

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 Central and Eastern Europe.....	14
• Issues in the Middle East.....	17
III. THE HISTORICAL SECURITY COUNCIL - 1956	19
• Issues in the Middle East.....	20
• Issues in Africa.....	22
• Issues in Asia.....	22
• Other Issues.....	23
IV. THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY	25
• The First Committee (Disarmament and International Security)	
• Prevention of the Violent Disintegration of States	25
• Preservation of and Compliance with the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems.....	26
• The Second Committee (Economic and Financial)	
• External Debt Crisis and Development.....	28
• Water Supply and Sanitation.....	29
• The Third Committee (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural)	
• Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Questions Relating to Refugees, Returnees and Displaced Persons and Humanitarian Questions.....	31
• Right of Peoples to Self-Determination.....	32
• The Sixth Committee (Legal)	
• Report of the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization Related to Economic Sanctions.....	33
• Relationship Between Domestic Courts and International Crimes.....	34
V. FAO: THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION	37
• Review of the Rome Declaration and Plan of Action	
• Commitment Two	38
• Commitment Three.....	39
• Commitment Five.....	40
• The Urban Poor.....	41
• Desertification.....	42
VI. THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL	44
• Right to Education	44
• Integration of Gender and Human Rights of Women.....	45
• Convention to Combat Desertification.....	47
• Assistance to Third States Affected by the Application of Sanctions.....	48
• Report of FAO.....	50
VII. THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE	51
• <i>Nauru v. Australia</i> (1989): Dispute on the rehabilitation of an island nation after colonial mining.....	51
• <i>Hungary v. Slovakia</i> (1994): Dispute over the finishing of treaty obligations.....	53
• <i>Nicaragua v. Honduras</i> (1999): Dispute over the maritime boundaries of two nations.....	54



AMUN INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Secretary-General

Shannon Dunn

Under-Secretaries-General

Kathleen Colin

Ryan Donovan

Dan Wright

President of the General Assembly

Chris Hairel

Vice President of the General Assembly

Stacy Short

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The 2001 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:

Background Writers:

Gregory E. Adams	Lisa Hendrickson
Don Carey	Justin Holdridge
Kathleen Colin	Tim Hoppe
Matthew Corso	Ryan Kennedy
Brijeet Dhaliwal	Chandra Linton
Brian Endless	Barbara Masilko
Elizabeth Falk	Ruth Randolph
Adam Goldstein	Michael Vicentijevic
Luke Helm	Teresa Woodard

Editor-in-Chief:

Adam Wolfe

Editors:

Mary Elizabeth Brennan
Kathleen Colin
Matt Corso
Brian Endless
Caroline Endless

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 August 2001, 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 2001

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 2001 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.

Two on-line sources of particular note are the *UN Wire* (www.unfoundation.org), a daily briefing on UN issues provided by the United Nations Foundation, and the *New York Times* on-line (www.nyt.com). Both of 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 2001 *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 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 persons 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 Organization of African Unity (OAU), 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 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

Bangladesh	Jamaica	Singapore
China	Mali	Tunisia
Colombia	Mauritius	Ukraine
France	Norway	United Kingdom
Ireland	Russian Federation	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 two or three 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 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.

One of the largest problems facing the UN is the implementation of this peace keeping force. The force has never reached its full capacity, and a number of very public departures by troop contributing countries (India in September 2000 and Jordan in October 2000) left the operation woefully under-staffed. The United Kingdom stepped up its operations in Sierra Leone to help stem the gap, and in April, 2001, Pakistan offered an additional 4,500 troops, but more troops are still needed. Many countries fear the repercussions of sending forces into a situation which is still far from settled, and in which the combatants have not all agreed to cease provocations.

Rebel atrocities continued across the country throughout 2000 and the early months of 2001. One of the low points occurred when rebels took 500 UN peace keepers hostage in May 2000. Almost 300 of these troops were held by the RUF until July, at which time a rescue operation, led by the Indian contingent and supported by Nigerian and Ghanaian forces, was initiated by UN peace keeping forces.

A key element in the Sierra Leone situation is the export of diamonds by rebel forces, often through Liberia, with funds financing ongoing military operations. Council discussions of these "diamond wars" culminated in an embargo on all rough cut diamonds originating in Sierra Leone, with the exception of those accompanied by a government issued "certificate of origin." This was followed

in May 2001 by sanctions against Liberia for its part in trading the diamonds and supporting the RUF.

Negotiations on Sierra Leone continue, with increasing numbers of peace keepers now deploying into zones formerly occupied by rebel troops. More international forces, as well as additional funding and other support, are still needed if the operation is to be an eventual success.

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?
- Is the international community capable of successfully embargoing diamonds (and similar materials in other countries) when they are an element in internal warfare?
- 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?

Bibliography:

- "Annan Asks Powerful Nations For Support." *UN Wire*, 2 November 2000.
- "Annan Urges Continued Engagement If Sanctions Imposed." *UN Wire*, 2 May 2001.
- "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 March 2001.
- Crossette, Barbara. "World Briefing | United Nations: Sanctions Loom For Liberia," *The New York Times*, 3 May 2001.
- "Jordan to Withdraw From Peacekeeping Mission." *UN Wire*, 25 October 2000.
- "Liberian Accuses Britain of Stirring Regional War." *The New York Times*, 30 May 2001.
- Onishi, Norimitsu. "Sierra Leone Endures In the Grip of Civil War." *The New York Times*, 19 November 2000.
- 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.
- "Peacekeepers Halt Rebel Advance; Observers Escape." *UN Wire*, May 12, 2000.
- Perlez, Jane. "G.I.'s to Be Sent to Train Africans for Sierra Leone." *The New York Times*, 9 August 2000.
- "Rebels Release Dozens More Children." *UN Wire*, 12 June 2001.
- "RUF Returns More Weapons to UN Mission." *UN Wire*, 1 June 2001.
- Rupert, James and Farah, Douglas. "Nigeria Leader Agrees to Send Troops Into Sierra Leone." *Washington Post*, 19 May 2000. A23.



Schneider, Daniel B. "World Briefing | United Nations: New War Crimes Tribunal For Sierra Leone." *The New York Times*, 25 July 2001.

"Security Council Praises Diamond Certification Plan." *UN Wire*, 18 September 2000.

"UK Plans Exercise to Offset UN Troop Reduction." *UN Wire*, 8 January 2001.

