSR also opposed open discussion in the Council, apparently not wanting the US to use the Council for its own purposes in the war effort. Additionally, France (which was involved in Vietnam before the US presence there) also opposed these discussions, citing the problematic effect of the US being the only party to the conflict which was a UN member, and the fact that this would deny a voice to the two parts of Vietnam and to mainland China.

Following a contentious vote on 2 February (nine in favor, two opposed, four abstentions) to add the item to the Council's agenda, actual talks proved less than meaningful. A letter from the Council President, explaining the discussions, noted the failure of all parties to the dispute to meet with the Council as the key factor in the Council not reaching any formal decision. In general, the President noted that the members expressed a general concern over continued hostilities in the region. Even this minimal statement was criticized by several Council members, who argued that the discussions had been strictly procedural, and that the President should not have drawn any conclusions from the statements made. While a number of reports were made by the Secretary-General and

various members throughout the year on the situation in Vietnam, after February it was not again considered in formal discussions.

OTHER ISSUES

Peace Keeping Issues

United Nations peace keeping was rocked in 1966 by the continuing refusal of the Soviet Union to pay for costs incurred for the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) and in ONUC. The Soviets considered these operations to be politically motivated in unacceptable directions, and refused payment. Under Article 19 of the UN Charter, Soviet voting rights in the General Assembly could be removed if that country falls more than two years behind in its mandatory payments to the organization. The key question this raised was of the voluntary nature of peace keeping payments, versus the collective financial responsibility usually assumed for peace keeping activities. This politicization of peace keeping could reflect significantly on the planning processes for continuing and future operations.

A further issue impacting peace keeping was the question of whether the United Nations should intervene in the situations in South Africa and in Southern Rhodesia. These complex issues, leading to widely varying views among the Permanent Members, have left both situations somewhat in limbo with regards to the possibility of UN actions beyond economic embargoes.

The Situation in South Africa / Apartheid

South Africa's policy of Apartheid continued to be a significant item under discussion at the UN, primarily under the auspices of the General Assembly but also crossing over into Security Council discussions. While an arms embargo was in place against South Africa since 1963, agreement on a trade embargo has not been reached to date. On 25 October 1966, the Special Committee on South Africa provided its most recent report to both the GA and Council. This argued that the UN has a fundamental interest in combating the doctrine of Apartheid, both for the people of South Africa and for peace in the region. This report also noted that the key issue continued to be one of ongoing trade between South Africa and some key Member States, and that the situation was not likely to improve until this was resolved.

The Question of the Representation of China

The representation of China continued to be an underlying issue effecting many UN discussions, with the Republic of China on Formosa/Taiwan retaining the General Assembly and Security Council seat allocated to China. Discussions about this issue occurred between August and November of 1966, mainly in the General Assembly. These revolved around questions such as the war in Vietnam, in which the People's Republic of China's involvement and lack of UN membership was becoming an increasingly important issue, as well as vari-

ous other political and trade issues in dealing with the increasingly powerful mainland government. A key question raised by allies of the Formosa government is what will happen to Taiwan if the seat is awarded to the mainland government, both in terms of UN representation and its future relations with other countries.

Other Open Issues

Any issue on the world scene in 1967 will be fair game for discussion in the Historical Security Council. Representatives should have broad historical knowledge of the world situation as it stood through 1 January 1967.

Bibliography:

Please note: The books and documents listed below provide both contemporary and historical information on the year 1966. Any information provided for dates after 1 January 1967 will not be considered factual or appropriate in debates before the Council.

It is **strongly recommended** that representatives to the Historical Security Council consult contemporary materials, especially periodical sources from late 1966. These might include the *UN Chronicle*, *the New York Times*, *Time* magazine, and similar sources to get a better "feel" for the time in which the simulation occurs.

- The Blue Helmets: A Review of United Nations Peace-Keeping* (3rd Edition). New York: United Nations, 1996.
- Calvocoressi, Peter. *World Politics Since 1945* (4th Edition). London & New York: Longman Group, 1982.
- Cremmeans, Charles D. *The Arabs and the World*. New York, 1963.
- Davidson, Lt. Gen. Philip B. (USA Ret.). *Vietnam at War: The History 1946-1975*. 1988.
- Djonovich, Dusan J. *United Nations Resolutions: Volume VI, 1966-67*. Dobbs Ferry, NY: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1989.
- Fine, Leonard. *Politics in Israel*. Boston, 1967.
- Hadawi, Sami. *Bitter Harvest, A Modern History of Palestine*. New York, 1991.
- Herring, George, *America's Longest War: The United States in Vietnam, 1950-1975*.
- The Israeli-Arab Reader: A Documentary History of the Middle East Conflict*. New York: Bantam, 1969.
- Laqueur, Walter. *The Struggle for the Middle East: The Soviet Union and the Middle East, 1958-1968*. New York: Macmillan, 1969.
- The Middle East* (7th Edition). Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Inc., 1991.
- Oren, Michael. *Six Days of War: June 1967 and the Making of the Modern Middle East*. Oxford Press, 2002.
- Shalim, Avi. *The Iron Wall: Israel and the Arab World*. W.W. Norton Co., 2001.
- Swift, Richard N. (ed). *Annual Review of United Nations Affairs: 1965- 66*. New York: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1967.
- Swift, Richard N. (ed). *Annual Review of United Nations Affairs: 1966- 67*. New York: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1968.



- Turley, William S. *The Second Indochina War: A Short Political and Military History*. 1986.
- Vietnam War Almanac*. 1985.
- Yearbook of the United Nations: 1966*. New York: United Nations, 1968.
- UN Documents, Southern Rhodesia:*
S/Res/216 (12 Nov 65)
S/Res/217 (20 Nov 65)
S/Res/221 (9 Apr 66)
S/Res/232 (16 Dec 66)
- UN Documents, Palestine:*
A/6302, Report of the Security Council to GA, Chapter 20 (15 Jul 66)
S/7432, SG's Report to Security Council (25 Jul 66)
S/7433, SG's Report to Security Council (25 Jul 66)
S/7533, SG's Report to Security Council (17 Oct 66)
S/7561/Rev.1, SG's Report to Security Council (19 Oct 66)
S/7572, SG's Report to Security Council (1 Nov 66)
- S/7573, SG's Report to Security Council (2 Nov 66)
S/Res/228 (25 Nov 66)
- UN Documents, Republic of the Congo:*
S/7503, Letter from Congo (21 Sep 66)
S/7506, Letter from Portugal (24 Sep 66)
S/7524, Letter from Congo (3 Oct 66)
S/Res/226 (14 Oct 66)
- UN Documents, Vietnam:*
S/7168, Letter from President of Security Council (26 Feb 66)
A/6301/Add.1, SG's Annual Report (15 Jun 66)
A/6302, Report of Security Council to GA, Chapter 18 (15 Jul 66)
A/6400, Letter from SG (1 Sep 66)
- UN Documents, Apartheid:*
A/6486 or S/7565, Report of Special Committee on Apartheid (25 Oct 66)
GA/Res/2202A (XXI) (16 Dec 66)

CHAPTER IV.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

All delegations are represented on each committee of the General Assembly. Two topics will be discussed in each committee, as listed below. Any resolutions passed on these topics will be automatically submitted to the General Assembly Plenary session for final approval. To allow all Representatives an equal opportunity for preparation, resolutions will only be accepted on the topics listed in this handbook. No new topics will be accepted in the General Assembly.

BACKGROUND RESEARCH

THE FIRST COMMITTEE (DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY)

GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION ON THE PROHIBITION OF THE USE, STOCKPILING, PRODUCTION AND TRANSFER OF ANTI-PERSONNEL MINES AND ON THEIR DESTRUCTION

The issue of anti-personnel mines (APM) came to the forefront of the global political debate in the early 1990s. Although primarily used during times of war, landmines are easy to deploy but difficult to disarm. Because of this, their impact after times of war on civilian populations became the central focal point in an international social movement that sought to ban landmines from the face of the earth. It was estimated that during the 1990s, 26,000 landmines were exploding each year, killing or crippling 22,000 civilians annually (*UN Wire*, 14 August 2000). Many victims of this indiscriminate weapon were women and children, deprived of their right to a fulfilling life as recognized by international law. In an effort to address these issues, a global network of human rights, humanitarian, peace, disability, medical, de-mining, arms control, religious, environmental, development and women's groups in over 75 countries came together in 1992 under the umbrella of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL). With over 1,100 members, the ICBL set out to persuade the world's governments that the use of landmines was impacting the lives of the very citizens they were to protect, in a manner that was detrimental to their own development.

Thanks in part to one of the most successful global campaigns ever, the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and Their Destruction, also known as the Mine Ban Treaty (MBT) was ready for signature on 4 December 1997. This was made possible by the Ottawa Process, the fast track diplomatic initiative that was launched as a result of the October 1996 "Towards a Global Ban on Landmines: International Strategy Conference." Three preparatory meetings were held in Vienna, Bonn, and Belgium to draft the MBT. On 1 March 1999, the MBT entered into force after 86 States had ratified the Convention in just 15 short months. The MBT is one of the fastest international treaties to be drafted, signed and ratified in the history of humankind. For its efforts to ban a whole class of weapons and to mitigate the suffering experienced by the victims of landmine encounters, the ICBL was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1997.

The MBT is significant as it is one of the few international treaties on record that simultaneously bans the use, produc-

tion, stockpiling and transfer of an entire class of weapons, while also recognizing the human suffering that has occurred as a result of their deployment. The MBT aims for the elimination of APM as a weapon of war and terror and obliges each state party to the Convention to destroy its stocks of APMs within four years. It also includes a variety of compliance, transparency, and dispute settlement procedures to ensure states party to the MBT are fulfilling their treaty obligations. Finally, the treaty outlines the necessary commitment and assistance for effective mine clearance, mine awareness, care and rehabilitation of mine victims and their social and economic reintegration to ensure its implementation.

Since the Treaty's adoption by the UN in 1997, 143 countries have signed the MBT and 124 have ratified it. According to the third annual report of the Landmine Monitor, the stigmatization of the weapon in recent years has resulted in a reduction in the use of landmines worldwide. Part of this trend is also attributed to the conclusion of conflicts in Ethiopia-Eritrea, Kosovo and the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Current estimates indicate that there has been a gradual decline in the number of new casualties from landmines from 26,000 in the 1990s to 15,000-20,000 in 2000. In addition, the number of landmine producers dropped from 55 to 14 and there has been a complete halt in the trade of landmines. The destruction of stockpiled landmines continues at an increasing rate with a total of 28 states party to the Convention having completely destroyed their stockpiles. To date, more than 27 million APMs have been destroyed by over 50 nations. Finally, more than one billion dollars have been provided for humanitarian assistance since 1993, while more and more land is being de-mined through the efforts of humanitarian clearance programs in conjunction with state programs (Landmine Monitor Report, September 2001).

Nevertheless, significant obstacles remain in the implementation of the MBT. Despite the successful campaign to ban landmines, it was estimated in 2000 that over 60-70 million landmines remained deployed in 60 nations (*UN Wire*, 14 August 2000). Key nations which have yet to ratify the MBT include the United States, China, Russia, Ukraine, South Korea, India, Pakistan, Belarus, Israel and Turkey. The US and Turkey are the only two NATO countries that have not signed the treaty and the presence of ongoing conflicts between states such as India and Pakistan, and North and South Korea are cause for alarm as the use of landmines continues to impact civilians and the development of those regions. Finally, also at issue is the lack of transparency with respect to the use



of landmines by non-state actors (rebel groups, counter-insurgency movements or terrorists) not covered by the MBT. Although the UN Conference on Disarmament (UNCD), the Department of Disarmament Affairs (DDA), the ICBL, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and a number of other NGOs actively monitor the progress and implementation of the MBT, the continued lack of transparency on the part of signatory and non-signatory parties to the Convention is cause for concern. How best to ensure compliance in the absence of strict verification procedures has been a common criticism leveled against the ICBL and the MBT.

Questions to consider from your government's perspective on this issue include:

- How can the MBT be enforced without the availability of verification procedures?
- What role should the UN system continue to play in regard to the banning of landmines?
- What measures are available for countries to implement the MBT?
- What steps can be taken to address the issues surrounding the use of landmines by non-state actors and the continued objections to the MBT by key nations? How can more states be encouraged to sign and/or ratify the Treaty?

Bibliography:

Atwood, David C. "Implementing Ottawa: Continuity and Change in the Roles of NGOs." *Disarmament Forum* 4, 1999: 19-31.

"Expert Says US Should Sign Ottawa Treaty." *UN Wire*, 14 Aug 2000.

Kongstad, Steffen. "The Continuation of the Ottawa Process: Intersessional Work and the Role of Geneva." *Disarmament Forum* 4, 1999: 57-62.

"Landmine Advocacy Fact Sheet." ICBL, 1999. www.icbl.org

"Landmine Monitor Report 2001." ICBL, 2001. www.icbl.org/lm/2001/findings

Wareham, Mary. *Antipersonnel Landmine Stockpiles and Their Destruction*. Fact Sheet prepared by Human Rights Watch, 14 Dec 1999. www.icbl.org/lm/factsheets/destr1999.php3

UN Documents:

A/Res/52/38A, 9 Dec 1997, Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction

A/Res/52/38H, 9 Dec 1997, Contributions toward banning anti-personnel landmines

A/Res/53/77N, 12 Jan 1999, Anti-personnel Mines Convention

A/Res/54/54B, 10 Jan 2000, Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction

A/Res/56/24M, 10 Jan 2002, Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction

A/Res/56/219, 14 Jan 2001, Assistance in Mine Action

DC/2823, 12 Dec 2001, Conference Appeals for Wider Adherence to Protocol on Prohibition of Mines
GA/9675, 1 Dec 1999, General Assembly Calls for Strict Compliance with 1972 ABM Treaty, as it Adopts 51 Disarmament, International Security Texts

Additional Web Resources:

disarmament.un.org/TreatyStatus.nsf

www.un.org/Depts/dda/resources.htm

www.icbl.org/

www.unog.ch/UNIDIR

www.un.org/Depts/DPKO/maputo/2029.htm

www.un.org/Depts/DPKO/maputo/maput7.htm

www.un.org/Depts/DPKO/maputo/2030.htm

CONVENTION ON THE PROHIBITION OF THE DEVELOPMENT, PRODUCTION AND STOCKPILING OF BACTERIOLOGICAL (BIOLOGICAL) AND TOXIN WEAPONS AND ON THEIR DESTRUCTION

There are only two multilateral treaties that specifically address the issue of biological weapons. The first of these is the 1925 Geneva Protocol, which bans the use of chemical and biological weapons in war. Although the treaty contains no enforcement or verification procedures and does not address the issues of development, production and stockpiling, it did establish a historical precedence for banning such weapons given the experience of their use in the First World War. During and immediately after World War II, it was discovered that this non-binding treaty was insufficient in the fight against biological weapons, given their limited use by a number of states.

In 1972 a second treaty, the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction, was concluded, also known as the Biological Weapons Convention (BWC). The BWC bans the use, development, production, and stockpiling of microbial or biological agents or other toxins "that have no justification for prophylactic, protective or other peaceful purposes." Unfortunately, given the political climate and the lack of enabling technology, the treaty contained no verification or enforcement provisions, necessary to ensure states party to the Convention were not disregarding the ban. Its viability rested on the good will of those states party to the agreement.

In 1984, a small group of states party to the BWC gathered in response to the use of chemical weapons by Iraq against the armed forces of Iran during the Iran-Iraq war. The outcome of the meeting, informally known as the Australia Group, as it was chaired by Australia, was the establishment of voluntary licensing measures to prevent dual-use technologies from ending up in countries harboring illegal chemical and biological weapon programs. Since then, the Australia Group has met informally once a year to ensure licensing measures are uniform and harmonized among members of the group and to reaffirm the group's stated position against the use, development, production, or stockpiling of chemical and biological weapons. 33 nations currently belong to the group and are



parties to both the 1972 BWC and the 1997 Chemical Weapons Convention.

Coupled with the advances in biotechnology over the past 25 years and new concerns raised during the Gulf War, the shortcomings of the BWC prompted the signatories to begin negotiations on verification measures. Since 1987, 41 of the 137 states party to the Convention have undertaken voluntary confidence-building measures aimed at providing greater openness and transparency in monitoring each other's biological programs. In the early 1990s, a small group of government experts (the VEREX Group) reviewed the measures being undertaken and proposed 21 specific measures that could be included in a verification protocol. In response to these recommendations, the members of the BWC formed an Ad Hoc Working Group to study these measures and to draft a legally binding BWC Protocol that would be signed around the new millennium.