"UN-Imposed Sanctions to Take Effect Today." *UN Wire*, 7 May 2001.

"UN Peacekeeping Missions Establish Awareness Units." *UN Wire*, 26 April 2001.

"UN Releases List Banning Travel for 130." *UN Wire*, 6 June 2001.

"UN Review of W. Africa Program Shows No Progress." *UN Wire*, 17 April 2001.

"UN Says Rebel Zone Deployment Ahead of Schedule." *UN Wire*, 2 May 2001.

"UN Scrambles for Troops After India's Withdrawal." *UN Wire*, 22 September 2000.

"UN to Double Peacekeeping Force." *UN Wire*, 2 April 2001.

"UN Troops Deployed in Rebel Areas." *UN Wire*, 15 March 2001.

"UN Welcomes Release of Children in Sierra Leone." *UN Wire*, 29 May 2001.

"UNAMSIL Expansion Could Cost More Than \$780M." *UN Wire*, 15 September 2000.

"UNHCR Wants Security Council Support For Troops." *UN Wire*, 9 February 2001.

Wren, Christopher S. "Annan Meets With West Africans Over Sierra Leone Crisis." *The New York Times*, 12 September 2000.

Wren, Christopher S. "Liberian President Urges U.N. to Move Into Rebel-Held Areas in Sierra Leone." *The New York Times*, 17 October 2000.

UN Documents:

S/2001/627, 25 June 2001 - SG Report on Sierra Leone

S/2001/513, 23 May 2001 - SG Report on Sierra Leone

S/2001/228, 14 March 2001 - SG Report on Sierra Leone

S/2000/992, 16 October 2000, Report of the Security Council Mission to Sierra Leone

S/2000/455, 19 May 2000, Fourth SG Report on S. Leone

S/2000/186, 7 March 2000, Third SG Report on Sierra Leone

S/2000/13, 11 January 2000, Second SG Report on Sierra Leone

S/1999/645, 4 June 1999, Sixth SG Report on Sierra Leone

S/Res/1346 (2001) on the situation in Sierra Leone

S/Res/1343 (2001) on the situation in Liberia

S/Res/1334 (2000) on the situation in Sierra Leone

S/Res/1321 (2000) on the situation in Sierra Leone

S/Res/1317 (2000) on the situation in Sierra Leone

S/Res/1315 (2000) on the situation in Sierra Leone

S/Res/1313 (2000) on the situation in Sierra Leone

S/Res/1306 (2000)

S/Res/1299 (2000)

S/Res/1289 (2000)

Additional Web Resource:

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

The Situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo

Ongoing conflict continues between the government and rebel groups in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC). While there have been some increased hopes for peace in the first months of 2001, a final resolution of this conflict is far from realized. 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. Based on the Secretary-General's call for an increased force to ensure that the cease-fire holds, a mission made up of Security Council members visited the DRC in both May 2000 and in May 2001. This mission 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. Some positive news came in June, however, as rebel troops withdrew from several major urban areas, with a few remaining peacefully to govern part of Kisangani. Continued rebel activity in many rural areas, along with the presence of external troops from neighboring Uganda and Rwanda, has kept the situation contentious. One of the largest current problems involves the alleged pillaging and illicit trade of resources by rebel and foreign groups operating within the DRC.

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 situation was complicated in early 2001, with the death of DRC President Laurent Kabila. Joseph Kabila, his son and successor, has successfully taken over as president, but some uncertainty still remains about the internal stability of the Congolese government.

Contention also remains about whether phase II of MONUC, allowing for greater troop deployments, is reasonable at this time. Visits by both the Security Council representatives and the Secretary-General's liaisons show



the continuing great need for peace keepers, but with continuing conflict any additional deployments could still be problematic. Also, the ongoing crisis in Sierra Leone has both distracted the world community from the DRC, and has caused a climate in the Security Council which may now rethink additional commitments.

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

- How can the international community incense the various international parties now active in the DRC to cease operations and return to internationally recognized borders?
- Given current conditions in the DRC, is this manifestation of MONUC likely to succeed once it is in place? Are changes to the mandate or composition of the forces needed to enhance the chances of success?

Bibliography:

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

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

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

Crossette, Barbara. "Another War Is Threatening Central Africa." *The New York Times*, 3 June 2001.

Crossette, Barbara. "Rwandan Leader Draws a Sadder Portrait of Congo Than Does a U.N." *The New York Times*, 27 June 2001.

Crossette, Barbara. "U.N. Delegation Finds Reasons for Hope in Congo Peace Talks." *The New York Times*, 24 May 2001.

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

Fisher, Ian. "World Briefing | Africa: Congo: Optimism On The War." *The New York Times*, 26 May 2001.

"Glimmerings of a Congo Peace." *The New York Times*, 5 March 2001.

"Kabila Addresses Security Council, Requests Troops." *UN Wire*, 5 February 2001.

"Kabila Promises Eventual Elections Once Peace is Reached." *UN Wire*, 6 February 2001.

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

"The Looting of Congo." *The New York Times*, 29 May 2001.

Onishi, Norimitsu. "Pressure Rises on Outsiders in Congo War." *The New York Times*, 17 April 2001.

"Rebel Troops to Withdraw as MONUC Arrives." *UN Wire*, 23 April 2001.

"Rwanda Rejects UN Call for Troop Withdrawal." *UN Wire*, 10 January 2001.

"Security Council Begins Talks; Kabila Ends Ban on Parties." *UN Wire*, 18 May 2001.

"Security Council Extends MONUC Mandate; more." *UN Wire*, 15 December 2000.

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

"16 Million Face Human Rights Violations." *UN Wire*, 29 November 2000.

"UN Accuses Neighbors of Looting Natural Resources." *UN Wire*, 17 April 2001.

"UN Plans for Fewer Troops," *UN Wire*, 13 February 2001.

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

"UNHCR Driver Killed by Gunmen; First UN Troops Arrive." *UN Wire*, 28 March 2001.