Since 1994, the Ad Hoc Working Group has been meeting to negotiate a verification protocol to the BWC. This protocol would establish an Organization for the Prohibition of Biological Weapons (OPBW), whose form and structure would be similar to its counterpart for chemical weapons, the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW). The Protocol establishes detailed provisions for participating states to declare facilities that would be regulated under the Protocol. Additionally, both regularly scheduled and special clarification on-site inspections by the OPBW are permitted under the Protocol. Provisions also exist to protect sensitive information and there are various incentives set up for states to join the Protocol.

After many years of negotiation, the Ad-Hoc Working Group released the draft protocol text in the summer of 2001. The United States immediately registered serious objections with the draft protocol for a host of reasons. The next few months were spent trying to work out a compromise to allow the US to accept the draft protocol. However, in November, at a BWC Review Conference, US Undersecretary of State for Arms Control and International Security John Bolton delivered his now infamous "naming names" speech in which he indicated the United States' refusal to even consider using the draft protocol as a basis for negotiation. Also of importance, Undersecretary Bolton took the very diplomatically unusual step of publicly naming states the US believed to be illicitly running biological weapons programs. The US cited fears over international inspectors' learning too much about US biological defense programs, and the current BWC violations by the named states, as primary reasons for rejecting the draft protocol. In its stead, the US proposed a much more scaled down compliance program that relies upon more bilateral work, cooperation with the World Health Organization, and a role for the UN Secretary-General in BWC verification. Since that November 2001 Review Conference, verification negotiations are at a standstill.

At this point, the future is quite uncertain regarding a verification protocol for the BWC. Since the November conference, some states have privately told the US that they share its concerns over the draft protocol. However, a great majority of states party to the BWC are also willing to overlook the flaws

of the draft protocol and at least use it as a basis for negotiation.

Questions to consider from your government's perspective on this issue include:

- How important is it that a verification protocol be negotiated for the BWC?
- How can the events of 11 September 2001 impact future negotiations given the vulnerabilities of many nations to a biological attack?
- Should negotiations on the draft protocol continue even without the support of the United States?
- What should be done in the meantime to ensure that states are complying with the BWC?

Bibliography:

- Bolton, John. Speech to the BWC RevCon, 19 Nov 2001. www.state.gov/t/us/rm/janJuly/6231.htm
- Brugger, Seth. "Executive Summary of the Chairman's Text," *Arms Control Today On-Line*, May 2001. www.armscontrol.org/act/2001_05/brugger.asp.
- "Chronology of State Use and Biological and Chemical Weapons Control." Center for Non-Proliferation Studies, 24 Oct 2001. cns.miis.edu/research/cbw/pastuse.htm
- The Harvard and Sussex Program on CBW Armament and Arms Limitation. fas-www.harvard.edu/~hsp/
- "Limiting the Acquisition and Use of Biological Weapons by Strengthening the BWC." The Center for Nonproliferation Studies at the Monterey Institute of International Studies, 2002. www.nti.org/f_wmd411/f2j.html
- "Science's Call To Arms: The Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons Convention (BWC)." The Chemical and Biological Arms Control Institute. www.cbaci.org/
- Special Weapons Primer on Biological Weapons. Federation of American Scientists, 11 Nov 1998. www.fas.org/nuke/intro/bw/intro.htm

UN Documents:

- A/Res/55/40, 20 Nov 2000, Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction
- A/Res/54/61, 31 Dec 1999, Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction
- A/Res/53/84, 8 Jan 1999, Biological Weapons Convention
- DC/2561, 20 Sep 1996, Working Group on Strengthening of Biological Weapons Convention Completes Session without Finalizing Work
- DC/2567, 26 Nov 1996, Verification Regime Urged, Terrorist Threat Cited, as Biological Weapons Convention Conference Continues General Debate
- DC/2572, 6 Dec 1996, Fourth Review Conference on Biological Weapons Convention Concludes
- DC/2688, 13 Mar 2000, Ad Hoc Group of States Parties to Biological Weapons Convention to Hold Nineteenth Session 13-31 March



Additional Web Resources:

www.armscontrol.org/subject/bw/

THE SECOND COMMITTEE (ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL)

GLOBALIZATION AND INTERDEPENDENCE: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR THE LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES FOR THE DECADE 2001-2010

Since 1971, the United Nations has given special recognition to Least Developed Countries (LDCs) through the Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). At present, these 49 countries face a number of impediments to development and are impacted by the forces of poverty. The United Nations has singled out these nations as places where special support from the international community is needed to aid in providing a better environment for development efforts. The criteria used by the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) to determine those states deemed Least Developed Countries is based on income, level of human resource development, and the nation's level of economic vulnerability. Countries that fall below the standards established by ECOSOC are eligible for special benefits from the international community.

Ten years after the establishment of the LDC status, the United Nations held its first Conference on Least Developed Countries. Delegates met in Paris and agreed upon a "Programme for Action for the 1980s" which established an outline for addressing the poor socio-economic situation of the LDCs. Concern grew in response to the increasing gap between the levels of economic growth in the LDCs and the rest of the world. In response, the United Nations decided to convene a second conference in 1990 to discuss the situation of the LDCs. Member States once again convened in Paris to review the socio-economic situation of the LDCs and attempted to reinvigorate international support embodied in the 1980s Programme for Action.

In general, the Programme of Action both for the 1980s and 1990s has been unsuccessful in achieving its goals. In 1990, 48 countries were classified as LDCs and only one nation since then has been graduated from this status, while one new nation was added to the list. In terms of social development, only a few LDCs have made progress, but many others continue to experience rising population rates and increasing infant mortality rates. Many of these negative social developments can be attributed to rises in social strife and ravages of HIV/AIDS. With regard to governance, many LDCs in the 1990s saw a weakening in their ability to govern stemming from an increase in internal and external conflict, the persistence of poverty and corruption, and poorly conceived policies that lack domestic support. All of these problems were supposed to be dramatically reduced through the Programme of Action for the 1990s.

Nevertheless, not all of the failures of the past Programmes

for Action can be placed at the feet of the LDCs. Donor nations have also fallen short in achieving their obligations. A considerable amount of the programs' success hinges on the role of international support. However, since 1990, long-term net capital flows to LDCs have actually declined nominally by 25 percent. Success is dependent upon developed nations following through with their agreed-upon obligation to contribute a set percentage of their GNP to the initiatives outlined in the Programme for Action. Unfortunately target contribution levels have not been met and in many cases developed countries have cut back on official development assistance.

Recently, the United Nations General Assembly approved the work of the Third UN Conference on the Least Developed Countries (April 2001) as outlined in the Brussels Action Programme for Least Developed Countries. The Brussels action plan represents a large-scale agreement by 193 countries, financial institutions, NGOs, and other multilateral donors that attempts to construct a comprehensive and ambitious framework. The main issues addressed in the Programme of Action for the decade 2001-2010 included commitments for both LDCs and their development partners. These include the creation of national policy frameworks for accelerated growth and poverty reduction, the promotion of good governance, the strengthening of productive capacities within LDCs, the role of trade and development, the reduction of vulnerability, the protection of the environment, and the mobilization of financial resources.

The largest challenge for the most recent Programme of Action is implementing the framework in a manner that achieves measurable results. The problems of the past are amplified today in the wake of the pressures of globalization and need to join the global market, especially as LDCs fall further behind their neighbors and grow more dependent on foreign aid. In order to achieve greater rates of growth and subsequently address the pressing issues of poverty, environmental degradation, resource crises and other interrelated issues, conventional wisdom indicates that for LDCs to enter the world market they must first establish a sustainable development infrastructure. Implementation of the Programme of Action and the fulfillment of obligations agreed upon by the member-states is vital to the future development of the LDCs.

Questions to consider from your government's perspective on this issue include:

- What efforts are being made by regional, financial, or non-governmental international organizations to address the Programme for Action for Least Developed Countries for the decade 2001-2010?
- What commitments or obligations has your nation agreed to in order to help implement the initiatives outlined in the

Programme for Action?

- How can the United Nations help support Member States in completing the goal of reducing poverty in LDCs by half at the end of the decade?
- What types of new initiatives should be implemented in order to make the Brussels Action Programme achieve greater results compared to its two predecessor Programmes for Action?

Bibliography:

Annan, Kofi. *We the Peoples-The Role of the UN in the 21st Century*. Secretary-General's Millennium Report. www.un.org/millennium/sg/report/full.htm

"Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP)." 19 Apr 2002. www.imf.org/external/np/prsp/prsp.asp

Sura, Vikram. "Questions of development." *UN Chronicle* 39, No. 1 (Mar-May 2002): p. 47-49.

"What Are the Least Developed Countries." www.unctad.org/Idcs/accueil.asp

UN Documents:

A/CONF.191/IPC/L.4 (15 Dec 2000)

A/CONF.191/IPC/16 (20 Dec 2000)

A/CONF.191/IPC/18 (26 Jan 2001)

A/CONF.199/CP/43 (Vol.1) (9 May 2001)

A/Res/54/231, 22 February 2000, Role of the UN in promoting development in the context of globalization and interdependence

A/Res/54/235, 24 February 2000, Implementation of the Programme of Action for the LDCs for the 1990s

A/Res/55/184, 22 January 2001, Enhancing international cooperation towards a durable solution to the external debt problem of developing countries

A/Res/55/191, 29 January 2001, Integration of the economies in transition into the world economy

A/Res/55/214, 22 February 2001, 3rd UN Conference on the Least Developed Countries

A/Res/56/178, 22 January 2002, International trade and development

A/Res/56/181, 24 January 2002, Towards a strengthened and stable international financial architecture responsive to the priorities of growth and development, especially in developing countries, and to the promotion of economic and social equity

A/Res/56/227, 28 February 2002, 3rd UN Conference on the Least Developed Countries

DEV/BRU/24 (20 May 2001)

GA/9892 (12 Jul 2001)

Additional Web Resources:

www.jubileeplus.org

www.unctad.org/conference

www.worldbank.org/poverty/strategies/index.htm

www.unctad.org/en/pub/ps1ldc02.en.htm

if.wto.org/LDCS.htm

www.unesco.org/ldc/strategy.htm

www.unesco.org/ldc/

www.itu.int/ITU-D/ldc/projects.html

www.wipo.int/ldcs/en/

www.uncdf.org/index.html

www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dda_e/dda_e.htm

STRENGTHENING INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC COOPERATION FOR DEVELOPMENT THROUGH PARTNERSHIP

Financing for development continues to be a subject in which the United Nations takes great interest. The recent International Conference on Financing for Development, held in Monterrey, Mexico, underscored the need for international economic cooperation to confront a variety of development and finance issues of concern to the world community. Within this context, issues of North-South and South-South partnerships are high on the UN's agenda. The common message that permeated from major UN conferences and summits throughout the 1990s was that for development to be successful, it must be people-centered and people-driven. Thus, it appears a new consensus on development is emerging. With the foundation of the Agenda for Development, adopted by the General Assembly in 1997, the world community has been reawakened by the need for increased global partnerships in the pursuit of development goals (A/RES/52/179, 1 January 1998).

In a world increasingly dominated by global issues, many developing countries claim that developed countries have redefined development from a multilateral support system into a laissez-faire approach to global economic prosperity. At issue is the proper role of the state. Developing countries criticize the developed world for disregarding their interests in areas such as trade, financial flows, and technology transfers. According to these criticisms, the rewards of this global economic system are reserved for only the strongest of economies, therefore widening the economic gap between the developed and developing countries. In response, Northern governments emphasize the need for developing countries to liberalize their trade regimes and promote effective governance in order to release their domestic economic potential and to fully participate in the new global economy. Unless the necessary regulatory and financial reforms are put into place to attract more private capital, developing countries are in danger of becoming marginalized.

In response to this global debate on the effective means by which the forces of the global economy can be unleashed to bring about prosperity and development for many in the developing world, the UN system, backed by reports from the Secretary-General, has called for greater cooperation between countries and the private sector to address the issues surrounding development. Secretary-General Kofi Annan appointed a High-level Panel on Financing for Development, known as the Zedillo Panel, to make recommendations on how to ensure a stable global development and to make significant inroads in the fight against poverty. The international panel of 11 experts chaired by former Mexican President Ernesto Zedillo submitted a report to the Secretary-General prior to the Monterrey Conference calling for improved monetary and fiscal cooperation among countries, greater cooper-



ation on tax collection, technical assistance to improve tax administrations, and improvements in efficiency and honesty to enhance a country's development prospects. These and similar cooperative activities are viewed as particularly cost-effective forms of development assistance. According to the report, developing countries can benefit by more actively engaging and partnering with the private sector, which plays a key role in encouraging foreign direct investment, promoting economic development, and making efficient use of domestic resources. Furthermore, the Zedillo Panel suggested the consideration of a worldwide carbon tax to finance development and emphasized the need for a renewed push among developed countries to reach the Official Development Assistance goal of 0.7% GNP.

Also at issue is the role of regional cooperative arrangements that may assist developing countries. In an effort to promote economic coordination at the regional level, the international community could actively support regional trade zones of developing countries to encourage freer and more open trade. Such arrangements could also serve to improve rules, regulations, and standards in the monetary, financial and trade related fields. In addition, UN agencies and developing country experts point to the widening digital divide between the North and South that threatens to constrain many in the developing world from actively participating in the new global economy, potentially leading to further marginalization. Developing countries have called on the various sectors in the international community to partner with them by providing financing resources, transferring relevant technology on preferential terms, and helping them to build the infrastructure capacity to utilize Information Communication Technologies (ICT). In response to these calls, the UN created the ICT Task Force to strengthen collaborative efforts in these areas. Along with the UN Department for Economic and Social Affairs (DESA), the ICT Task Force has been active in helping to reach the goal of universal access to these technologies.

As the debates continue to rage regarding the issues of international economic cooperation for development, the UN continues to emphasize the need for multilateral solutions to global economic problems. Although many Member States are committed to addressing development issues, the needs of the least developed countries, the newly industrialized countries, and those with economies in transition all may vary considerably. Whether or not consensus can be reached within the international financial institutions or the UN remains to be seen. Certainly the perspectives of donor countries will continue to play a dominant role. Amidst these issues one thing is clear: greater attention to the challenges facing the developing world will be required in a world increasingly defined by global economic and development issues.

Questions to consider from your government's perspective on this issue include:

- How can North-South partnerships be leveraged to enhance the limited financial resources available for development?
- Are regional partnerships and cooperative arrangements among developing countries a viable alternative to the current framework? Do these agreements help developing

countries integrate into the world economic community, or do they contribute to marginalization and parochialism?

- Developing countries continue to call for bridging the "digital divide." How should this be done with regard to respecting intellectual property? Should bridging the divide be a priority over perhaps more immediate concerns?

Bibliography:

"General Assembly Opens High-Level Dialogue on Cooperation for Development." UN News service, 21 Sep 2001. www.globalpolicy.org/socecon/un/2001/0921ga.htm
 "Global Development Finance 1998: Analysis and Summary Tables." The World Bank. Washington D.C.: World Bank, 1998.

"Proposals by Zedillo panel to fight poverty would alter international financial skyline." Press Release, 28 Jun 2001. www.un.org/reports/financing/press_release.htm

Rich, Anna. "The UN and Financing for Development." Briefing Paper No. 2/98. 6/98. www.afsc.org/quono/BP0698.htm.

UN Documents:

A/48/935, "An Agenda for Development," Report of the Secretary-General, 6 May 1994

A/55/1000, "Report of the High-level Panel on Financing for Development," 26 Jun 2001

A/55/28, "Report of the Preparatory Committee for the High-level International Intergovernmental Event on Financing for Development," 10 Jan 2001

A/55/314, "Renewal of the Dialogue on Strengthening International Economic Cooperation for Development through Partnership," Report of the Secretary-General, 16 Aug 2000

A/AC.257/12, Report of the Secretary-General to the Preparatory Committee for the High-level International Intergovernmental Event on Financing for Development

A/CONF/198, "Final Outcome of the International Conference on Financing for Development," Monterrey Consensus, 1 Mar 2002

A/Res/52/179, Global Partnership for Development: High-level International Intergovernmental Consideration of Financing for Development, 14 Jan 1998

A/Res/53/173, 19 Jan 1999, Financing for development

A/Res/54/196, 14 Jan 2000, High-level international intergovernmental consideration of financing for development

A/Res/55/193, 15 Jan 2001, High-level dialogue on strengthening international economic cooperation for development through partnership

DPI/2171/B/Rev.2, Jun 2001, Global Financial Profile.

G/27/2000, Press Release, 27 July 2000

Additional Web Resource:

www.oecd.org/oecd/pages/home/displaygeneral/0,3380,EN-countrylist-57-2-no-no-77-57,00.html, Donor Aid at a Glance charts, OECD, 3 Jan 2002



THE THIRD COMMITTEE (SOCIAL, HUMANITARIAN AND CULTURAL)

PROMOTION AND PROTECTION OF THE RIGHTS OF CHILDREN: PROTECTION OF CHILDREN IN ARMED CONFLICT

In the history of human warfare, the twentieth century is marred by the plight of civilians during armed conflict. Modern warfare, with its roots in the First World War, has been the cause of countless civilian deaths and the displacement of innocent civilians around the world. Although the plight of children in armed conflict has been a serious issue since the introduction of modern warfare, global concern was heightened during the 1990s. In the last decade alone, two million children have been killed in conflicts, over one million were orphaned, six million have been seriously injured or permanently disabled and over ten million have been left with grave psychological trauma. In addition, over 20 million children have been displaced from their homes within and outside their country and around 800 children are killed or maimed every month from landmines. These disheartening statistics underscore the predicament children face during times of armed conflict. Children are not only losing the right to their own lives, but in countless examples they have been drafted as soldiers by unscrupulous governments or mercenaries for political conquest. At present, children are suffering in the midst of armed conflict and in its aftermath in approximately 50 countries with some 300,000 children under the age of 18 exploited as child soldiers in 30 areas of conflict around the world.

Since the 1990 World Summit for Children, the United Nations has increasingly brought the plight of children affected by armed conflict to the world's attention. The primary document that protects the rights of children is the 1989 Convention on the Rights of the Child. It spells out the basic human rights children have: the right to survival, the right to develop to the fullest, the right to protection from harmful influence, abuse, and exploitation, and the right to participate fully in family, cultural and social life (UNICEF, 2002). It is the first legally binding international treaty that incorporates civil, political, economic, social, and cultural rights into its framework. It is one of the most universal documents, as 191 countries have ratified the Convention. To date, only two countries - the United States and Somalia - have not ratified the Convention. In 1993, the General Assembly (GA) adopted resolution 48/157, recommending that an independent expert be appointed by the Secretary-General to study the impact of armed conflict on children (A/Res/48/157, 7 March 1994). Ms. Garça Machel, former Minister of Education of Mozambique, was subsequently appointed to conduct the study with support from the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the UN Center for Human Rights. After three years of research, Ms. Machel submitted her report, entitled "Impact of Armed Conflict on Children," in 1996 to the GA during its 51st session (A/51/306, 26 August 1996). Her report outlined how children are affected by conflict, viewed as unfortunate victims of war, and that they were increasingly being targeted through the conscious and deliber-

ate decisions made by adults. Her report went on to recommend that a special representative be appointed by the Secretary-General to support UN efforts to end this terrible situation. The GA responded to her report through Resolution 51/77, requesting that the Secretary-General appoint a Special Representative for three years (A/Res/51/77, 20 February 1997).

In September 1997, Mr. Olara A. Otunnu was appointed by Secretary-General Kofi Annan as the Special Representative for Children in Armed Conflict. He was given the mandate to promote the protection, rights and welfare of children during every phase of conflict. Mr. Otunnu's personal goals include raising awareness and mobilizing the international community to take action to protect children embroiled in armed conflicts, to promote the application of international norms and local values on the need to protect children in conflict situations, and to undertake diplomatic and political steps to provide concrete initiatives. Noting that over half the world's refugees are children and the need to address the plight of child soldiers and provide for their rehabilitation into society, the Special Representative works closely with UNHCR, UNICEF, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, and relevant Non-Governmental Organizations. The mandate of the Special Representative was extended for another three years during the 54th session of the GA (A/Res/54/149, 25 February 2000).

One of the achievements of the Special Representative has been the establishment and deployment of Child Protection Advisers as an integral component of peacekeeping missions, approved unanimously by the Security Council in August 1999 (S/Res/1261, 25 August 1999). Child advocates are part of the central staff of heads of field missions and work to ensure that children's interests are not marginalized in policy-making, resource allocation and priority setting functions in peacekeeping operations. Through UN agency, national and non-governmental collaboration, Child Protection Advisers coordinate their efforts with a variety of humanitarian organizations involved in conflict and post-conflict activities. Child Protection Advisers have been deployed in Sierra Leone (S/Res/1260) and in the Democratic Republic of Congo (S/Res/1279) to help train peace keeping personnel about the rights of children and to assist with the demobilization and reintegration of child soldiers, the resettlement of children and families displaced by the armed conflicts in their respective regions, and to help provide social, psychological, medical, and educational services to children traumatized by conflict.

On 4 May 2002, the United Nations held a Special General Assembly Session (UNGASS) on Children to review the progress made since the 1990 World Summit for Children and to renew the world's commitment to improve the living conditions of children, to increase their chances of survival, to reduce the spread of preventable diseases, to create more educational opportunities and to provide better nutrition and sanitation services to allow children to realize their full potential. The overarching goal of the session was to reinvigorate political support for renewed commitments and to refocus the



global agenda to include the complex and dynamic forces that impact the daily lives of children. With regard to armed conflict, UNGASS underscored the need for more countries to ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict. Adopted by the GA on 25 May 2000, the Optional Protocol raises the age at which children are allowed to participate in armed conflict from 15 to 18 and establishes a ban on compulsory recruitment below 18 years of age. The Protocol came into force on 12 February 2002 and to date 109 countries have signed on and 33 have ratified the Protocol. The Coalition to Stop the Use of Child Soldiers, founded in 1998, participated in a variety of events during UNGASS to highlight the use of children as soldiers in conflict and the challenges ahead in reintegrating them into civilian society. How the world can best protect its children during times of conflict remains one of the most fundamental political, social, and humanitarian questions before the UN System.

Questions to consider from your government's perspective on this issue include:

- What steps has your government taken to address the issue of protecting children affected by armed conflict?
- What role can and should the UN play to further the efforts of the international community in addressing this issue?
- What mechanisms are available to better coordinate on-the-ground strategies to protect the rights of children?
- How can the role of the Special Representative be further integrated into the decision making structure of the UN System?

Bibliography:

- “Child Soldiers on the Global Agenda.” *Child Soldiers Newsletter*, Issue 4. Coalition to Stop the Use of Child Soldiers, Jun 2002. www.child-soldiers.org/
- “Children Principal Victim Of Mines, Says UN Envoy.” *UN Wire*, 17 June 2002.
- “Children's Status Falls Short Of UN Targets.” *UN Wire*, 25 March 2001.
- “Conference Address Children in War Time.” *UN Wire*, 27 April 2000.
- “Countries Agree To Ban Minors From Combat.” *UN Wire*, 23 January 2000.
- “Displacement and Child Soldiering.” *Policy Paper in Child Soldiers Newsletter*, Issue 4. Coalition to Stop the Use of Child Soldiering, June 2002. www.child-soldiers.org/
- “Former Peacekeeper Links Children, Violence.” *UN Wire*, 11 July 2001.
- “Jordan Meeting Examines Problems In Middle East.” *UN Wire*, 8 April 2001.
- “Optional Protocols to the Convention on the Rights of the Child.” UNICEF, 2002. www.unicef.org/crc/oppro.htm
- “Otunnu Begin Visit, Speaks on Children's Issues.” *UN Wire*, 21 July 2002.
- “Refugees International Warns Of Risks Children Face.” *UN Wire*, 6 February 2002.
- “Million Children Killed In Conflicts In Decade - Report.”

- UN Wire*, 6 May 2001.
- “UN Envoy Evaluates Progress OF Child Victims of War.” *UN Wire*, 24 February 2002.
- “UN Official Calls For Enforcement of Protections.” *UN Wire*, 27 October 1999.
- “UN Representative Calls For Worldwide Cease-fire.” *UN Wire*, 11 April 2000.
- “UN To Examine Protecting Women, Children In Conflict.” *UN Wire*, 8 November 2001.
- “UNICEF Head Say Children Are At Higher Risk.” *UN Wire*, 3 December 2001.

UN Documents:

- A/51/306, 26 Aug 1996, Impact of Armed Conflict on Children
- A/53/482, 12 Oct 1998, Protection of Children affected by Armed Conflict: Report of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict
- A/54/430, 1 Oct 1999, Protection of Children affected by Armed Conflict: Report of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict
- A/54/L.84, 16 May 2000, Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict
- A/Res/48/157, 7 Mar 1994, Protection of Children Affected by Armed Conflict
- A/Res/54/149, 25 Feb 2000, The Rights of the Child
- A/S-27/19/Rev.1, 4 Jun 2002, A World Fit for Children
- E/CN.4/2000/L.11/Add.8, 28 Apr 2000, Commission on Human Rights Omnibus Resolution on the Rights of the Child
- GA/SHC/3382, Press Release, 8 Nov 1996, Report on the Impact of Armed Conflict on Children Exposes Moral Vacuum, Secretary-General's Expert Tells Third Committee
- HR/4463/PKO/85, 22 Feb 2002, UN Announces Deployment of Child Protection Advisers, Groundbreaking Development in UN Peacekeeping
- S/2000/101, 11 Feb 2000, Report of the Secretary-General on the Role of UN Peacekeeping in Disarmament, Demobilisation, and Reintegration
- S/2000/712, 19 Jul 2000, Report of the Secretary-General on Children and Armed Conflict
- S/Res/1260, 20 Aug 1999, Peacekeeping in Sierra Leone
- S/Res/1261, 25 Aug 1999, Children and Armed Conflict
- S/Res/1265, 17 Sep 1999, Protection of Civilian in Armed Conflict
- S/Res/1279, 30 Nov 1999, The Situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo
- S/Res/1296, 19 Apr 2000, Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict
- S/Res/1314, 11 Aug 2000, Children and Armed Conflict

Additional Web Resources:

- www.un.org/special-rep/children-armed-conflict/index.html
- www.un.org/millennium/sg/report/index.html
- www.un.org/special-rep/children-armed-conflict/fUnDocs.htm



INTERNATIONAL DRUG CONTROL

The impact of illicit drug use and trade has been recognized by the United Nations as a global problem that affects the economic, social and political stability of all nations. Approximately 200 million people abuse drugs worldwide. Drug abuse affects both affluent societies and poor communities, reducing the effectiveness of development programs and causing damage to the social fabric that binds communities together. Drug use is responsible for lost wages, soaring healthcare costs, broken families and deteriorating communities. Intravenous drug use is also fueling the rapid spread of HIV/AIDS and hepatitis. There is a direct link between drugs and the incidence of crime and violence. Drug cartels can often undermine governments and corrupt legitimate businesses. In some countries, it is estimated that addicts supporting their habits commit more than 50 percent of thefts. Revenues from illicit drugs fund some of the most deadly armed conflicts in the world. In an effort to stem the flow of drugs, countries have spent a staggering amount of resources to strengthen police forces, border patrols, judicial systems and treatment and rehabilitation programs. In addition, the social costs are equally confounding. Street violence, gang warfare, fear and urban decay are often symptoms of a larger problem.

Drug control has been a factor of life for the countries and corporations of the world since the Opium Commission was founded in Shanghai in 1909. Following the establishment of the UN, three conventions have been adopted, establishing guidelines for drug control: the 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs (amended by the 1972 Protocol), the 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances and the 1988 UN Convention Against the Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances. Each of these documents provides a set of guidelines for countries to apply and to participate in as a means of curbing illegal drug flow and retaining control over legal substances. In addition, a number of UN resolutions have underscored the transnational nature of the problem, particularly focusing on the link between terrorism, drug trafficking and illegal arms procurement, the need for an intersectoral approach to fighting crime and drug trafficking, sub-regional and regional coordination in the fight against the illegal drug trade, and the impact of illicit drugs on the world's youth (A/Res/55/65, 26 January 2001; A/Res/54/132, 2 February 2000).

Though it is decidedly difficult to determine the best way to control the flow of both legal and illegal drugs, the United Nations works with the international regime on legal drugs to ensure a sufficient supply for medicinal purposes as well as to assist Member States in restricting the flow of illegal drugs. A variety of UN agencies are responsible for coordinating the UN's drug programs. The main organ in maintaining this delicate balance is the UN Office for Drug Control and Crime

Prevention (ODCCP). Created in 1997, this office makes the point that drug abuse and subsequent obstacles, such as diseases contracted through misuse, are a global and individual issue. The UN ODCCP also monitors and reports monthly on adherence to the aforementioned treaties. The UN International Drug Control Programme (UNDCP), established by the General Assembly in 1991, works to educate the world about drug abuse and its associated problems. The Programme later became a part of the ODCCP. The Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) is also involved with this issue. The Commission on Narcotic Drugs was established in 1946 by ECOSOC and provides guidance to nations seeking to create and to implement drug control legislation. The Commission also serves as the policy arm of the UN, formulating policy recommendations with regard to drug issues to be adopted by the Member States.

Current issues on the agenda for the ODCCP are alternative development, crop monitoring, law enforcement and the current situation in Afghanistan. The idea behind alternative development is to target sources of illegal substances such as coca and opium poppies. Many times the farmers who engage in this illicit agriculture see it as the only lucrative crop. The ODCCP is working in community-based partnerships to educate the rural poor in techniques as well as to overcome gender barriers in development strategies. This activity is currently based in the Andean region of South America and South Asia. The same groups working within the local communities are also working with the local governments to monitor crops grown in their jurisdictions. There is also a global effort to use satellite imagery and geographic information systems to monitor where workers are not allowed. The ODCCP has named six countries as main suppliers of coca (Peru, Bolivia and Colombia) and opium poppy (Afghanistan, Laos and Myanmar) and has focused its efforts there. Law enforcement is applied as an initiative when the drugs leave the producing nations and enter the transporting and receiving nations. The current situation in Afghanistan is the most recent example of all three initiatives in action and may well serve as a benchmark in determining how supportive the global community will be in the realm of international drug control to a young government.

Questions to consider from your government's perspective on this issue include:

- Is your country directly affected by the UN ODCCP initiatives? If so, which ones and in what capacity?
- How does your government feel about supranational authority on the issue of drug control?
- Has your government voiced an opinion on the issue contrary to the vein of UN actions? If so, how was this opinion received in the global arena?
- How can the UN better assist Member States to thwart the use of drug revenue in supporting illegal and/or violent activities?

Bibliography:

"China Marks UN Anti-Drug Day With Executions; More."
UN Wire, 26 June 2001.



“Government, ODCCP Launch Survey Of Teen Drug Abuse.” *UN Wire*, 27 March 2002.

“ODCCP, EU Increase Cooperation On Monitoring Trends.” *UN Wire*, 11 July 2002.

“ODCCP, Government Launch Anti-Corruption Program.” *UN Wire*, July 11, 2002.

“ODCCP Launches Project Against Drugs, Organized Crime.” *UN Wire*, 17 June 2002.

“ODCCP Unveils New Anti-Narcotics Measures.” *UN Wire*, 12 July 2002.

“Tokyo Meeting On Drugs Addresses Youth, Afghanistan; More.” *UN Wire*, 24 April 2002.

“UNDCP, Local NGOs Join To Fight Narcotics.” *UN Wire*, 25 January 2002.

“UNDCP To Assist With OAU Conference On Drug Trafficking.” *UN Wire*, 10 May 2002.

“UNDCP Wraps Up Narcotics Commission Session.” *UN Wire*, 18 March 2002.

UN Documents:
 A/Res/53/115
 A/Res/54/132
 A/Res/55/65
 A/55/594
 GA/SCH/3579, (2 Oct 2000)
 GA/SHC/3532, (20 Oct 1999)
 UNIS/NAR/742, (15 Mar 2002)

Additional Web Resources:
www.undcp.org/index.html
www.undcp.org/drug_demand_reduction.html
www.undcp.org/alternative_development.html
www.undcp.org/crop_monitoring.html
www.undcp.org/law_enforcement.html
www.undcp.org/treaty_and_legal_affairs.html
www.undcp.org/event_2001-06-26_1.html
www.emcdda.org/links/europe.shtml
www.undcp.org/cnd_session_45.html -- The 45th Session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs (11-15 Mar 2002)

THE SIXTH COMMITTEE (LEGAL)

MEASURES TO ELIMINATE INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

On 11 September 2001, the world was witness to the total devastation that international terrorism can bring to bear. Acts of terrorism have again stopped the peace process in the Middle East, bringing the fighting there once more to dangerous levels. Instances of terrorism throughout the globe have been alarmingly on the increase. The international community has recognized the severity of this issue; terrorism's effect on the human rights of its victims, the difficulty in tracking down the actors and their supporters, and the destabilizing effect terrorism has on the international community itself make this issue one of urgent and great importance.