UN Documents:

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

S/2000/566 (12 June 2000) Third SG Report

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

S/2000/330, 18 April 2000, SG Report on MONUC

S/2000/30, 17 January 2000, SG Report

S/Res/1355 (2001)

S/Res/1341 (2001)

S/Res/1332 (2000)

S/Res/1323 (2000)

S/Res/1316 (2000)

S/Res/1304 (2000)

S/Res/1291 (2000)

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 HIV/AIDS Crisis in Sub-Saharan Africa

The HIV/AIDS crisis has negatively impacted much of the world, but nowhere more so than sub-Saharan Africa. While this is traditionally thought of as a health problem, since early 2000 the Security Council and other segments of the world community have been addressing the significant security concerns which are part of the HIV/AIDS crisis. In January 2000, the Security Council, led by the United States, proclaimed the "month of Africa" and focused significant concern on the HIV/AIDS crisis. In security terms, this was seen as an important issue to address in



conflict areas, where the disease is known to spread much more quickly as precautions to prevent it are rarely taken. This spread occurs among combatants, innocent civilians caught in the area, and among national and international forces attempting to pacify an area.

This action by the Security Council opened a floodgate of discussion and action by the UN on the security implications of HIV/AIDS. In July 2000, the Council passed S/Res/1308, the first resolution to ever cover the impact of HIV/AIDS on peace keeping operations and security issues. Since that time, almost every Council resolution dealing with peace keeping has included a preambular clause on HIV/AIDS, "welcoming and encouraging efforts by the UN to sensitize peacekeeping personnel in the prevention and control of HIV/AIDS and other communicable diseases in all its peacekeeping operations." (see S/Res/1362, 2001 as a recent example)

HIV/AIDS threatens political stability by causing socioeconomic crises within a nation as internal health and social services are overwhelmed by the dying and the orphans left in its wake. Secretary-General Annan has noted that these crises have effects akin to those of war.

The Council has also worked with other UN bodies, including ECOSOC and the Joint UN Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), to discuss actions and solutions to this problem. Many parts of the UN system have come together on the AIDS pandemic, and the Security Council has taken a leadership position on the security implications of this issue.

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

- How can the UN better increase its ability to solve security problems by focusing on HIV/AIDS?
- What specific steps should be taken to limit the peace and security threat of HIV/AIDS?

Bibliography:

- Crossette, Barbara. "New Determination Is Seen Emerging in AIDS Battle." *The New York Times*, 28 June 2001.
- "Durban Conference Ends on Positive Note." *UN Wire*, 14 July 2000.
- "Holbrooke Urges Stronger UN Action on HIV/AIDS." *UN Wire*, 22 January 2001.
- "Security Council Addresses Crisis in Africa." *UN Wire*, 11 January 2000.
- "Security Council Adopts First Ever Health Resolution." *UN Wire*, 18 July 2000.
- "Summit in New York; The Words of Many Government." *The New York Times*, 7 September 2000.
- "UN Conference Examines Disease as Security Concern." *UN Wire*, 11 December 2000.
- Wren, Christopher S. "Ex-Diplomat To Lead Group In AIDS Battle." *The New York Times*, 20 June 2001.
- Wren, Christopher S. "Powell, at U.N., Asks War on AIDS." *The New York Times*, 26 June 2001.

Wren, Christopher S. "U.N. Council Addresses HIV/AIDS In Its Forces." *The New York Times*, 20 January 2001.

UN Documents:

S/Res/1308 (2000) on the responsibility of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security: HIV/AIDS and international peacekeeping operations

ISSUES IN ASIA

The Situation in Afghanistan

The year 2001 has seen the de facto Taliban government of Afghanistan seeking increased international legitimacy, but finding support in very few places. While United Front (UF) forces posed very little real threat to the Taliban throughout 2000 and 2001, the United Nations and most governments (with the notable exception of neighboring Pakistan) continue to recognize the exiled Afghani government and refuse to deal with the Taliban. The Russian Federation and United States have found common ground in leading UN actions aimed at controlling Taliban influence and limiting their effectiveness. Concerns center primarily on the Taliban's exporting terrorist activities and training terrorists, as well as providing a safe haven for Osama Bin Laden. Also, there is concern from many of Afghanistan's neighbors that the Taliban's brand of extreme fundamentalism might spread to other countries.

The Taliban undertook a campaign in September 2000 to gain the Afghan seat at the UN, which has been denied to them since they first took power in the civil war. They were not only unsuccessful in this quest, but by December the Russian Federation and the US, over the objections of several Islamic countries, successfully moved the Security Council to increase sanctions against the Taliban. Current sanctions include an arms embargo, closure of offices outside Afghanistan, a ban on selling fuel used by the militia, air travel restrictions and restrictions on travel visas for Taliban officials.

These sanctions so far do not appear to have had the desired effect. While Taliban leaders still enjoy the lifestyle they had before the sanctions, the poorest segments of Afghan society are suffering from the sanctions. Additionally, the sanctions provoked significant backlash against UN officials and relief workers. The UN was forced to close its offices in Afghanistan when sanctions were increased in December 2000, and again in January, following threats against the safety of those workers by the Taliban. These were only slowly reopened when the Taliban government agreed to guarantee the safety of relief workers almost a week later.

The Secretary-General's Special Envoy to the region has expressed concern over the lack of progress toward peace in the country, and credits this to the absence of political will on the part of all warring factions in



Afghanistan. He also expressed disappointment with the cooperation of countries in the “six plus two” group of countries in the region; since Afghanistan is landlocked, ammunition and weapons must be traveling through other countries to reach the warring parties, who continue to remain well supplied. The “six plus two” group consists of China, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Pakistan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan (all neighbors of Afghanistan) plus the Russian Federation and the United States. The Secretary-General’s office has repeatedly stressed the responsibility of these parties to assist in finding a common approach to peace in the conflict. In April 2001, the Russian Federation went so far as to suggest that sanctions may be appropriate against Pakistan for its complicity in allowing trade goods (including arms) and supplies to reach the Taliban.

One of the key issues in recent months is the near-famine condition prevalent in much of Afghanistan. This, along with significantly increasing refugee problems among both returning and new refugees, threats of a polio outbreak, urban poverty, continued narcotics trafficking and difficulties in clearing land mines have all contributed to the poor humanitarian situation in the country. Reports of human rights problems have also abounded. These have included the results of war, in which men, women and children have been subjected to summary executions in some cases and have been relegated to the status of virtual hostages in their own land. Human rights problems have been particularly strong concerns for women and children. Women’s educational opportunities have been largely eliminated under the Taliban, and gross violations of women’s rights have been reported.

The Council has frequently noted a deep concern over the human rights problems, particularly against women and girls. This has even been a problem when relief workers are within Afghanistan, as the stringent laws are applied regardless of nationality and women have a difficult time joining relief efforts. It also noted the continuing diplomatic difficulties between the Taliban and Iran, revolving around the abduction and killing of Iranian diplomats in Afghanistan. Additionally, the use of Afghan territory for the sheltering and training of terrorists was strongly condemned. This resolution further imposed an air embargo on Afghanistan, and froze all of the Taliban assets held in foreign accounts.