The United Nations has been attempting to bring states together to combat terrorism for decades. Through dozens of treaties ranging from the 1963 Convention on Offences and Certain Other Acts Committed On Board Aircraft, to the protection of human rights of non-actors and the illegal trafficking of arms and drugs, the UN and other international bodies have struggled to combat this issue. But these treaties have been largely ineffectual in combating the problems of terrorism because the actors themselves are difficult to trace, let alone apprehend and bring to justice. Each year, the Secretary-General, the General Assembly (GA) and the Security Council revisit the issues surrounding international acts of terror, including issues of human rights, the funding of terrorists and the responsibilities of state actors.

In 1994 the GA, through Resolution 49/60, outlined what it saw as measures to eliminate international terrorism. This document not only outlines the previous treaties and conventions on the subject, but also calls attention to the roles states must play in accepting responsibility in the protection of their citizens against terror, whether it is in protection of their human rights, or ensuring that the states are not harboring terrorists. The resolution also called upon the Secretary-General

to assist in the implementation of the measures, with emphasis on the collection of data on the status of implementation and on the existing international laws and regulations regarding the prevention of international terrorism.

In an effort to further the progress in implementing the GA's recommendations, an Ad Hoc Committee was established by resolution 52/210 in 1996. The Ad Hoc Committee on Terrorism was asked to elaborate on and solidify existing conventions related to international terrorism. In 1997, the UN adopted the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings and in 1999 it adopted the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism to complement and strengthen existing measures. The 6th Committee has a special interest in this Ad Hoc Committee, and has a standing working group committed to the issue. The GA has continually reframed the mission of the Ad Hoc Committee, committing it to work on expanding the various treaties and conventions related to international terrorism and on gaining compliance among the UN's Member States. The Committee's work regarding the aspects of international law related to the prevention of terrorism has been especially important. The UN has invested a large amount of its resources into finding a solution to this problem because of its scope and devastating consequences.

Most recently, the General Assembly convened a high level session from 1-5 October 2001 to discuss the topic of terrorism in the aftermath of the events of 11 September. Speakers focused on their renewed commitment to combating terrorism in all forms, and expressed strong support for and condolences toward the US. In particular, many speeches emphasized the need to follow the existing international legal instruments on terrorism. Discussion has also continued on the drafting of a comprehensive treaty on terrorism, to cover all of the areas not currently included in existing instruments. The Ad Hoc Committee on Terrorism has been tasked with

this discussion, which frequently overflows into General Assembly debate. In a recent report (Press Release L/2993 of 2 January 2002) the Ad Hoc Committee described the key stumbling bloc as an inability to decide who would be entitled to exclusion from the treaty's scope. Deciding who is a terrorist is often difficult, with many different perspectives on the topic, some of which are mutually exclusive. This will likely continue to be the key problem in creating a broad definition of terrorism into the future.

Questions to consider from your government's perspective on this issue include:

- What are your state's specific concerns regarding acts of international terrorism?
- To which treaties, protocols and conventions is your state a party, and what are its concerns regarding the ones to which it is not a party?
- How can the work of the 6th Committee be used to help implement the existing framework on measures to eliminate international terrorism?
- What can this body do to further prevent acts of international terrorism?

Bibliography:

"Annan Seeks More Limits On Weapons Of Mass Destruction." *UN Wire*, 1 October 2001.

"Countries Consider Links Between Drugs, Terrorism." *UN Wire*, 16 October 2001.

"Global Battle Should Not Mean Violating Freedoms, Experts Say." *UN Wire*, 29 November 2001.

"Muslim and EU States End Forum, Urge Tolerance." *UN Wire*, 12 February 2002.

"OSCE Calls For 'Comprehensive' Fight At Kyrgyzstan Meeting." *UN Wire*, 12 December 2001.

"Poverty, Middle East Conflict Key Factors, African Leaders Told." *UN Wire*, 17 October 2001.

"Progress Reported On Implementing UN Resolutions." *UN Wire*, 27 June 2002.

"Stress Human Rights to Avoid Terrorism-Robinson." *UN Wire*, 9 October 2001.

"Symposium Aims To Channel UN Efforts To Fight Scourge." *UN Wire*, 3 June 2002.

"Terrorism, Poverty Dominate High-Level Meeting." *UN Wire*, 18 November 2001.

"UN Focuses On Terrorism On World Day." *UN Wire*, 2 May 2002.

"UN Panel Urges Cooperation Against Terrorism; More." *UN Wire*, 25 April 2002.

"UN To Launch Information Campaign In Arab World." *UN Wire*, 31 July 2002.

"UN, International Conferences Debate Prevention Measures." *UN Wire*, 28 October 2001.

Wurst, Jim. "Counterterrorism Committee Extended As It Enters Phase Three." *UN Wire*, 15 April 2002.

Wurst, Jim. "Lubbers Warns Against Making 'Scapegoats' In Anti-Terror War." *UN Wire*, 7 February 2002.

Wurst, Jim. "Negotiations On Anti-Terrorism Treaties Yield No Progress." *UN Wire*, 3 February 2002.

Wurst, Jim. "Security Council Begins Evaluating Counterterror Measures." *UN Wire*, 17 January 2002.

UN Documents:

A/56/190: SG's Report on Human Rights and Terrorism

A/56/160: SG's Report on Measures to Eliminate International Terrorism

A/Res/56/1: Condemnation of terrorist attacks in the United States of America

A/Res/55/158: Measures to eliminate international terrorism

A/Res/54/439

A/Res/54/164: Human rights and terrorism

A/Res/54/110: Measures to eliminate international terrorism

A/Res/54/109: International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism

A/Res/53/108: Measures to eliminate international terrorism

A/Res/52/165: Measures to eliminate international terrorism

L/2993 (2 Jan 2002): Press Release from the Ad Hoc Committee on Terrorism

A/Res/51/210

A/Res/49/60

S/PRST/2000/38

S/Res/1269 (1999)

S/Res/1373 (2001)

Additional Web Resources:

www.un.org/law/terrorism/index.html

www.un.org/terrorism

www.un.org/terrorism/sc.htm

www.un.org/terrorism/ga.htm

www.un.org/dda/terrorism.htm

www.ict.org.il

state.gov/www/global/terrorism

www.globalterrorism101.com

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION AGAINST THE REPRODUCTIVE CLONING OF HUMAN BEINGS

As scientific advances continue in the field of genetic research, a growing international debate has ensued around the legal, ethical and moral implications of these breakthroughs. With the completion of the human genome project at the turn of the century and the successful cloning of a sheep in 1997 from the cells of an adult, genetic research has raised the possibility that methods to clone human beings are now within reach. Human cloning is seen to have a variety of uses. It may be used as a means for reproduction, to avoid genetic diseases or for the laboratory growth of compatible tissues for transplantation. Nevertheless, the international community has raised considerable concerns about the use of the human genome in scientific experiments that would be considered incompatible with respect for human dignity. This concern is significant considering the announcements of several scientists of their intention to pursue human reproductive cloning.

Human cloning is a divisive issue that centers on complex scientific thought and the definition of human life. Within the context of the debate exists a unique dynamic between inter-



national law and scientific progress in regards to genetics. The main question is whether cloning that attempts to create a new human being (reproductive cloning) should be illegal for ethical and moral reasons. The issue has created a new chapter in the argument over just what constitutes a human being. Some scholars, practitioners, and theologians see those cells as early stages of a human being, and as such believe any research would bring about the destruction of life. However, in terms of therapeutic cloning, which involves using embryonic cells for research in combating afflictions and diseases, there is significant debate.

On 11 November 1997, The Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights was unanimously adopted by acclamation by 186 Member States at the 29th General Conference of the United Nations Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). Shortly thereafter, in 1998, the United Nations General Assembly (GA) endorsed the Declaration. The construction and subsequent adoption of the Declaration was made possible by the passage of a resolution by UNESCO on 15 November 1993. This resolution approved the “preparation of an international instrument for the protection of the human genome,” and created the International Bioethics Committee (IBC) (27C/Resolution 5.15, 15 September 1993). Upon its inception, the IBC announced the creation of a Legal Commission that was to study the means necessary to create an international convention on the protection of the human genome. The Legal Commission had approximately two years to discharge its duties. In November 1996 the Legal Commission presented a preliminary draft of a Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights to UNESCO, which was soon after adopted. After its adoption, the Member States in UNESCO agreed to a resolution on its implementation (29C/Resolution 17, 11 November 1997).

The Universal Declaration emphasized the preservation of human dignity, recognized the common heritage of humanity, sought to protect the fundamental rights of each individual in relation to the development of human genetics, and guaranteed the protection of the human genome and its intangibility. Although the Declaration is legally nonbinding and considered somewhat ambiguous, it makes some important statements regarding the genetic rights of human beings. It concluded that “everyone has a right to respect for their dignity and for their human rights regardless of their genetic characteristics” and that “dignity makes it imperative not to reduce individuals to their genetic characteristics and to respect their uniqueness and diversity” (Articles 2a and 2b). The Declaration also emphasized that reproductive cloning would threaten the “entire human family.” Thus, it prohibits the cloning of humans for reproductive purposes, while excluding from the ban other, non-reproductive types of cloning.

Upon the request of France and Germany for the creation of a legally binding agreement at the beginning of the 56th session of the GA, the Sixth Committee was given the responsibility to determine the necessity of such an instrument. At the conclusion of its deliberations, the Sixth Committee passed a resolution calling for an “International Convention Against the Reproductive Cloning of Human

Beings,” and created an Ad Hoc Committee to begin drafting the mandate necessary to carry out its recommendations and to address the issues related in protecting the human genome in the realm of scientific progress (A/C.6/56/L.19, 19 November 2001). The resolution was officially endorsed by the GA in January 2002 (A/RES/56/93, 28 January 2002). At present, the Ad Hoc Committee continues to work to define the scope of the convention and to determine what legal means are available for enforcing a ban on reproductive cloning. Building off of the principles of the Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights and fully cognizant of the multidisciplinary legal complexities involved in addressing this issue before the international community, the Committee has sought advice from other UN agencies and bodies (such as the Economic and Social Council, the World Health Organization, and the Commission on Human Rights), country representatives, and scientific, legal and bioethics experts. Formal negotiations on translating the non-binding ECOSOC Declaration into a binding instrument is expected to continue throughout the year.

Questions to consider from your government’s perspective on this issue include:

- How should the international community define “cloning?” Should the ban be limited only to human cloning for reproductive ends or should cloning tissue cells for transplantation also be included?
- By banning human reproductive cloning, is humanity prevented from scientific and technological progress?
- Should the work of the Sixth Committee be expanded to include non-human cloning?
- Considering that human cloning may be used to enable a sterile couple to have children, does the ban on cloning conflict with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights’ Article 16 guaranteeing the right to “found a family” and Article 12 guaranteeing freedom from “arbitrary interference with privacy, family, etc.?”
- How would the UN monitor and enforce an international convention? Would the convention have jurisdiction over individual scientists or over the countries where the scientists conduct the research?

Bibliography:

- “Bid to Outlaw Human Cloning.” 8 Aug 2001. www.cnn.com
- Kass, Leon and Wilson, James Q. *The Ethics of Human Cloning*. Washington, D.C.: AEI Press, 1998.
- Koalta, Gina and Pollack, Andrew. “A Breakthrough on Cloning? Perhaps, or Perhaps Not Yet.” *New York Times*, 27 Nov 2001: A1.
- MacKinnon, Barbara. *Human Cloning Science, Ethics, and Public Policy*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2000.
- Masci, David. “Designer Humans.” *CQ Researcher*, 18 May 2001: 425-440.
- Masci, David. “The Cloning Controversy.” *CQ Researcher*, 9 May 1997: 411-427.
- Postrel, Virginia. “Should Human Cloning Be Allowed? Yes, Don’t Impede Medical Progress.” *Wall Street Journal*, 5 Dec



2001: A19.
Stock, Gregory. "Cloning: A Tempest in a Petri Dish." *Los Angeles Times*, 2 Dec 2001: M1.
Stolberg, Sheryl Gay. "Bush Makes Fervent Bid to Get Senate to Ban Cloning Research." *New York Times*, 11 Apr 2002: 28.
Travis, John. "Dolly Was Lucky: Scientists Warn that Cloning is too Dangerous for People." *Science News*, 26 Oct 2001: 16.
"UN Asked to Broker Talks on a Cloning Ban." 9 Aug 2001. www.igc.org/globalpolicy/socecon/global/0809clone.htm

UN Documents:

22 C/Resolution 13.1
23 C/Resolution 13.1
24 C/Resolution 13.1
25 C/Resolution 5.2
25 C/Resolution 7.3
27 C/Resolution 5.15 (15 Nov 1993)
28 C/Resolution 2.2 (14 Nov 1995)
29 C/Resolution 17 (11 Nov 1997)
30 C/Resolution 26 and Add. Implementation Resolution (16

Nov 1997)
A/RES/56/93, 28 Jan 2002, Resolution adopted by the GA on convention against reproductive cloning
A/Res/53/152 (9 Dec 1998)
A/Res/56/192, 7 Sep 2001, Request for Inclusion of Supplementary Item for 6th Committee Agenda on Convention Against Reproductive Cloning
A/Res/56/599, 26 Nov 2001, Report of the 6th Committee on Convention Against Reproductive Cloning
A/C.6/56/L.19 (19 Nov 2001)
A/C.6/56/SR.27 (19 Nov 2001)
GA/9908, Press Release, 14 Sep 2001
GA/9998, Press Release, 12 Dec 2001
GA/L/3199, Press Release, 19 Nov 2001
HR/CN/1999/63
E/CN.4/RES/2001/71 (25 Apr 2001)

Additional Web Resource:

The Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and on Human Rights: www.unesco.org/ibc/en/genome/



CHAPTER V.

THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

INTRODUCTION TO THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

In keeping with the tradition of presenting a unique simulation of a United Nations body, AMUN 2002 will simulate the Commission on Human Rights (CHR) of the United Nations. Participation will be voluntary and open to one Representative from any delegation attending AMUN. CHR will meet for all four days of the Conference. While the range of subject matter before CHR may seem daunting, significant work on the topics of discussion is nonetheless achievable with thoughtful preparation.

Before delving into the substantive issues, Representatives should understand why this Commission is distinctive. In the tradition of AMUN special simulations, CHR will give participants a diverse, more challenging atmosphere in which to use their skills of diplomacy, research and analysis. The topics to be discussed are detailed, and will require careful preparation prior to conference. In order to fully participate in the simulation, it will be imperative that Representatives have a working knowledge of the structure and mission of the CHR, the relevant policies of the Member State they represent, and an awareness of human rights issues worldwide.

ABOUT CHR

The United Nations Commission on Human Rights is composed of 53 Member States, which meet in Geneva in regular session for six weeks during March and April. Representatives of Member, non-Member and Observer States, as well as those of non-governmental organizations, participate in the regular session. The Commission can also meet outside of its regular session in a special session, on the condition that the majority of the Member States agree. In general, special sessions are called to deal with “urgent and acute human rights situations in the most expeditious way.” During the regular session, the Commission tends to adopt about a hundred resolutions. It is within these sessions that many aspects of human rights pertaining to almost every region and situation are discussed. The Commission is assisted by the Sub-Commission on the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights, several working groups, individual experts, representatives and rapporteurs mandated to report on specific issues.

THE SIMULATION

During the 2002 AMUN Conference the simulation of the Commission on Human Rights will be a special session. As mentioned before, a regular session involves many issues encompassing all regions of the world and discussed in detail over six weeks. For the purposes of facilitating a simulation in four days, the special session will focus on two issues: the rights of refugees and the right to development. The Commission will also present a report, including resolutions, to the Economic and Social Council in the last Council session of the Conference. Also, for the purposes of this simulation, all UN Member States will be considered to have a seat in the special session.

PREPARATION

As a foundation for subsequent research, Representatives should familiarize themselves with not only foundation documents, such as the UN Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, but also the 2001 Human Development Report and the objectives of the Millennium Summit held in September 2000. Careful review of the provided topic overviews and the related bibliographies will provide some assistance in this regard. It should be noted however that the topic overviews should not serve as the terminal point for research efforts but only as the beginning.

BACKGROUND RESEARCH

THE RIGHTS OF REFUGEES

The situation of the world’s refugees is one of the most complex issues before the international community. The changing nature of human conflict has also changed the manner in which women, men and children find themselves involuntarily forced to flee violent conflicts, political, economic and social persecution, and other forms of psychological and physical endangerment. The problem today has become both

multidimensional and global, creating an even larger need to find preventive and permanent solutions to the refugee situation, especially in the face of the realities surrounding the new security crisis following the horrific events of 11 September 2001.

The 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees lays the groundwork for refugee rights today. The convention defines the term “refugee” and establishes some of the basic rights of refugees as well as the legal obligations of states. It



also prohibits the forcible return of persons granted refugee status. The 1967 Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees refined the definition by removing geographical and temporal restrictions. Article 33 of the Convention establishes the principle of non-refoulement, which provides the right of a refugee not to be returned to a place where his or her life or freedom is threatened. In 1949, the General Assembly (GA) created the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). The office was set up as a subsidiary body of the GA in 1951 and was created to protect refugees and to assist governments in repatriating or integrating refugees into the host country society.

The status and nature of the refugee problem has changed in recent decades since the establishment of UNHCR and the subsequent ratification of the 1951 Convention and the 1967 Protocol. In 1951, there were an estimated one million refugees within its mandate, primarily within Continental Europe. Today, the estimate has grown to 21.1 million with an additional 2.5 million cared for by the UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine refugees in the Near East (UNRWA). The majority of refugee populations are found in Africa or Asia, are women and children, and, unlike in the past, refugee movements increasingly occur in mass exodus. Finally, the causes of mass exodus and the incumbent refugee problems are now multifaceted and often fall outside the definition established in the Convention. Natural and ecological disasters, extreme poverty and other forms of economic hardship, and violations of human rights as well as the new security threats related to international terrorism are often the primary or contributing factors forcing people to flee their country of origin.

The relationship between human rights and the refugee problem is clear. Under many circumstances, human rights violations are the direct cause of mass exodus and prevent the voluntary return of refugees. Minority populations are often singled out during times of ethnic, social or political strife, causing them to flee to neighboring countries or to seek asylum in far away countries in Europe or North America. During these difficult times, refugees often face discrimination and disregard for their basic human rights as guaranteed under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and can confront restrictive policies that prevent their access to safe territories when they seek asylum. Asylum seekers also can face situations in which they are forcibly returned to areas where their lives, liberty and security are endangered. Often, refugee populations can become embroiled in armed conflict, becoming pawns in a violent confrontation or forcibly recruited to fight for one side or another in civil conflicts. As the nature of armed conflict shifts from interstate to intrastate, the plight of internally displaced peoples has been brought to center stage.

Although refugee issues have always been a major concern to humanitarian organizations, the publicity of the post-11 September refugee crisis has increased the intensity of the debates. There are now over 50 million people globally that have been uprooted from their homes, but only 21.1 million of them are under the protection of the UNHCR. Serious concerns have been raised about the principle of non-refoulement,

the tightening of immigration and asylum policies, and arbitrary arrest and detention. In response to recent events and mounting criticism due to an increasing number of states that violate Article 33, UNHCR initiated the "Global Consultations on International Protection" talks to review the 1951 Convention. In December 2001, this group, consisting of governments, Non-Governmental Organizations and experts from 156 states and organizations, met and reaffirmed its commitment to the Convention, but raised several issues including security-related concerns and the importance of sharing refugee burdens equitably between states.

Currently, the regions of most concern regarding refugee populations are the Great Lakes region of Africa, the Balkans, Eastern Africa, the Horn of Africa, and Central Asia. The UNHCR characterizes the situation in Afghanistan as the "world's biggest repatriation and rehabilitation operation," with 3.7 million Afghans outside of their country and an additional 1.5 million internally displaced. The rights of refugees that have been of most concern recently include the principle of non-refoulement, which was violated by many nations following 11 September when they closed their borders for security reasons and refused to accept refugees. In addition, the tightening of immigration and asylum procedures has made it more difficult for refugees to seek safety from persecution. Displaced persons have also been increasingly subject to arbitrary arrest and detention, which violates the 1966 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR). These violations threaten the rights of refugees guaranteed under the UN Declaration of Human Rights, the ICCPR and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

Special populations of refugees have also received increased attention due to their unique needs. The majority of displaced people are women and children, who require protection against violence and abuse, as well as access to food, shelter, water, health care and education for children. Their needs are being increasingly addressed by the Executive Committee of the UNHCR, which has published guidelines on the protection of both women and children as refugees. These guidelines are intended to protect the rights of women and children as outlined in the 1979 Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women and the 1989 Convention on the Rights of the Child. On 8-10 May 2002 the GA held a special session on children's rights to review developments since the 1990 Summit on Children, which focused on the 25 million globally displaced children.

Within the context of the new security realities, there has been renewed emphasis on the part of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (UNHCHR) and UNHCR to ensure that human rights and the rights of refugees are not left out of the equation. In her report to the Commission on Human Rights on 27 February 2002, UNHCHR Mary Robinson underlined this importance by stating that those seeking asylum should not become victims of harsh anti-terrorist policies and reminded nations of their humanitarian obligations related to the protection of refugees, asylum-seekers, returnees and internally displaced peoples as reaffirmed in the Durban Declaration agreed to at the World Conference



against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance (E/CN.4/2002/18, 27 February 2002). In this context, the key issues surrounding refugee rights are the obligation of states to accept refugees, the sharing of burden by international donors, discrimination and xenophobia following 11 September, and the special needs of women and children. Human rights groups are now paying more attention to the violations of legal obligations and calling for cooperative international agreements to guarantee that the most basic rights are upheld.

Questions to consider from your government's perspective on this issue include:

- What measures should be undertaken to ensure that the rights of refugees are included in the post-11 September security agenda?
- What outcomes from the Global Consultations should be implemented to address security concerns and to ensure that responsibilities for refugees are shared equally among affected nations?
- What can be done to protect the rights of internally displaced people even though their status falls outside the 1951 Convention and the 1967 Protocol?

Bibliography:

"Agency Marks 50th Anniversary, Urges Respect of Refugees." *UN Wire*, 13 December 2000.

"As EU Meet, UN Warns Against Harsh Immigration Policies." *UN Wire*, 20 June 2002.

"Assistant UNHCR Head Outlines Priorities, Challenges." *UN Wire*, 24 July 2002.

"Australia Offers To Pay Refugees To Resettle." *UN Wire*, 30 January 2002.

Cowell, Alan. "Migrants Feel Chill in a Testy Europe." *The New York Times*, 28 April 2002.

Crossette, Barbara. "New Crisis Over Refugees Adrift in Their Own Lands." *The New York Times*, 24 July 2000.

Crossette, Barbara. "UN Studies How Refugees Qualify to Get Assistance." *The New York Times*, 14 January 2000.

"Displaced Nearing Record Levels - Rights Group." *UN Wire*, 24 June 2001.

"Iran Repatriations Begin Despite Insecurity; More." *UN Wire*, 9 April 2002.

Lyll, Sarah. "Fortress Britain to Asylum Seekers." *The New York Times*, 27 April 2002.

Lyll, Sarah. "When Asylum Seekers Knock, Europe Is Deaf." *The New York Times*, 20 June 2002.

MacFarquhar, Neil. "Mideast Turmoil: Homesickness; For Palestinian Refugees, Dream of Return Endures." *The New York Times*, 16 April 2002.

Perlez, Jane. "Deep Fears Behind Australia's Immigration Policy." *The New York Times*, 8 May 2002.

"Refugees Charge Int'l Community With Betrayal." *UN Wire*, 2 February 2000.

"Repatriate Refugees With Caution, NGO Tells UNCHR." *UN Wire*, 25 February 2002.

"Rights Chief Worried About Anti-Terrorism Impact On Refugees." *UN Wire*, 17 October 2001.

Rosenthal, Elizabeth. "China's Release of North Korean Refugees Sidesteps Sensitive Issue." *The New York Times*, 30 June 2001.

Schmemmann, Serge. "Mideast Turmoil: The Aftermath; U.S. Official at Jenin Sees 'Terrible Human Tragedy'." *The New York Times*, 21 April 2002.

Shaw, John. "Australians Rally for Largest Protest Yet Over Refugee Policy." *The New York Times*, 13 February 2002.

"Subcommission Tackles Justice, Terrorism, More." *UN Wire*, 28 July 2002.

"UN Committee Discusses Cooperation With Other Bodies." *UN Wire*, 30 January 2002.

"UN Jenin Report Sparks Controversy; More." *UN Wire*, 1 August 2002.

"UN Welcomes Pro-Refugee Ruling." *UN Wire*, 4 April 2000.

"UNHCR Fails Women Refugees, Rights Group Claims." *UN Wire*, 25 September 2000.

"UNHCR Responds To Critics Of Refugee Return Policy." *UN Wire*, 28 July 2002.

Wines, Michael. "Chechens Tell of Murderous Rampage by Russians." *The New York Times*, 21 April 2002.

UN Documents:

1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees

1966 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

1967 Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees

1979 Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women

1989 Convention on the Rights of the Child

1991 UNHCR guidelines on the Protection of Refugee Women

1994 UNHCR guidelines on Protection and Care of Refugee Children

A/56/168, Internally Displaced Persons

A/Conf.189/PC.1/9, Report of the Expert Seminar on Racism, Refugees, and Multi-Ethnic States

A/Res/49/7, Regional Conference on Assistance to Refugees, Returnees and Displaced Persons in the Great Lakes Region

A/Res/52/132, Human rights and mass exoduses

A/Res/53/128, The rights of the Child

A/Res/54/145, Assistance to unaccompanied refugee minors

A/Res/56/166, Human Rights and Mass Exoduses

E/CN.4/2002/18, Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and Follow-up to the World Conference on Human Rights

E/CN.4/RES/1993/70, Human Rights and Mass Exoduses

E/CN.4/RES/1993/95, Internally Displaced Persons

E/CN.4/RES/1999/56, Situation of Human Rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo

E/CN.4/RES/2002/56, Internally Displaced Persons

E/CN.4/SUB.2/RES/1996/9, The right to freedom of movement

E/CN.4/SUB.2/RES/1997/31, The right to return

E/CN.4/SUB.2/RES/1998/26, Housing and property restitution in the context of the return of refugees and internally displaced persons

E/CN.4/SUB.2/RES/2000/20, The right to seek and enjoy



asylum
E/CN.4/SUB.2/RES/2001/16, International protection for
refugees and displaced persons

Additional Web Resources:

www.unhcr.ch
www.unhchr.ch/html/intlinst.htm
www.unhcr.ch/pubs/sowr2000/sowr2000toc.htm
www.unhcr.ch/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/global-consultations
www.unhcr.ch/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/afghan
www.unhcr.ch/pubs/fdrs/ga2002/ga2002toc.htm
www.unhcr.ch/children/index.html
www.hrw.org/refugees/
www.hri.ca/children/mig_refIndex.htm

THE RIGHT TO DEVELOPMENT

According to the 2001 Human Development Report, the past 30 years have been rather impressive in human development. Overall, individuals around the world are living longer, are better educated and have higher incomes. More countries have accepted human rights covenants and conventions. Despite this, progress varies significantly between regions and groups of the world.

Throughout the history of the United Nations, human rights and the environment in which to promote such rights have been the cornerstone of many discussions and debates. Within these deliberations, the correlation between development and human rights has been touched upon at several instances. Although the Declaration of Human Rights addressed basic human rights, development was only alluded to and no further elaboration was made.

In 1957, the UN General Assembly (GA) addressed development in Resolution 1161 (XII). This resolution linked the concepts of development and human rights by stating that economic and social development would contribute towards the observance of and respect for human rights. This was the first time in which the correlation between development and human rights was explicitly mentioned. In a sense, the resolution was a commencement of the dialogue that would last for decades in the United Nations. At the International Conference on Human Rights in Tehran from 22 April to 13 May 1968, development issues became a focal point of many discussions. Specifically, the conference explicitly recognized the link between economic and social rights in the context of development and how this interconnection is important to the realization of human rights in the developing world. The main issue that was realized was the necessity for the international community to work for every human person to attain the minimum standard of living to enjoy basic human rights.

Resolution 2542 (XXIV) in 1969 in the GA saw the adoption of the Declaration on Social Progress and Development. The Declaration further recognized the link between social progress, development and human rights and spread awareness of human rights as being a multi-faceted issue. The Commission on Human Rights on 21 February 1977 through resolution 4 (XXXIII) decided to pay special attention to the consideration of obstacles impeding the full realization of

social, economic and cultural rights in developing nations. It also recommended that the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) invite the Secretary-General to undertake a study focusing on development in particular. In 1979, the Secretary-General presented the study for consideration by the Commission on Human Rights. The Commission decided that the study should continue.

On 11 March 1981, CHR established a working group composed of 15 governmental representatives appointed by the chairman of the commission (E/CN.4/RES/1981/36). The working group presented a report in 1984 (E/CN.4/1985/11) which enabled the GA to adopt the Declaration on the Right to Development in 1986 through Resolution 41/128. The resolution defined the right to development as “a comprehensive economic, social, cultural and political process, which aims at the constant improvement of the well-being of the entire population and of all individuals on the basis of their active, free and meaningful participation in development and in the fair distribution of benefits” (A/Res/41/128, 4 December 1986). Within the articles of the resolution development is declared as an inalienable human right. Both individuals and Member States are encouraged to facilitate the process of development at the local, national and international level. As outlined by the Declaration on the Right to Development, these rights include “full sovereignty over natural resources, self-determination, popular participation in development, equality of opportunity and the creation of favorable conditions for the enjoyment of other civil, political, economic, social, and cultural right.”

Ever since the passage of Resolution 41/128, progress has been made on the right to development. The Working Group’s tenth session in 1987 had the goal of preparing a report for proposals per the request of CHR Resolution 1986/16 on 10 March 1986. In 1989, the Working Group’s 12th and final session studied the analytical compilation of responses to report E/CN.4/1987/10 from various governments, UN organs, NGOs and others. They recommended that the implementation of the right to development should focus on particularly vulnerable groups such as women on local and national levels. The Commission on Human Rights in 1989 invited the Secretary-General to organize a global consultation on the right to development (E/CN.4/RES/1989/45). This global consultation occurred on 8-12 January 1990 in Geneva, Switzerland. While reaffirming the rights outlined in Resolution 41/128, the conclusion of these meetings was that development that is solely oriented for economic growth and financial considerations does not in fact promote an environment for human rights. Rather, these models fail to achieve social justice. Therefore, there is no one single correct approach to implementing an economic model of development for every human population because of the differing social, political, and cultural climates throughout the world. Overall, there is a need for the United Nations to lead the implementation of the Declaration and make sure all mechanisms that are established to facilitate development are in fact compatible with the principles of the United Nations.

In 1993, the World Conference on Human Rights held in Vienna dealt extensively with the right to development. It was



within this conference that the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action was written. The declaration noted that democracy, development and respect for human rights are interdependent and mutually reinforcing. The declaration further stated that, while development facilitates the enjoyment of all human rights, the lack of development should not be used to justify the abridgement of internationally recognized human rights. In 1996, when the mandate ended, the CHR established an Intergovernmental Group of Experts, which met twice and adopted two reports over a two-year period. When its mandate ended, the CHR realized that the Working Group needed to be reestablished, however this time the approach was different. Through Resolution 72, CHR established an open-ended working group and the position of an independent expert on the right to development. Dr. Arjun Sengupta was appointed by the Commission to fulfill this role.

Since its establishment, the open-ended working group has put out one report, while Dr. Sengupta has put out four. Essentially, the role of the working group is to examine progress made in the realization of the right to development, to evaluate information provided by states and NGOs, and to present a sessional report to the CHR. Dr. Sengupta's role, however, is to provide information to further assist the working group. To date, he has submitted four reports. Within these reports he discusses his goal of implementing the right to development in a fashion that is attainable immediately. From these reports, the concept of the "development compact" is discussed. According to Dr. Sengupta, the "development compact" is a way for developing countries to join with volunteer states and international financial institutions to work towards development.