The possibility of elections has also been raised, but has yielded no significant results. While the Taliban does not rule out the possibility of future elections, it seems more interested in two other “alternatives” to end the conflict, those being the surrender of the opposition or military victory. Overall, no solutions to the ongoing conflict, instability and human rights violations appear forthcoming.

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

- How can the Taliban and opposition forces be encouraged to negotiate on the dispute?

- How can this conflict best be contained within Afghanistan, to prevent spillover into neighboring countries?
- How can the refugees and others displaced due to the conflict best be cared for while violence continues? How can the Taliban be encouraged to recognize internationally specified human rights and limit abuses?
- How can international efforts to relieve the worst cases of suffering within Afghanistan be better implemented?

Bibliography:

- Burns, John F. “Analysis: In Afghanistan, Triumph of Fundamentalism.” *The New York Times*, 26 May 1997.
- Crossette, Barbara. “February 11-17; Afghan Refugees Dying.” *The New York Times*, 18 February 2001.
- Crossette, Barbara. “Rights Group Says Taliban Aren't Solely to Blame for the Afghan.” *The New York Times*, 13 July 2001.
- Crossette, Barbara. “Russia Seeks Sanctions Against Pakistan for Aid to Taliban.” *The New York Times*, 9 April 2001.
- Crossette, Barbara. “Taliban and Opposition Forces Are Said to Agree to Peace Talks.” *The New York Times*, 4 November 2000.
- Crossette, Barbara. “Taliban Open A Campaign To Gain Status At the U.N.” *The New York Times*, 21 September 2000.
- Crossette, Barbara. “Tough Sanctions Imposed on Taliban Government Split U.N.” *The New York Times*, 20 December 2000.
- Crossette, Barbara. “U.N. Worries That Afghans Export Terror.” *The New York Times*, 26 May 2001.
- “Entire UN Staff Withdrawn Ahead of Sanctions Vote.” *UN Wire*, 19 December 2000.
- “Islamic Leaders Pledge Unified Sanctions Stand.” *UN Wire*, 10 January 2001.
- “Ousted President Appeals for UN to Aid His Country.” *UN Wire*, 8 September 2000.
- Reuters. “U.N. to Use Experts on Taliban Embargo.” *The New York Times*, 31 July 2001.
- “Russia Reports to UN on Sanctions Violations.” *UN Wire*, 16 April 2001.
- “Taliban Denied UN Seat; more.” *UN Wire*, 2 November 2000.
- “Taliban Regulates Foreigners’ Behavior; more.” *UN Wire*, 6 June 2001.
- “Taliban Says Destruction Will Come.” *UN Wire*, 8 March 2001.
- “Taliban Threatens to Close UN Offices; more.” *UN Wire*, 11 December 2000.
- “UN Report Blasts Taliban on Women’s Rights; more.” *UN Wire*, 20 October 2000.
- “UN Report Cites Sanctions’ Impact.” *UN Wire*, 23 August 2000.



“UN Staff Return After Taliban Promise Safety.” *UN Wire*, 2 January 2001.
“UN Warns of Famine; Millions at Risk of Starvation.” *UN Wire*, 8 June 2001.
“US, Russia Request Tougher Sanctions.” *UN Wire*, 8 December 2000.
“Warring Parties Agree to UN Sponsored Talks.” *UN Wire*, 6 November 2000.
Wren, Christopher S. “Where Troops Fear to Tread, Aid Workers Are at Risk.” *The New York Times*, 19 November 2000.

UN Documents:

S/2001/695, 13 July 2001 - SG Report on humanitarian implications of the measures imposed by S/Res/1267 (1999) and 1333 (2000) on Afghanistan
S/2001/384, 19 April 2001 - SG Report on Afghanistan
S/2001/241, 20 March 2001 - SG Report on the humanitarian implications of the measures imposed by S/Res/1267 (1999) and 1333 (2000) on Afghanistan
S/2000/581, 16 June 2000, SG Report
S/2000/205, 10 March 2000, SG Report
S/Res/1363 (2001)
S/Res/1333 (2000)

The Situation in East Timor

After a period of civil unrest that threatened to expand into other parts of the region, the initial conflict in 1999 in East Timor was successfully resolved through UN auspices. This included significant support from Australia in volunteering to lead the peace keeping mission which would ensure stability in East Timor. The United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET) was created by the Security Council in S/Res/1272 (1999). UNTAET is endowed with the administrative responsibility for East Timor by means of legislative, executive and judicial authority. UNTAET assumed full administration of East Timor in March 2000.

More specifically, UNTAET's mandate is: 1) to provide security and maintain law and order throughout the territory of East Timor; 2) to establish an effective administration; 3) to assist in the development of civil and social services; 4) to ensure the coordination and delivery of humanitarian assistance, rehabilitation and development assistance; 5) to support capacity-building for self-government; and 6) to assist in the establishment of conditions for sustainable development.

The current situation in East Timor is still transitional and very unpredictable. Issues now revolve around the status and eventual return of East Timorese refugees, the disposition of militias and their support from Indonesia proper, continuing attacks by militia members against UN personnel, and an independence vote tentatively scheduled for late 2001. An additional issue may be the instability

which East Timor is engendering in other parts of Indonesia.

The refugee situation is still a central issue in the area. Starting in September 1999, over 450,000 East Timorese were internally displaced or turned into refugees by the crisis. This included approximately 200,000 displaced in-country, with the remaining 250,000 displaced to neighboring West Timor. Of these, most of the internally displaced have returned to their homes. While many have returned from West Timor, estimates in March 2001 place approximately 93,000 people still in refugee camps in West Timor. UN efforts are concentrating primarily on caring for and repatriating these current refugees, although some efforts are also underway to assist in resettlement after people return to their homes. Problematically, militia groups continue to plague the refugee camps. While the militias are relatively small in numbers, they have attacked numerous refugees, and also killed three UN humanitarian aid workers as recently as September 2000.

The overall militia situation continues to be a complicated one. While the Indonesian government has publicly disconnected itself from the militias, it appears that elements of the military may still support these groups. UN estimates put the number of militia members in the low hundreds, with one to two thousand additional informal supporters. Even so, the presence of these militia members, who can easily blend into society when not active, is problematic. Harassment of humanitarian aid workers and peace keepers is also a significant concern, but new rules of engagement were recently passed to allow peace keepers to shoot first when confronted with armed civilians. The current goal of the militias appears to be an attempt to reestablish a presence in East Timor, with the intent of challenging civil authorities following East Timor's independence.

The vote on East Timorese independence, currently scheduled for late 2001 but likely to be postponed into 2002, is also a key issue for which the UN is preparing. Allowing for a free and fair vote, as well as assisting in creating governing structures which will be sustainable after the UN departs, are the key issues. Repatriation of refugees is also seen as highly desirable before a vote takes place.

Additionally, the impact of the East Timor situation has gone beyond just that region. Early in the crisis, it was suggested that the most dangerous element of East Timor for Indonesia might be the “demonstration effect,” with other Indonesian regions following East Timor's lead and breaking off from the central government. This does appear to be happening at present, with a major separatist movement in the northern Sumatra province of Aceh as the prime example. The potential for continuing disintegration in other parts of Indonesia is of definite concern to the international community, with the potential that violence will spill over even after the East Timor situation is settled.

A further complication to the entire situation is the uncertain nature of the Indonesian government. The



peaceful removal of President Wahid by parliament and succession by Megawati Sukarnoputri, daughter of the country's founding president Sukarno, leaves an air of uncertainty over the situation.

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

- How can the UN better assist East Timor in its transitional phase?
- What is your government's position on the future of the UN's East Timor operation?
- Should the UN play a role in disarming the militias? What can the international community do realistically to prevent future violence?
- What role should the international community play in the possible spreading of violence, based in self-determination movements, in other parts of Indonesia?

Bibliography:

"Annan Praises Results of Donor Aid." *UN Wire*, 9 November 2000.

"East Timor Leader Calls for Sanctions." *UN Wire*, 14 September 2000.

"Government Pledges to Disarm Militia." *UN Wire*, 11 September 2000.

"Government Sets Timetable for Disarmament; more." *UN Wire*, 20 September 2000.

"Independence Declaration Could Be Postponed." *UN Wire*, 7 December 2000.

"Indonesia Calls on UN To Return." *UN Wire*, 15 November 2000.

"Militias Levying Fees on Refugees, UNHCR Says." *UN Wire*, 14 November 2000.

Mydans, Seth. "Indonesia Gets a New Leader; Ex-Chief Balks." *The New York Times*, 24 July 2001.

Mydans, Seth. "Modest Beginnings for East Timor's Justice System." *The New York Times*, 4 March 2001.

Mydans, Seth. "The World; And Justice For All?" *The New York Times*, 22 October 2001.

"No UN Observers for West Timor, more." *The New York Times*, 21 May 2001.

"Security Council Visit Reviews Repatriation Efforts." *UN Wire*, 13 November 2000.

"Security Council Worried for Refugees, UN Staff." *UN Wire*, 4 August 2000.

Sims, Calvin. "Indonesian Is Under Fire For Comments About Timor." *The New York Times*, 24 September 2000.

"Soldiers Arrested For UN Staff Deaths, more." *UN Wire*, 21 September 2000.

"Speakers Oppose Militia Leader's Extradition." *UN Wire*, 12 October 2000.

"Territory to Declare Independence in 2001, UN Says." *UN Wire*, 29 November 2000.

"UN Approves Extension of UNTAET Mandate, more." *UN Wire*, 2 February 2001.

"UN Delegation Recommends Sending Security Experts." *UN Wire*, 21 November 2000.

"UN War Crimes Tribunal Still An Option, Ramos Horta says." *UN Wire*, 14 February 2001.

"Vote Will Be Dominated By A Few Parties -- UNTAET." *UN Wire*, 14 June 2001.

Wren, Christopher. "Summit in New York: The Atrocities; Indonesia is Pressed to End Terror by Militias." *The New York Times*, 9 September 2000.

Wren, Christopher. "Where Troops Fear to Tread, Aid Workers Are at Risk." *The New York Times*, 19 November 2000.

UN Documents:

S/2001/719, 24 July 2001-SG Report on East Timor

S/2001/436, 2 May 2001- SG Report on East Timor

S/2001/42, 16 January 2001- SG Report on East Timor

S/Res/1338 (2001) on the situation in East Timor

S/Res/1319 (2000) on the situation in East Timor

Additional Web Resource:

www.un.org/peace/etimor/etimor.htm

ISSUES IN CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE

The Situation in Kosovo

Regional and national elections, along with increasing violence by ethnic Albanian groups and the concurrent need to protect other minorities were the key issues facing the UN in Kosovo in late 2000 and the first half of 2001. Perhaps the most important event for the region occurred in October 2000 with the election of Vojislav Kostunica to replace Slobodan Milosevic as president of Yugoslavia. With this single election, the international community's perspective on all facets of the Yugoslav situation was radically altered, culminating in Yugoslavia's re-admission as a UN member state in November. While this was generally seen as a positive move for the ongoing situation in Kosovo, limiting the potential for future conflict from Serbian forces, it may also prove to extend the crisis, since most States now see Kosovar independence as a less-than-likely option.

UN operations in Kosovo are focused around an international civilian administration, the UN Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK), created on 10 June 1999 by S/Res/1244. UNMIK consists of four main branches, a UN-led interim civil administration, a humanitarian affairs component led by UNHCR, an EU-led reconstruction effort, and efforts to rebuild institutions in Kosovo, led by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). While the UN has put significant effort into Kosovo over the past two years, with efforts primarily focused on rebuilding the region, many of the problems which started the conflict still remain.



Local legislative elections have been delayed several times since 2000, with current elections scheduled for November 2001. A number of issues have held up elections, but ethnic violence and the position of the Serbian minority in Kosovo continue to be exacerbating problems.

Chief among the current concerns the protection of Serbs remaining in Kosovo and renewed ethnic violence by Kosovar Albanians. Albanian forces have attacked numerous Serbs within Kosovo, have attacked UN officials and burned a UN police station, and have used Kosovo as a base for attacks in the neighboring Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM). The Secretary-General has strongly urged all ethnic communities and parties in Kosovo to demonstrate restraint and tolerance and to fully cooperate with the international community in efforts to restore the region. The SG has clearly stated the aim of UN operation in Kosovo as the creation of a "secure, multi-ethnic, prosperous and democratically governed society for all Kosovars, regardless of ethnicity." Problematically, there are consistent and ongoing staff shortages for both civil administration and police, which have constrained UN operations.