The current work of the Commission on Human Rights falls in line with the goals outlined at the Millennium Summit that took place in September 2000. Major goals include halving extreme hunger and poverty by 2015, achieving universal primary education and gender equity, reducing infant and maternal mortality, reducing the spread of HIV/AIDS, increasing access to clean water and promoting environmental sustainability. Although progress on these goals to date has been mixed, major work during this year is underway to outline policies and programs necessary to achieve these goals. The first conference, the International Conference on Financing for Development, took place in Monterrey, Mexico in March. In August and September, the World Summit for Sustainable Development will take place in Johannesburg, South Africa. Before the summit, four preparatory committee sessions took place worldwide to establish the framework for the conference.

Organizations within the United Nations have also worked toward the goal of furthering development. The United Nations Industrial Development Organization focuses on working with industrial organizations within countries to ensure that there is room for various aspects of development and acts as a negotiator between governments and industrial organizations. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) deals exclusively with development and works in conjunction with other UN bodies. In conjunction with the Commission on Human Rights, UNDP has developed the

Human Rights Strengthening Program, to assist Member States in strengthening human rights during the development process. The major areas of focus of this program include: "pro-poor development policies, HIV/AIDS, environment management and energy use, inclusive decentralized governance and governing institutions, and indigenous peoples."

In essence, the three main issues before the Commission on Human Rights with regard to the right to development are good governance, poverty and globalization. Countries will often discuss the correlation between these three factors and how it has affected people in least developed, developing and developed countries. The issue of contention still remaining is which factor takes precedence over the others in creating a comprehensive solution in lieu of the right to development. It remains to be seen whether good governance, the eradication of poverty or mainstreaming globalization first will be the best way to achieve development. Generally speaking, the interplay of issues between good governance and globalization are often construed as a double-edged sword within the context of development.

Given the scope of human rights issues and the enabling environment necessary for their full realization, the Commission on Human Rights continually faces the challenge of implementing effective programs. By examining the history on how the right to development has evolved in the United Nations, it becomes apparent that this issue has many dimensions, including economic, environmental and social. Unfortunately, there is no one all-inclusive solution for implementing development; rather local, regional and national concerns such as the preservation of culture or the levels of economic status within a society make every situation unique.

Questions to consider from your government's perspective on this issue include:

- Does your country accept a "right" to development?
- What steps can be taken in development programs to ensure the human right to development through good governance?
- If poverty is a violation of the human rights of those living in that condition, does this affect how the international community should address issues of poverty?
- How can countries be more quickly mainstreamed into the globalization process while still protecting the people of those countries from the negative effects of globalization?

Bibliography:

- Carl, Traci. "Development Frays Close-Knit Culture." *The Washington Post*, 27 January 2002.
- "Democracy Key to Development, UNDP Says." *UN Wire*, 23 July 2002.
- Farah, Douglas and David B. Ottaway. "World Bank Reassesses Chad Pipeline Deal." *The Washington Post*, 5 December 2000.
- Kahn, Joseph. "Losing Faith: Globalization Proves Disappointing." *The New York Times*, 21 March 2002.
- Kristof, Nicholas D. "World Ills Are Obvious, the Cures Much Less So." *The New York Times*, 18 February 1999.
- "UN Pushes 'Right To Development'." *UN Wire*, 13 April 2000.



UN Documents:

E/CN.4/1957/1161
A/RES/27/2542
E/CN.4/RES/1977/4
E/CN.4/RES/1981/36
E/CN.4/1985/11
A/RES/41/128, 4 Dec 1986, "Declaration on the Right to
Development"
E/CN.4/1986/16
E/CN.4/RES/1989/45
Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action
E/CN.4/RES/1998/72

Additional Web Resources:

www.unhchr.ch
www.amnesty.org/
www.hrw.org/un/
www.unhchr.ch/development/right.html

www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/74.htm
www.unhchr.ch/html/menu2/10/e/wgrtd.htm
www.unrisd.org/index.htm
www.eldis.org/
www.cepr.net/globalization/Scorecard.pdf
www.undp.org/bdp/
poverty.worldbank.org/webguide/category/2
magnet.undp.org/Docs/policy5.html
www.yale.edu/unsy/UNDPhist.htm
www.undp.org/hdr2001/
www.ciesin.org/docs/010-152/010-152.html
[www.hsph.harvard.edu/fxbcenter/FXBC_WP7--
Sengupta.pdf](http://www.hsph.harvard.edu/fxbcenter/FXBC_WP7--Sengupta.pdf)
[web.amnesty.org/802568F7005C4453/0/A6C067F85D75668
D8025691A00726B67?Open](http://web.amnesty.org/802568F7005C4453/0/A6C067F85D75668D8025691A00726B67?Open)
[web.amnesty.org/802568F7005C4453/0/15A4AB43B1ABE
EA480256AE7003C7A96?Open](http://web.amnesty.org/802568F7005C4453/0/15A4AB43B1ABE EA480256AE7003C7A96?Open)



CHAPTER VI.

THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

AMUN's Economic and Social Council will consider five topics on its agenda. Representatives can choose to explore these topics in a number of forms: through resolutions, in less formal working groups or commissions, or through the creation of treaty or convention documents.

STATE MEMBERS

Andorra	Costa Rica	India	Romania
Angola	Croatia	Iran, Islamic Republic of	Russian Federation
Argentina	Cuba	Italy	South Africa
Australia	Egypt	Japan	Spain
Austria	El Salvador	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	Sudan
Bahrain	Ethiopia	Malta	Suriname
Benin	Fiji	Mexico	Sweden
Bhutan	Finland	Nepal	Uganda
Brazil	France	Netherlands	Ukraine
Burkina Faso	Georgia	Nigeria	United Kingdom
Burundi	Germany	Pakistan	United States
Cameroon	Ghana	Peru	Zimbabwe
Chile	Guatemala	Qatar	
China	Hungary	Republic of Korea	

BACKGROUND RESEARCH

COORDINATION, PROGRAMME AND OTHER QUESTIONS: MALARIA AND DIARRHOEAL DISEASES, IN PARTICULAR CHOLERA

Malarial and diarrhoeal diseases remain prevalent in developing countries, primarily affecting populations living in poverty, where the access to preventive and treatment measures is limited. Malaria is a tropical parasitic disease carried by mosquitoes. Although it is often curable, malaria is responsible for many deaths in the developing world. Cholera is an acute intestinal infection caused by the bacterium *Vibrio cholerae*. It is a water-borne viral disease characterized by diarrhea, vomiting, muscle cramps and severe loss of body fluids and is spread by contaminated water and food. Malaria and cholera are endemic in many African states and continue to be a stumbling block to social and economic development. Malaria has been shown to slow the economic growth of African countries by up to 1.3% per year.

A number of UN bodies have been assigned the task of addressing health concerns regarding malaria and cholera and have been most vigilant in their fight against these diseases. The World Health Organization (WHO) and the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) recognize the prevalence of malaria and diarrhoeal diseases in many tropical and sub-tropical states and stress the importance of national plans of action in countries where malaria is endemic (ECOSOC Resolution 1998/36). Both bodies have continued to call for the expansion of fund-raising efforts in order to provide for adequate financial and medical resources as well as technical assistance to affected developing countries. Current and past programs recognize the importance of preventive measures and the need for vaccine programs.

Roll Back Malaria, an initiative of the WHO, is the most expansive action taken to decrease the spread of malaria and to address the factors that contribute to the outbreak of diarrhoeal diseases such as cholera. The initiative promotes community-driven action and sector-wide planning in the development of effective control measures to strengthen developing country health programs that address this disease. It makes every effort to avoid building separate, vertical malaria control operations in host countries. In April 2000, at the African Heads of State Summit in Abuja, Nigeria, advocates succeeded in placing malaria high on the development agenda of poor countries. Since the summit, governments and country partners have developed strategic vision and identified feasible plans of action. Global partners of the Initiative were challenged to identify resources and channel mechanisms to streamline implementation. Round-table discussions held at the national level produced favorable outcomes, allowing countries to draw on additional resources through bilateral and multilateral debt relief programmes such as the World Bank's Highly Indebted Poor Countries initiative.

Since the beginning of 2002, cholera outbreaks have reached endemic proportions in Somalia, Malawi, Madagascar, South Africa, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the Limpopo region. This year alone, cholera cases in Malawi have increased by a staggering 900%. Mitigating factors such as food shortages, droughts, floods, poor sanitation and insufficient water purification systems have contributed to outbreaks of cholera. Political factors are also responsible for recent outbreaks. Civil wars and intra-state conflicts often produce mass refugee populations where outbreaks of such diseases are imminent. The lack of the hygienic disposal of human waste, an adequate supply of safe drinking water and sufficient food



hygiene produce breeding grounds for cholera bacteria and cause a large number of deaths. Unless water supply sources are purified in a manner consistent with current guidelines and practices, epidemics of diseases such as cholera, hepatitis and typhoid could occur.

Nevertheless, new developments such as cholera vaccines are a source of hope for many. Among these is a vaccine produced in Vietnam for the cost of 20 US cents. During research, the vaccine was found to result in high levels of immunity in children, for whom the risk of cholera is highest. The response to the new vaccine was comparable to those elicited by a Swedish-produced vaccine that has already been licensed for use in several European countries. Furthermore, research is being done on the effectiveness of traditional Chinese and Japanese medicines. Researchers are currently testing new therapies. In addition, plant derivatives, such as the compound galloyol-tannin derived from rhubarb, has been shown to inhibit cholera's toxic effects in the laboratory. Many leading scientists from institutions around the world have supported this research and some day in the near future new therapies and medicines might be used as a third phase of treatment, complementing oral-rehydration therapy and traditional antibiotic treatments.

Questions to consider from your government's perspective on this issue include:

- What role does your government play in supporting international health initiatives?
- To which regional bodies does your government belong that may play a pivotal role in fighting malaria and cholera?
- How can NGOs and local governments better coordinate their efforts and help fund initiatives?
- What types of policies should the UN promote in terms of health-sector reform?
- Should there be an international emergency stock of cholera vaccines established similar to the current emergency stock held for meningitis vaccines?

Bibliography:

- "20 cents-a-dose vaccine safe and immunogenic." Medical Letter on the CDC & FDA, 21 Apr 2002.
- "Almost 1000 Cholera Deaths Reported." Africa News Service (AllAfrica.com), 19 Apr 2002.
- "Cholera Cases and Deaths Reported to WHO 2001-Mid-year report." Communicable Disease Surveillance and Response (CSR), 8 Aug 2001.
- "Cholera Cases On the Rise in Urban Areas." Africa News Service (AllAfrica.com), 19 Mar 2002.
- "Cholera Kills Over 500 in Malawi." Xinhua News Agency, 16 Mar 2002.
- "Cholera Outbreak Reported in Limpopo." Africa News Service (AllAfrica.com), 12 Mar 2002.
- "Dead in Cholera Outbreak." Africa News Service (AllAfrica.com), 8 Apr 2002.
- "Draft Proposal for an International Airline Levy to Provide Funding for Health Measures." National Council for International Health, Nov 1996.
- "Fact Sheet N 107 - Cholera". World Health Organization,

- Revised Mar 2000. www.who.int/inf-fs/en/fact107.html
- "Identification in traditional herbal medications and confirmation by synthesis of factors that inhibit cholera toxin-induced fluid accumulation." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States*, 5 Mar 2002.
- Nagy, Thomas J. "The Secret Behind the Sanctions: How the US Intentionally Destroyed Iraq's Water Supply." *Global Policy*, Sep 2001.
- "NGOs, Aid Agencies Move to Control Cholera Outbreaks." Africa News Service (AllAfrica.com), 12 Apr 2002.
- "Over 270 Die of Cholera in Congo." Xinhua News Agency, 16 Mar 2002.
- "Researchers find how rhubarb remedy eases cholera." *Science News*, 30 Mar 2002.
- "Strengthening Surveillance and Control of Vaccine Preventable Diseases." United Nations Foundation, Nov 1999.

UN Documents:

- A/Res/50/128, 23 February 1996, Preventive action and intensification of the struggle against malaria in developing countries, particularly in Africa
- A/Res/55/284, 28 September 2001, 2001-2010: Decade to Roll Back Malaria in Developing Countries, particularly in Africa
- E/2001/80, 7 June 2001, Preventive action and intensification of the struggle against malaria and diarrhoeal diseases, in particular cholera -The Roll Back Malaria Partnership -- Report of the Secretary-General
- E/1998/20, 30 April 1998, Preventive action and intensification of the struggle against malaria and diarrhoeal diseases, in particular cholera - Report of the Secretary-General
- E/Res/1994/34, 29 July 1994, Malaria and diarrhoeal diseases, in particular cholera
- E/Res/1995/63, 28 July 1995, Malaria and diarrhoeal diseases, in particular cholera
- E/Res/1998/36, 30 July 1998, Malaria and diarrhoeal diseases, in particular cholera
- ECOSOC/5795, 30 July 1998, Economic and Social Council Adopts 52 Texts on Human Rights, Economic and Environment, Coordination
- WHO/CDS/CSR/EDC/99.4, 12-13 May 1999, "Potential use of oral cholera vaccines in emergency situations. Report of a WHO meeting"

Additional Web Resources:

- www.globalpolicy.org
- www.unfoundation.org
- www.who.int/emc/index.html

SOCIAL AND HUMAN RIGHTS QUESTIONS: SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Social problems have been recognized by the United Nations as an urgent need to be addressed by all Member States. Issues such as poverty, unemployment, social exclusion, health and welfare, malnutrition, aging and education impact



every country. As a macro-level concern, social development affects all aspects of human life. As a result, the UN convened the World Summit for Social Development in 1995 in Copenhagen, Denmark, to reaffirm the importance of social development and its interdependence with economic and political development, and to develop a framework of action to address the issues of social development.

Participants at the World Summit agreed to the Copenhagen Declaration, which contains ten commitments related to a variety of issues surrounding social development. In particular, the Declaration called upon Member States to create an economic, political, social, cultural and legal environment to enable its citizenry to achieve the goals of social development, to progress towards the eradication of poverty by a target date set by each Member State, to support full employment, to promote social integration based on the enhancement and protection of all basic human rights, to achieve equality between the sexes, to accelerate development efforts in Africa and the Least Developed Countries, to ensure that structural adjustment programs include social development goals, to increase overall resources allocated to social development, and to strengthen cooperative efforts between Member States and various UN agencies. The commitments were detailed in their expectations and goals to address social problems and Summit participants went to great lengths to develop national, regional, and international action plans for each commitment.

Created in 1962 at the request of ECOSOC, the Commission on Social Development (CSD) reviews and implements the policies agreed upon in the Copenhagen Declaration and the Programme for Action. In 1995, the Commission's membership was expanded to 46 Member States and each year at its substantive meeting, a key theme is selected from the Declaration and the Programme of Action as that year's policy focus. Selected themes include the eradication of poverty (1996), productive employment and sustainable livelihoods (1997), promoting social integration (1998), providing social services for all (1999), reviewing the contributions of the Commission to the Summit +5 (2000) and the issue of social protection and vulnerability in a globalizing world (2001). This year's functional agenda is the integration of social and economic policy. The Commission agreed upon 11 conclusions; among them was the importance of promoting sound institutions that are open and transparent to public policy consensus building and the encouragement of broad participation in the formulation of economic policies between governments and other related policy actors in an effort to engage the private and NGO sectors.

From 26 June - 1 July 2000, a follow-up summit was held in Geneva (Summit +5) to review the progress made during the last five years since the agreement on the Copenhagen Declaration. During the Summit, the CSD presented an overview on the progress made toward achieving the goals outlined in the Declaration. While the participants noted that much progress remained to be made, they did reaffirm the commitments made at the last summit in the Geneva Declaration. They also agreed to tackle the issues of poverty, unemployment and social integration and agreed to a range of

new commitments with regard to social development. The Geneva Declaration called for a "much stronger and more comprehensive action, and new, innovative approaches by all actors, national and international, governmental and non-governmental."

Despite the progress made in the last ten years, significant barriers remain in the majority of developing countries to achieving the commitments outlined in the Copenhagen and Geneva Declarations. Cross-cutting issues including who wins in a globalized world, the impacts of debt on development and the ability of nations to adequately fund social services and basic needs have hampered the efforts of many nations to address social development. Many of these issues have deep political undertones and their solutions remain elusive at best. Nevertheless, the CSD and the UN continue to underscore the importance of social development and providing for the needs of each country's citizens as an effective means of ensuring a prosperous and meaningful future for the world's growing population. Developing the proper governance structures and ensuring the integration of key issues on a multilateral level remain key themes and challenges for many UN Member States as they pursue development. Perhaps the Millennium Development Goals may serve as the blueprint for a new consensus on global development.