The Security Council remains actively involved in the situation, including a mission of Council representatives to Kosovo in June 2001. Discussions involve both monitoring the progress of efforts led by the Secretary-General, and taking measures to deal with the continuing threats of violence between various parties as the refugees are repatriated and the region is rebuilt.

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

- How can the international community best facilitate ongoing actions to rebuild Kosovo, including increasing needed personnel and assisting in the upcoming elections?
- What additional steps are necessary to ensure fair legislative elections in Kosovo?
- What steps are needed to ensure the safety of the remaining Serbian population of Kosovo?

Bibliography:

- "Annan Lauds Self-Government Plan; KFOR Offers Amnesty." *UN Wire*, 16 May 2001.
- "Elections to Be Held No Earlier Than Summer, OSCE Says." *UN Wire*, 31 January 2001.
- Erlanger, Steven. "Having a Vote In Kosovo Is Requiring Determination." *The New York Times*, 1 February 2001.
- Erlanger, Steven. "Multiplying Albanian Insurgents in Yugoslavia Threaten Belgrade's." *The New York Times*, 21 January 2001.
- Erlanger, Steven. "The World; Is Serbia's Victory Kosovo's Loss?" *The New York Times*, 29 October 2000.
- Gall, Carlotta. "Albanian Moderates Claim Kosovo Victory." *The New York Times*, 30 October 2000.

- Gall, Carlotta. "U.N. Officials Revive Plan to Return Serbian Refugees to Kosovo." *The New York Times*, 8 June 2001.
- Gordon, Michael R. "Rebellion Poses Quandary for G.I.'s in Kosovo." *The New York Times*, 3 February 2001.
- "Gov't Considers War; EU Calls for Restraint." *UN Wire*, 7 May 2001.
- "Mission to Tour Yugoslavia This Month." *UN Wire*, 8 June 2001.
- "NATO Considers Return of Yugoslav Forces." *UN Wire*, 7 March 2001.
- "Protecting Minorities Poses Biggest Problem, UN Says." *UN Wire*, 22 September 2000.
- "Province Should Be Independent, Report to UN." *UN Wire*, 24 October 2000.
- "Russian KFOR Peacekeeper Killed." *UN Wire*, 12 April 2001.
- "Security Council Adopts Plan on Troop Withdrawal." *UN Wire*, 23 February 2001.
- "Security Council Condemns Albanian Rebels." *UN Wire*, 8 March 2001.
- "Serbian Parliament Rejects UN Framework." *UN Wire*, 1 June 2001.
- "Territory Will Not Vote On Independence, Haekkerup Says." *UN Wire*, 10 May 2001.
- "UN Delegation Urges Yugoslav Support For Elections." *UN Wire*, 18 June 2001.
- "UN General Assembly Approves Membership." *UN Wire*, 2 November 2000.
- "UN Police Station Attacked; more." *UN Wire*, 20 December 2000.
- "UN Warns That Continued Violence Could Risk Aid." *UN Wire*, 21 February 2001.
- "UN Withdraws Police, Personnel From Northern Area." *UN Wire*, 19 December 2000.
- "UNMIK Seeks Progress, Elections on Track." *UN Wire*, 10 April 2001.
- "Yugoslav Army Charges 183 With War Crimes; more." *UN Wire*, 25 April 2001.

UN Documents:

- S/2001/600, 19 June 2001, Report of the Security Council Mission on the implementation of Security Council resolution 1244 (1999), 16-18 June 2001
- S/2001/565, 7 June 2001, SG Report on Kosovo
- S/2000/363, 29 April 2000, Report of the Security Council Mission on the implementation of Security Council resolution 1244 (1999)
- S/2001/218, 13 March 2001 - SG Report on Kosovo
- S/2000/548, 6 June 2000, SG's Report
- S/2000/177, 3 March 2000, SG's Report
- S/Res/1244(1999)
- S/Res/1239(1999)
- S/Res/1207(1998)
- S/Res/855(1993)



The Situation in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Since the collapse of Yugoslavia in the early 1990s, many observers have viewed the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM) as a critical flashpoint in the Balkans. The international community gave high priority to preventing the spread of ethnic conflict to FYROM, since it was feared that war there could quickly involve some or all of FYROM's neighboring countries and lead to a broader Balkan war. In 1993, the Security Council voted to send a small military contingent to FYROM to prevent the violence in the rest of the region from spilling over into the new nation. The United Nations Preventive Deployment Force (UNPREDEP) was the first instance ever of UN forces' being sent on a preventative deployment. By all measures, the operation was a success; FYROM was spared the violence that engulfed much of the region. However, in early 1999, China vetoed a further extension of UNPREDEP's mandate, in apparent retaliation for FYROM's recognition of Taiwan, and this veto led to the removal of the UN forces.

At the same time, NATO was deploying its forces to the area around the Yugoslav province of Kosovo in response to the escalating conflict there. By June 1999, NATO air strikes had led the government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to ask for a cease fire under NATO conditions. In response, the Security Council passed Resolution 1244 (1999) authorizing NATO forces to deploy to Kosovo to establish an environment conducive to finding a long-term solution to the conflict. Some NATO forces were deployed to FYROM, both before and after S/Res/1244, in support of the main operation.

The conflict between Kosovo's Serb and Albanian populations had an impact on the relationship of the Slav and Albanian communities in FYROM, but inter-ethnic relations never sank as low as those in Kosovo. In fact, Albanian parties were part of the FYROM government throughout the 1990s. However, relations have historically been tense between the Slav majority and ethnic Albanian minority, and the groups have never been integrated. Albanians resent their status as second class citizens, and believe their language should be made an official language of FYROM. Many in FYROM fear that these demands for Albanian autonomy are simply a pretext for the eventual separation of the Albanian areas.

The conflict in neighboring Kosovo in 1999 exacerbated inter-ethnic tensions in FYROM. About 250,000 Kosovar Albanian refugees flooded into FYROM during the height of the crisis. FYROM authorities were at times reluctant to accept Kosovar Albanian refugees and pressed for many thousands of them to be evacuated to

third countries. The Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA) maintained a presence in FYROM during the conflict. FYROM authorities frequently intercepted and seized weapons deliveries en route to Kosovo.

In early 2001, a group calling themselves the "National Liberation Army" (UCK in Albanian) appeared on the scene, claiming responsibility for a number of the attacks. As the violence escalated, the FYROM government moved to respond. Active diplomacy by the international community led the government to tread lightly in trying to reassert control. While this diplomacy is credited with keeping the level of the conflict in check, it drew resentment from many within FYROM. Many Slavs felt the foreign interference was preventing them from dealing decisively with internal rebellion; many Albanians felt betrayed by the same nations which they had seen as saviors months before.

The violence continued through the summer, with neither side able to gain a decisive advantage. After concerted diplomatic pressure, a cease-fire in July led to a peace agreement in early August. The agreement calls for the deployment of NATO troops in FYROM to separate the forces and disarm the rebels. As of this writing, NATO forces have not yet been deployed.

Questions to consider from the perspective of your government on this issue include:

- Should the international mission to FYROM be under NATO or UN auspices?
- Does your government believe that foreign diplomacy made the situation in FYROM better or worse?
- Does your government feel this situation sets any precedents for how the international community should address conflicts like this in the future?
- What measures, if any, should the international community now take to prevent the conflict from rekindling and spreading?
- What would be the results of the withdrawal of the international community?

Bibliography:

- "China Uses Veto To Block Extended UN Mission." *UN Wire*, 26 February 1999.
- Fisher, Ian. "Macedonia Tension Eases Slightly as Talks Are to Restart." *The New York Times*, 8 August 2001.
- Fisher, Ian. "Macedonians Give Initial Approval to a Peace Agreement." *The New York Times*, 8 August 2001.
- "Gov't Considers War; EU Calls For Restraint." *UN Wire*, 7 May 2001.
- "Hostilities Raise Fears Of Regional Crisis." *UN Wire*, 6 March 2001.
- "Macedonia Fighting Intensifies." *UN Wire*, 19 March 2001.
- Reuters. "NATO Says It Won't Directly Disarm Rebels in Macedonia." *The New York Times*, 8 August 2001.
- "Security Council Condemns Albanian Rebels; More." *UN Wire*, 8 March 2001.

“UN Praises Restraint In Face Of Deadly Attacks.” *UN Wire*, 1 May 2001.

UN Documents:

S/PRST/2001/8, 16 March 2001

S/PRST/2001/7, 7 March 2001

S/PRST/2000/40, 19 December 2000

S/Res/1345 (2001)

S/Res/1244 (1999)

S/Res/1239 (1999)

S/Res/1203 (1998)

S/Res/1199 (1998)

S/Res/1160 (1998)

ISSUES IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The Situation between Iraq and Kuwait

The latter months of 2000 and early 2001 brought a number of changes to the Security Council's handling of the Iraqi situation. While disarmament, monitoring and verification issues continue to be a concern, the Council now appears to be moving toward allowing nations to normalize trading relations with Iraq. A broad realization, even among the United Kingdom and the United States, has set in that the current sanctions are ineffective, and is harming the Iraqi people while not seriously affecting the government. The sanctions have become subject to multiple violations, by both neighboring States and several major powers.

While the UK and US did engage in a prolonged bombing attack against Iraq in February 2001, this was followed by discussions of “recasting” the sanctions. A UK and US resolution to modify the sanctions failed to gain support in May. Following this, in June Iraq again refused to comply with a Security Council resolution extending the oil-for-food programme, thus attempting to show its defiance to international regulation. As of the time of this writing, oil is again flowing from Iraq with limited restrictions; all money received goes into the oil-for-food accounts, thus limiting Iraq's ability to purchase weapons, which would be contrary to the remaining sanctions.

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 current stalemate in the Security Council includes the UK and US position of keeping sanctions on weapons and a possible renewed inspection regime, while lifting all other sanctions. The Russian Federation and China, on the other hand, favor only very limited restrictions on Iraq,

arguing that the Iraqi people have suffered enough and that the country should be allowed to rebuild. France and several other European nations are in the middle of this stalemate, with significant interests in Iraqi trade driving the positions of some countries.

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

- What actions can be taken to break the current stalemate in the Council? Which position does your government favor to overcome the impasse?
- Should sanctions be lifted as Iraq continues to comply with the demands of the Security Council?
- What concessions, if any, should be made to Iraq in order to restore the disarmament and monitoring mission? Is this a desirable outcome for your government?

Bibliography:

“Baghdad Insists on Sanctions' End Before Arms Inspections.” *UN Wire*, 22 February 2001.

Crossette, Barbara. “British-US. Plan to Ease Curb On Iraq Seems Stalled for Now.” *The New York Times*, 31 May 2001.

Crossette, Barbara. “Effort to Recast Iraq Oil Sanctions Is Halted For.” *The New York Times*, 3 July 2001.

Crossette, Barbara. “Paris Talks Will Address Plan Revising Iraq Sanctions.” *The New York Times*, 13 June 2001.

Crossette, Barbara. “U.N. Sanctions Didn't Stop Iraq From Buying Weapons.” *The New York Times*, 18 June 2001.

Dao, James and Myers, Steven Lee. “Attack on Iraq: the Overview; U.S. and British Jets.” *The New York Times*, 17 February 2001.

Eckholm, Erik. “China Rejects Allegations On Improving Iraqi Weapons.” *The New York Times*, 7 March 2001.

“Former UN Aides Say Sanctions Amount to Genocide.” *UN Wire*, 18 June 2001.

Frantz, Douglas. “At Iraq's Backdoor, Turkey Flouts Sanctions.” *The New York Times*, 30 March 2001.

“Iraq Halts Oil Sales Over U.N. Decision On Food Program.” *The New York Times*, 4 June 2001.

MacFarquhar, Neil. “Arab Leaders End Meeting In Disarray Over Iraq.” *The New York Times*, 29 March 2001.

“New Inspection Chief Offers Detailed Plan.” *UN Wire*, 7 April 2000.

“Recasting the Iraq Sanctions.” *The New York Times*, 20 May 2001.

“Security Council Members Discuss Easing Sanctions.” *UN Wire*, 14 June 2001.

“Security Council Representatives Meet in Paris on Sanctions.” *UN Wire*, 13 June 2001.

“Stalemate Over Iraq.” *The New York Times*, 5 July 2001.

“U.N. Council Votes To Extend Iraq Plan.” *The New York Times*, 4 July 2001.

“US, UK Attack Baghdad Sites, Imperiling Upcoming UN Talks.” *UN Wire*, 20 February 2001.