Questions to consider from your government's perspective on this issue include:

- Are the commitments developed by the Summit attainable in your country?
- What resources need to be made available to achieve the goals of the Summit, the Summit +5 and the Commission for Social Development?
- What role should Non-Governmental Organizations and the private sector have in assisting nations in achieving the commitments?
- Are there important social issues that are not currently being addressed by the UN?

Bibliography:

- "40th session of the Commission for Social Development: Review of the working methods of the Commission." Commission for Social Development, Jan 2002. www.un.org/esa/socdev/csd/workingmethods.htm.
- "Advancing the Social Agenda: Two Years After Copenhagen: Report of the UNRISD International Conference and Public Meeting." Geneva: UNRISD Publications, Nov 1997.
- "Follow-up IMF Initiatives in Support of Social Development." International Monetary Fund, 6 Dec 2000.
- Ghai, Dharam, Hopkins, Michael, and Mcgranahan, Donald. "Some Reflections on Human and Social Indicators for Development (DP 6)." UNRISD Publications, Oct 1988.
- Ghai, Dharam. "Social Development and Public Policy: A Study of Some Successful Experiences." UNRISD Publications, 2000.
- Ghai, Dharam. "Social Development and Public Policy: Some Lessons from Successful Experiences (DP 89)." UNRISD Publications, Oct 1997.



Ghai, Yash. "Human Rights and Social Development: Toward Democratization and Social Justice (PP-DGHR 5)." UNRISD Publications, Oct 2001.

Human Development Report. UNDP, New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Kolodner, Eric. "Transnational Corporations: Impediments or Catalysts of Social Development?" UNRISD Publications, Dec 1994.

Mkandawire, Thandika and Rodriguez, Virginia. "Globalization and Social Development after Copenhagen: Premises, Promises and Policies (OPG 10)." UNRISD Publications, Jun 2000.

"Results of the Social Summit +5: The outcome of the Social Summit+5." Commission on Social Development, Jul 2000. www.un.org/esa/socdev/docs/english.pdf

"Review of Social Issues and policies in IMF-Supported Programs." International Monetary Fund, 26 Aug 1999.

"Social Policy Issues in IMF-supported Programs: Follow-up on the 1995 World Summit for Social Development." IMF Fiscal Affairs and Policy Development and Review Departments, 16 Mar 2000.

"The World Bank Annual Report." World Bank, 1997.

UN Documents:

A/55/344, 1 Sep 2000, "Twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly: World Summit for Social Development and beyond: achieving social development for all in a globalizing world"

A/Conf.166/9, 19 Apr 1995, "Report Of The World Summit For Social Development"

Additional Web Resources:

www.un.org/esa/socdev/wssd/index.html
www.un.org/esa/socdev/csd/index.html
www.iisd.ca/vol10/enb1063e.html
www.unrisd.org/
www.worldbank.org
www.imf.org

HIGH-LEVEL SEGMENT: THE ROLE OF THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM IN SUPPORTING EFFORTS OF AFRICAN COUNTRIES TO ACHIEVE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

The problems faced by African countries since decolonization are numerous; internal and external conflicts, refugees and internally displaced peoples, food safety and security, and vast health crises including the HIV/AIDS epidemic all profoundly affect the African continent's development. With such a large region of the world facing so many serious difficulties, it is not hard to imagine that the problems faced there affect the rest of the world.

Over the last several decades, the United Nations has attempted to work with African states and regional organizations in tackling the problems faced by many on the African continent. In 1991, the General Assembly (GA) established the United Nations New Agenda for the Development of Africa (A/Res/46/151, 18 December 1991). This resolution enumerates what actions the GA felt were necessary to

achieve durable peace and sustainable development, calls that were echoed by both the Secretary-General and many African nations. The resolution addressed issues ranging from trade and health to environmental issues, specifically calling upon United Nations organizations and specialized agencies to create, implement and monitor programs aimed at fostering development within Africa. To this end, not only has the ECOSOC devoted a considerable amount of its resources to achieve these goals, but also its specialized agencies such as the Office of the Special Coordinator for Africa and Least Developed Countries (OSCAL) and the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) have stepped up their efforts toward African development and in garnering more cooperation from within the United Nations system.

Throughout 2001 and 2002, the UN revisited the New Agenda, examining its strengths and weaknesses, deciding ultimately what still needs to be done. In a report to the GA, the Secretary-General addressed the cooperation between the UN and the Organization for African Unity (now the African Union) and examined the progress of the New Agenda's hope for further cooperation between the UN and regional organizations (A/RES/56/48, 23 January 2002). While the Secretary-General commends the achievements made toward this end, the report also points to issues that still need resolution. In October 2001, the ECA and the African Development Bank, with support from the Group of 8 (G8) and other multilateral donors, announced a new initiative entitled the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD). NEPAD is a wholly African initiative that was adopted by the Organization for African Unity (now the African Union) and the G8 to be the centerpiece for a new commitment to bring the benefits of the global economy to the African continent. Stressing the need to develop public-private partnerships, to eradicate poverty and to modernize the agricultural sector, NEPAD represents a major, long-term initiative designed to lift African countries out of the poverty, conflict, and economic stagnation that has plagued the continent since the 1980s.

With the work that has been concentrated over the last decade, there still remains a need for more progress. In 2001, the Ad Hoc working group on the Causes of Conflict and the Promotion of Durable Peace and Sustainable Development in Africa published a report calling for continued discussion and action, and detailing that the topic of sustainable development should remain on the agenda as a priority for the United Nations. To this end, the GA has plans for meetings in June and September 2002 to discuss further implementation and actions on the New Agenda. The reports of the Ad Hoc group and the Secretary-General, as well as documents from ECOSOC and the Security Council, all agree in spirit that work toward sustainable development in Africa is crucial to international stability and security.

Questions to consider from your government's perspective on this issue include:

- What contribution has your country made toward the development and implementation of the New Agenda for the Development of Africa and NEPAD?
- What are the most immediate problems that should be addressed by this body?



- How can ECOSOC expand the work of the New Agenda and contribute to NEPAD?
- How does your country's ties with Africa affect its priorities on this topic?

Bibliography:

- Ayittey, George B. N. *Africa In Chaos*. St Martin's Press, 1998.
- Dudley, William ed. *Africa: Opposing Viewpoints*. Greenhaven Press, 2000.
- Ishikawa, Kaoru. *Nation Building and Development Assistance*. MacMillan Press, Ltd, 1999.
- Lancaster, Carol. *Aid to Africa: So Little Done*. University of Chicago Press, 1999.

UN Documents:

- A/56/45, 3 Aug 2001, "Report of the Open-ended Ad Hoc Working Group on the Causes of Conflict and the Promotion of Durable Peace and Sustainable Development in Africa"
- A/56/270, 9 Aug 2001, "Final Review and Appraisal of the Implementation of the United Nations New Agenda for the Development of Africa in the 1990s"
- A/56/371, 18 Sep 2001, "Implementation of the Recommendations Contained in the Report of the Secretary-General on the Causes of Conflict and the Promotion of Durable Peace and Sustainable Development in Africa"
- A/Res/46/151, 18 Dec 1991, "Final Review and Appraisal of the Implementation of the United Nations Programme of Action for African Economic Recovery and Development 1986-1990"
- A/Res/56/187, 5 Feb 2002, "Second Industrial Development Decade for Africa (1993-2002)"
- A/Res/56/218, 14 Jan 2002, "Final Review and Appraisal of the UN New Agenda for the Development of Africa in the 1990s"
- A/Res/56/48, 23 Jan 2002, "Cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization for African Unity, Report of the Secretary-General"
- E/2002/17, 18 April 2002, Summary of the economic and social situation in Africa, 2001 -- Recent economic trends in Africa and prospects for 2002
- E/2001/13, 31 May 2001, Summary of the economic and social situation in Africa, 2000
- E/2001/83, 12 June 2001, The role of the United Nations system in supporting the efforts of African countries to achieve sustainable development -- Report of the Secretary-General
- E/2001/CRP.3, 16-18 July 2001, The role of the United Nations in support of the efforts of the African Countries to achieve sustainable development: An Overview Of Activities
- S/Res/1366, 30 Aug 2001, "The role of the Security Council in the Prevention of Armed Conflicts"

Additional Web Resources:

www.un.org/esa/africa/oscal.htm

www.un.org/esa/africa
www.uneca.org/

OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION: ECONOMIC AND TECHNICAL COOPERATION AMONG DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Under the threat of economic decline due to increased debt and unable to wrestle concessions from developed countries for the preferential treatment and technical cooperation necessary to promote growth, developing countries in the late 1970s and early 1980s began to turn to each other for help with their economic troubles. South-South cooperation has enjoyed official recognition in the United Nations since the Buenos Aires Conference in 1978. It encompasses two types of partnership: technical cooperation among developing countries and economic cooperation among developing countries (abbreviated TCDC and ECDC respectively). Economic cooperation refers to intra-South cooperation in trade, investment and finance and is also used to cover collaboration in other economic sectors, such as industry, technology and communication. Technical cooperation refers to the building, pooling and sharing of capacities to further enhance the environment for socio-economic progress in developing countries. The two interrelated approaches are intended to enable the South to promote collective self-reliance and to participate effectively in the international economic system. Through regional integration, many countries have expanded their market size, accelerated the pace of industrialization and laid the foundation for a more systematic integration of production structures across national boundaries.

Profound changes have occurred in the international system since the late 1980s that have had an equally profound impact on multilateral development cooperation. Since the 1970s, the United Nations has played an important role in promoting technical cooperation. It has provided guidance on policies and procedures and it has supported institutional capacity building, networking, and information systems. In the area of capacity-building, the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) has provided support to the Association of South-East Asian Nations, the Economic Community of West African States and the Central American Common Market and commodity groups such as the Union of Banana Producing Countries, in efforts to strengthen their overall capacity. The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the International Labour Organization (ILO), the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and the International Trade Union (ITU) have provided similar assistance to various regional organizations in the development of national and regional institutions in developing countries.

With the adoption of the Caracas Programme of Action in 1981, the Group of 77 (G-77) outlined an aggressive plan for the promotion of cooperation between developing countries in eight areas: trade, technology, food and agriculture, energy, raw materials, finance, industrialization, and technical cooperation. The strategies laid out in the Caracas Programme form



the foundation for South-South cooperation initiatives and have been reaffirmed by the G-77 in the San Jose Declaration and Plan of Action on South-South Trade, Investment and Finance and the Bali Declaration on Regional and Subregional Economic Cooperation of the Developing Countries. In addition, the United Nations has programs through the FAO, the ILO, UNFPA, UNESCO, UNDP, and the ITU. Along with support from these UN organizations, the Administrator of the UNDP in 1995 set up the Trust Fund for South-South Cooperation, and a Special Unit for Technical Cooperation among Developing Countries.

Nevertheless, South-South cooperation is still underexploited and, as the Special Unit for TCDC has reported to the Second Committee on several recent occasions, the marginal benefits from increasing cooperation remain large. There are several barriers to successful cooperation. The first is technical: developing countries need to be aware of the opportunities for cooperation that exist. To this end, there are several databases being set up to identify points where intellectual and material exchanges would be beneficial. These, however, are still not adequate given the lack of resources for independent collection of information in some of the countries themselves. Another area of concern is the monetary resources available for programs of cooperation between developing countries. Both the Trust Fund for South-South Cooperation and the Special Unit for TCDC report that their budget and staff are inadequate for the effective promotion of cooperation on a large scale. A third problem lies in monitoring compliance with agreements for cooperation. There is a natural incentive for countries to attempt to benefit from concessions by others without making concessions themselves. While some monitoring agencies have been set up, their resources have not allowed them to effectively enforce compliance with cooperative agreements.

Currently the United Nations is in a period of debate over where programs for the promotion of ECDC/TCDC should be directed. While the branches of the UN continue to execute their specific programs for the promotion of ECDC/TCDC, the question of how these programs should be funded and executed remains at issue. First, there are some countries that argue that developed countries should dedicate more resources to support of the Trust Fund and the Special Unit for TCDC. Others argue that it is the developing countries that should take on more responsibility for their own programs and provide most of the funding for their execution, and that this is the only way for the program to truly become self-sufficient. Second, there is some question as to which ends ECDC/TCDC should be directed. For some, the main goals of ECDC/TCDC should be economic, promoting free trade and cooperation between businesses. Another school of thought holds that cooperation can be most effective if directed toward humanitarian needs such as education, health, sanitation or housing. There is also some question about preferences toward countries that are in the Least Developed category, are land locked, or are island states. Broadly speaking, ECDC and TCDC encompass a wide range of issues dealing with the developing countries. Specific programs focus on issues from multinational business links and

free trade to the sharing of water resources.

Questions to consider from your government's perspective on this issue include:

- Can your country benefit from ECDC/TCDC, and if so, what is needed from the UN in order to support cooperation?
- Is your country a member of an organization that actively promotes ECDC/TCDC, and if so, what should the relationship between UN programs and other international organizations be on this issue?
- If your country benefits from ECDC/TCDC, what areas are most necessary for your country's welfare?
- What are the issues faced in your country in considering the range of projects prompted by ECOSOC for the sake of Economic and Technical Cooperation Among Developing Countries?
- How should the bodies and structures of the UN cooperate in common activities and regional initiatives in terms of Economic and Technical Cooperation Among Developing Countries?
- How much support should developed countries be asked to give in ECDC/TCDC efforts?

Bibliography:

- FAO. "Technical Cooperation and Networking among Developing Countries." www.fao.org/docrep/T3384e/t3384e08.htm
- G-77. *Caracas Programme of Action*. www.g77.org/Docs/CPA-contents.htm
- G-77. *Cairo Declaration on Economic Cooperation Among Developing Countries*. www.g77.org/Docs/Cairo.html
- G-77. *San Jose Declaration and Plan of Action on South-South Trade, Investment and Finance*. www.g77.org/Docs/sjdocs.html
- G-77. *Bali Declaration on Regional and Subregional Economic Cooperation of the Developing Countries*. www.g77.org/Docs/Bali%20Declaration.htm

UN Documents:

- A/56/39, 2001, Report of the High-level Committee on the Review of Technical Cooperation among Developing Countries
- A/Res/48/172, 21 December 1993, Economic and Technical Cooperation among Developing Countries
- A/Res/52/205, 18 December 1997, Economic and Technical Cooperation among Developing Countries
- A/Res/55/190, 29 January 2001, Implementation of the commitments and policies agreed upon in the Declaration on International Economic Cooperation
- A/Res/56/191, 7 February 2002, Implementation of the Declaration on International Economic Cooperation, in particular the Revitalization of Economic Growth and Development of the Developing Countries, and implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Fourth UN Development Decade
- A/Res/56/202, 21 February 2002, Economic and Technical Cooperation among Developing Countries
- A/Res/56/210, 21 February 2002, International Conference



on Financing for Development
DEV/2154, "High Level Committee on TCDC Urges United Nations Development System to Implement 'New Directions' Strategy, Concludes 1997 Session," 12 May 1997
DEV/2212, "Global Support for Development Must be More than Verbal, Phillipines Tells Committee on Review of Technical Cooperation," 2 Jun 1999
DEV/2150, "Special Unit for TCDC of UNDP Should be Maintained as Separate Entity and Ensured Adequate Resources, Speakers tell High-Level Committee," 6 May 1997
DSG/SM/21, "Deputy Secretary-General Encourages Members of UN Family to Include South-South Dimension in Operational Activities," 7 Oct 1998
E/2002/L.36, 26 July 2002, International Conference on Financing for Development
GA/EF/2696, "Conference on South-South Cooperation Called for by Developing Countries, as Second Committee Debates Economic, Technical Cooperation," 7 Nov 1995
GA/EF/2697, "Strengthened South-South Cooperation Emphasized in Second Committee," 7 Nov 1995

Additional Web Resources:

esa.un.org/techcoop/
www.g77.org/Docs/CPA-contents.htm
www.g77.org/Docs/CPA-TCDC.htm
www.un.org/esa/analysis/res.htm
www.un.org/esa/desa.htm
www.unctad.org/

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

In addition to the four main topics on ECOSOC's agenda, the Council will also receive a report on the final day from the Commission on Human Rights (CHR). As a functional commission established by ECOSOC, the CHR is required to make annual reports on its activities to the members of ECOSOC. As this is a special session of the CHR outside its normal meeting schedule, the CHR will present its report only on the specified topics. While these reports are generally accepted pro forma, ECOSOC may also choose to take some action on the recommendations contained in the report. The CHR may also present their recommendations in resolution format, allowing ECOSOC the chance to review and formally pass the CHR's proposals.

To facilitate this process, the final session of ECOSOC and CHR will culminate in a joint session, whereby the Member States represented in the CHR will join their counterparts on ECOSOC and those members without formal representation in ECOSOC will be granted full observer status. CHR will decide on a process to present its recommendations and present them to ECOSOC, whereby it will be up to the joint session to take further action. Please be aware that as a functional committee of ECOSOC, the CHR has been given significant responsibilities to study, review, debate and decide on recommended actions within specific topical areas that ECOSOC felt should be dealt with in greater detail than could be addressed by the main body.

It is recommended that all Representatives assigned to ECOSOC also review the background section on the CHR (Chapter V), and Representatives may choose to do some additional research into these topics.

CHAPTER VII.

THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

The International Court of Justice currently has three cases on its docket, as described below. Additional cases may be added by the AMUN Secretariat, or at the recommendation of any participating delegation and the Secretary-General. If cases are added, background information will be distributed to all delegations participating in the cases (as either Judge or Advocate). Please note that this background is intended only as a brief outline of the issues to be argued before the Court. Significant legal research will be required of the Representatives involved in cases before the Court, either as Advocates or Judges. Representatives should refer to the *AMUN Rules and Procedures Handbook, Chapter IV - The International Court of Justice* for detailed information on preparing for ICJ cases.

BACKGROUND RESEARCH

DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO V. UGANDA: DISPUTE OVER THE ARMED ACTIVITIES ON THE TERRITORY OF THE CONGO

The current ICJ proceedings stem from the 1998 invasion of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) by Burundi, Rwanda and Uganda. However, the root of the conflict comes from earlier actions by all involved parties. The diversity of actors and interests embroiled in the five years of the Congolese civil war has created a significant barrier to understanding the legal parameters in the case. The DRC, a wealthy nation with abundant natural resources and a breeding ground for rebel groups, attracted the attention of its neighbors for reasons of economic gain, internal security and political manipulation.

Rwandan and Ugandan interests in the Congolese government led to their assisting Laurent Kabila, leader of a major rebel group, in his 1996 overthrow of dictator Mobutu Sese Seko. Kabila's assumption of power did not lead to a decrease in raids by rebels based in Zaire as had been hoped, but heightened the hostilities as Kabila moved to counter the foreign influence in the newly renamed Democratic Republic of the Congo. The Rwandans, Ugandans and Burundians responded with increased support for other rebel groups in the resource-rich eastern region and Kabila called in troops from allied Zimbabwe, Namibia and Angola to secure the area, thereby escalating the situation into a regional conflict. It is estimated that nearly two million people have died as a result of the fighting, and there are countless cases of human rights abuses.

Throughout this conflict, the United Nations has acted to limit the level of the conflict. In 1999, the UN brokered a cease-fire and withdrawal agreement in Lusaka, Zambia. As a result, nearly 3,400 UN troops have been placed in Congo to oversee the execution of the Agreement. The Lusaka peace plan also called for an inter-Congolese dialog between all the parties in an effort to institute a stable government. The cease-fire was short lived and movement toward withdrawal has been halfhearted. In 2000, the Security Council adopted Resolution 1304, condemning the conflict and calling for an end to the destruction of the DRC. Meanwhile, the ICJ made an Order for provisional measures to diffuse the situation and protect the Congolese from further abuses. In an attempt to put on economic pressure, a UN report came out in late 2001

focusing on the exploitation of the reserves of natural resources in eastern Congo, calling for a ban on their export, and demanding an investigation into the parties involved.

In the current proceedings before the ICJ, the DRC is requesting the Court to adjudicate in its favor against Uganda for acts of aggression, thereby forcing Ugandan troops to vacate the eastern section of the DRC and giving the DRC the right to seek reparations for damages inflicted during the conflict. Uganda contends that the Court lacks the jurisdiction to hear the case due to the similar interest by the Security Council, and that they are fulfilling their responsibility by continuing to follow the requirements of the Lusaka Agreement. Both sides have submitted their claims and counter-claims.

Questions to consider while deliberating this matter include:

- Is the current case admissible to the ICJ within the context of the Rules of the Court?
- How do the Lusaka Agreement and the steps taken by both sides to fulfill the Agreement affect the actions of the Court?
- Does the DRC have a right to compensation for the acts taken by Uganda?

Bibliography:

- “Congo Withdrawal Unresolved.” *Los Angeles Times*, 4 Apr 2002.
- “Congo's new president meets the world.” *The Economist*, 358: 8213, 17 Mar 2001, 43.
- Crawley, Mike. “Kabila and Africa's ‘first world war’.” *Christian Science Monitor*, 93:37, 18 Jan 2001, 1.
- Dearaujo, Ernani. “Chaotic Congo Stabilizing the DRC.” *Harvard International Review*, 23:3, Fall 2001, 10.
- Hottelet, Richard C. “The Plundering of Congo: Without Precedent.” *Christian Science Monitor*, 93:120, 16 May 2001, 9.
- “Kabila, a victor in peace.” *The Economist*, 360:8220, 5 May 2001, 39.
- Lamont, James. “Peace deal' with Congo rebels leaves talks in limbo.” *Financial Times* (London), 27 Apr 2002.
- Vick, Carl. “UN Group Urges Ban on Imports from Congo.” *Washington Post*, 24 Nov 2001.

UN Documents:

2001/36, Press Release, 13 Dec 2001



2001/24, Press Release, 10 Oct 2001
2000/24bis, Press Release, 4 Jul 2000
2000/24, Press Release, 1 Jul 2000
2000/23, Press Release, 30 Jun 2000
2000/20, Press Release, 21 Jun 2000
2000/18, Press Release, 19 Jun 2000
99/45, Press Release, 25 Oct 1999
99/34, Press Release, 23 Jun 1999

Application, Armed Activities on the Territory of the Congo
(*Democratic Republic of the Congo v. Uganda*)
SC/RES/1304 (2000)

Additional Web Resource:

www.icj-cij.org/icjwww/idocket/ico/icoframe.htm

LIECHTENSTEIN V. GERMANY: DISPUTE OVER THE REPARATION OF PROPERTY STEMMING FROM WORLD WAR II

This dispute centers around a certain painting that was on loan to the city of Cologne, Germany from the Historic Monument Offices in Brno, Czech Republic, which had been previously owned by Liechtenstein nationals prior to WWII. The painting, along with several other pieces of property, had been seized by Czechoslovakia in 1945 through a series of laws that confiscated all German and Hungarian public and private property within its territory for the purposes of expropriation. These laws were known as the Benes Decrees. Although only directed towards German and Hungarian nationals, the Czech government extended that definition to include any person they considered to be of German or Hungarian decent. This included nationals of Liechtenstein, even though the country was neutral during the war.

Until 1998, this issue had been in dispute between the Czech Republic and the Principality of Liechtenstein. No compensation was ever awarded to the Principality for the property. However, when the painting left the country on loan to Germany, Prince Hans Adam II seized the opportunity to regain the property using the vehicle of the German courts, which were generally favorable toward such issues.

However, in January 1998 the German Federal Constitutional Court (the Supreme Court of Germany) issued a surprise ruling, which stated that the property in question was “to be treated as German-owned assets outside Germany, which had been seized for the discharge of war-related debts.” This ruling was not appealable and binding on all of Germany. In addition, the German government supported the court’s ruling. Liechtenstein immediately protested to the German government for two years following the ruling, but was denied compensation.

Prior to this dispute, Liechtenstein and Germany had been in agreement that the disputed property was not subject to any of the treaties or accords that proceeded WWII for the reparation of war debts or crimes committed by the Nazis. With the German high court ruling, Liechtenstein now claims that Germany has placed all such property under this umbrella and in so doing has violated the Principality’s sovereignty and international law by refusing to pay any sort of compensation for the lost property to Liechtenstein. In June 2001, the

Principality of Liechtenstein filed a motion against the Federal Republic of Germany in the International Court of Justice for violation of international law regarding property rights and violation of its national sovereignty.

Liechtenstein: The Principality’s position is that it is owed compensation for its property from Germany. In its filing with the ICJ, the Principality of Liechtenstein asserts the following as the basis for its application:

“(a) by its conduct with respect to the Liechtenstein property, in and since 1998, Germany failed to respect the rights of Liechtenstein with respect to that property;

“(b) by its failure to make compensation for losses suffered by Liechtenstein and/or its nationals, Germany is in breach of the rules of international law.”

Liechtenstein accordingly requests the Court “to adjudge and declare that Germany has incurred international legal responsibility and is bound to make appropriate reparation to Liechtenstein for the damage and prejudice suffered.” Liechtenstein further requests “that the nature and amount of such reparation should, in the absence of agreement between the parties, be assessed and determined by the Court, if necessary, in a separate phase of the proceedings.”

As a basis for the Court’s jurisdiction, Liechtenstein invokes Article One of the European Convention for the Peaceful Settlement of Disputes, signed at Strasbourg on 29 April 1957.

Germany: For its part, Germany is likely to argue that the Court has no jurisdiction to hear the case and that the case should be immediately dismissed. The basis for this rationale is that:

- Based on ICJ precedent, any rulings regarding the determination of the rights and obligations of a third party state must include the consent and representation of that state. This is known as the “third party rule.” In this case, this would be the Czech Republic, which is absent from these proceedings. Germany would have to show that any ruling by the Court would, in fact, involve the determination of rights and obligations of the Czech Republic.
- Based on Article 27(a) of the European Convention for the Peaceful Settlement of Disputes, the Convention does not apply to “disputes relating to facts or situations prior to the entry into force of this Convention as between the parties to the dispute.” The case in question has its origins in 1945, seven years before the Convention was signed. Further, Liechtenstein ratified the Convention in 1980 and cannot claim to invoke its power to any issues that originated prior to that time.
- The Czech Republic is not a party to the European Convention for the Peaceful Settlement of Disputes and can therefore not claim to acknowledge the Court’s jurisdiction in this case.
- The Czech Republic was an Allied power during WWII and was originally the one who seized the property.

There have been no UN resolutions dealing specifically with this topic. Most international disputes regarding property are referred to the ICJ. Past ICJ rulings have primarily dealt with territorial disputes and fishing rights. In such cases, the Court has relied upon its own interpretation of existing

treaties, in accordance with international law, as a framework for its decisions. All international treaties are required to be registered and filed with the UN by all Member States under Article 102 of the UN Charter.

Treaties and accords that might be considered in this case are:

- Luxembourg Agreement, 1952
- The Convention on the Settlement of Matters Arising out of the War and the Occupation, 1952
- The Settlement Convention, 1955
- European Convention for the Peaceful Settlement of Disputes, 1957
- German-Czech Declaration, 1997

In addition, Germany has instituted many laws to compensate victims of the Nazi regime that might also be considered. Primary among them is the Federal Law for the Compensation of the Victims of National Socialist Persecution, 1956, and the Federal Restitution Law of 1957.

Questions to consider while deliberating this matter include:

- Is this case dealing with sovereignty, reparations or property rights?
- Does the Court have jurisdiction to decide this case and if so, on what issue?
- How will this case affect international opinion of the parties involved?
- Can this case set a precedent within the ICJ?

Bibliography:

- www.liechtenstein-icj-case.de/en/index.htm - Comprehensive web site on the issue published by Liechtenstein
- www.asil.org/insights/insigh73.htm - Excellent overview of the case and how each side is positioned
- www.germany-info.org/relaunch/info/archives/background/ns_crimes.html - Specific information on German war reparations
- www.germany-info.org/relaunch/index.html - Information on Germany and its policies
- www.icj-cij.org/icjwww/idecisions.htm - A list of all cases brought before the ICJ
- untreaty.un.org/English/art102.asp - Article 102 of the UN Charter requiring the registration of all treaties with the UN
- www.icj-cij.org/icjwww/ipresscom/ipress2001/ipresscom2001-14_20010601.htm - Liechtenstein's formal filing with the ICJ
- www.icj-cij.org/icjwww/iwhats.htm - ICJ web site

SPAIN V. CANADA: FISHERIES JURISDICTION CASE

On 9 March 1995, Canadian officials forcibly boarded and took control of the vessel *Estai*. The *Estai*, a trawler flying the Spanish flag, was fishing in international waters just beyond the border of Canada's Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) in the North Atlantic. The vessel was towed to Canada, where it and the Ship's Master were charged with violations of Canadian law. Canadian officials claimed that they found ille-

gal catch and gear aboard the *Estai*. Spain responded by sending a war ship to international waters just outside Canada's EEZ; triggering Canada's positioning of its war ships just inside their EEZ and publically warning Spanish ships away from the international waters of the North Atlantic. A stand-off ensued when Spain subsequently sent fishing boats to the area under the protection of a Spanish gunboat. On 28 March 1995, the Spanish government filed an application with the International Court of Justice regarding the incident.

The over-fishing of the North Atlantic has long been a concern for those nations whose economies are heavily reliant on fishing in that area. Each nation has dominion and control over their Exclusive Economic Zone. A country's EEZ is roughly defined as the area extending 200 nautical miles out from the nation's coast line. The flora and fauna of the sea, however, do not correspond conveniently to the boundaries carefully carved out by international treaty. Fishing populations may straddle a border, living partially in the EEZ of one country and partially in international waters. Without conservation efforts in international waters, coastal communities found that the stocks of fish in their EEZ's were being affected by over-fishing taking place in international waters. During the 1970's and 80's the stocks in the North Atlantic became dangerously depleted and the international community addressed the issue via the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, which was then replaced by the 1978 Convention on Future Multilateral Co-Operation in the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, which created the North Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO).

The NAFO pledges international cooperation and consultation with respect to the fisheries resources of the Northwest Atlantic for the purpose of exploring and exploiting, conserving and managing these resources. Canada was an original signatory to the Convention, while Spain became a participant by virtue of its admission to the European Economic Community in 1986. Article XVIII of the Convention allows for reciprocal rights of boarding and inspection of vessels and the NAFO Commission is charged with allocating fishing quotas for the regulated area. There is, however, an objection procedure. A country may object to the fishing quota allocated it by the NAFO, thus drastically raising the amount of fish they extract from the region.

Canada believed that NAFO members were misusing the objection provision of the Convention to over-fish the area. In response, the Canadian Parliament enacted Bill C-29. The scope of the bill was set out by the Canadian Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, who said "the legislation gives Parliament of Canada the authority to designate any class of vessel for enforcement of conservation measures. The legislation does not categorise whom we would enforce against. The legislation makes clear that any vessel fishing in a manner inconsistent with good, widely acknowledged conservation rules could be subject to action by Canada." The *Estai* was boarded and towed under this provision.

This matter was brought before the court in 1995. Canada objected to the Court's jurisdiction based on their filing of an exception to their acceptance of the court's jurisdiction. The Court found that it did not, in fact, have jurisdiction over



Canada and therefore the case was dismissed. For the purposes of this simulation, the parties and justices are to assume that both sides have accepted the jurisdiction of the Court and review the merits of the case.

Spain has asked the Court to declare that the Canadian legislation be determined not to apply to Spain. In May 1995, the European Community and Canada reached an agreement relating to the NAFO; a portion of this agreement was the removal of Spain and Portugal from the list of countries to which Bill C-29 was to be applied. Canada now argues that there remains no issue for the Court on which to rule, as the parties have resolved the matter through diplomatic channels. Spain presses for the Court to review the applicability of a Canadian law governing its conduct in international waters.

Questions to consider while deliberating this matter include:

- Was it a violation of international law to board the *Estai*?
- Can domestic law apply to foreign vessels in international waters?

Bibliography:

- www.oceanlaw.net/texts/nafo.htm -- Text of the Convention on Future Multilateral Co-Operation in the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries
- www.oceanlaw.net/cases/fishj3.htm -- Links to the documents filed in the original case, also links to other resources such as press communique
- www.oceanlaw.net -- Guide to international fisheries law.
- www.csmonitor.com -- Search for "*Estai*"
- www.icj-cij.org -- Official page of the International Court of Justice