“World Briefing | Middle East: Iraq: Oil Exports Resume.”
The New York Times, 12 July 2001

UN Documents:

S/2001/582, 12 June 2001, SG Report on Iraq/Kuwait
S/2001/505, 18 May 2001, SG Report on Iraq
S/2001/287, 28 March 2001, SG Report on Iraq-Kuwait
S/2001/186, 2 March 2001, SG Report pursuant to paragraph
5 of resolution 1330 (2000) - Iraq
S/2000/575, 14 June 2000, SG's Report
S/2000/520, 1 June 2000, SG's Report
S/2000/347, 26 April 2000, SG Report
S/2000/269, 30 March 2000, SG's Report
S/2000/208, 10 March 2000, SG Report
S/1999/356, 27 and 30 March, 1999, Reports to the SC
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 August 1990)

The Situation in the Middle East:

The UN-monitored Israeli pullout from Lebanon in June 2000, along with ongoing talks between the Israeli government and the Palestinian Authority brought a brief sense of renewed hope to the region. Violence continued, however, and has intensified since the February 2001 election of Prime Minister Sharon in Israel. Both sides continue to engage in violent acts, whether through direct confrontations, or in increased bombings and other alleged terrorist incidents. The Security Council attempted to take action in March 2001, with a resolution which would have created an international observer force to protect Palestinian civilians in Gaza and the West Bank. This resolution, which was opposed by Israel, was vetoed by the United States, with four other European nations abstaining. While the Middle East is a frequent topic of discussion, little concrete action has been taken by the Council.

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?

Bibliography:

“Arafat Lobbies Security Council for Peacekeepers.” *UN Wire*, 13 November 2000.
Barak, Ehud. “Israel Needs a True Partner for Peace.” *The New York Times*, 30 July 2001.
“Border Clash Leads to New Syrian-Israeli Tensions.” *UN Wire*, 16 April 2001.

Crossette, Barbara. “Powell Assails Israel for Gaza Incursion.” *The New York Times*, 18 April 2001.
“Europeans Offer Alternative to UN Observer Force.” *UN Wire*, 23 March 2001.
“Gulf States Offer \$300 Million to Arafat Gov't; more.” *UN Wire*, 20 March 2001.
“Israel, Arabs Clash at UN Talks; More.” *UN Wire*, 24 April 2001.
“Israel Rejects UN Force; more.” *UN Wire*, 7 November 2000.
“Israeli Occupation Illegal, General Assembly Says.” *UN Wire*, 4 December 2000.
“Israeli-Palestinian Talks Gauge Cease-Fire.” *UN Wire*, 15 June 2001.
“New Israeli Prime Minister Urged to Pursue Peace.” *UN Wire*, 7 February 2001.
“Palestinians Repeat Request for UN Intervention.” *UN Wire*, 16 March 2001.
Perlez, Jane. “U.S. Widens Role in Mideast Crisis, Sending an Envoy.” *The New York Times*, 22 May 2001.
“Security Council Backs Annan's Peace Efforts.” *UN Wire*, 23 May 2001.
“Security Council Supports UNIFIL Reduction,” *UN Wire*, 17 May 2001.
Sontag, Deborah. “And Yet So Far: A special report. Quest for Mideast Peace: How and Why It Failed.” *The New York Times*, 26 July 2001.
Sontag, Deborah. “Arafat Stops Short of Rejecting Violence.” *The New York Times*, 11 March 2001.
“UN Diplomats Negotiate to End Violence.” *UN Wire*, 23 April 2001.
“U.S. Veto Blocks West Bank Force.” *The New York Times*, 28 March 2001.
Weaver, Mary Anne. “Egypt on Trial.” *The New York Times*, 17 June 2001.

UN Documents:

S/2001/714, 20 July 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 January 2001 - SG Report on the UN Interim Force in Lebanon
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
SC/6874 (2000) - Press Release: Tribute to Syrian President
SC/6847 (2000) - Press Release: Lebanon Withdrawal



CHAPTER III.

THE HISTORICAL SECURITY COUNCIL - 1956

STATE MEMBERS

Australia
Belgium
China
Cuba
France
Iran

Peru
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
United Kingdom
United States
Yugoslavia

The 2001 American Model United Nations Historical Security Council (HSC) will simulate the events of the world beginning on 1 July 1956. Historically, the key international security concerns at this time revolve around the situations in the Middle East, with the Palestine question and continuing Arab-Israeli hostilities; South Africa, including the race conflict and issues with people of Indian origin residing in that country; colonial issues in Algeria, Cyprus and many other areas seeking independence; and continued disputes and recognition issues between the two Chinas. The Cold War struggles between the United States and the Soviet Union are also a constant undercurrent in the world of international politics.

In 1956, Dag Hammarskjöld was the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Eisenhower the US President and Khrushchev the Soviet Premier. The Shah's government was in power in Iran, Batista's Cuba was in the American sphere of influence, 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 decolonization, with its creation of many new states and subsequent expansion of the United Nations, was moving into full swing. Issues of "Palestine" revolved around continued violations of the armistice which followed the 1948 war, and the only issues involving "Palestinians" were their status as refugees. There were "internal" conflicts in many countries in this time period (South Africa, Algeria, Morocco, etc.), but most never reached the Security Council, or were discussed with no action taken, due to the powerful patronage of one or more of the Permanent Members.

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 not be just a rote replay of national decisions as they evolved in 1956. 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 1956 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 countries' 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 of 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 solution. 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 the events that led up to mid-1956, 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 40 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 early- to mid-1956 to most accurately reflect the world view at that time. These periodicals, 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.

The HSC simulation will follow a flexible timeline 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 individuals assigned as their nations’ Representatives to the UN. Each person may have access to the up-to-the-minute policy decisions of the country, or may be relatively “in the dark” on the country’s 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 1956 time frame include: Israel, Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, South Africa, Algeria, Greece, Morocco, Hungary and India.

BACKGROUND RESEARCH

The following are brief synopses of the main international situations facing the Security Council on 1 July 1956. The prominent events of late 1955 and early 1956 are discussed, as well as some questions which will face the Security Council in the latter half of the year. This research is intended merely as a focal point for Representatives’ continued exploration of the topics.

Please note that resolutions should be written on the sub-topics of each regional area: i.e., resolutions would not be written about “The Situation in the Middle East,” but rather about “The Question of Palestine,” “The Situation of Armistice Violations between Israel and Egypt,” or similar sub-topics within the region.

ISSUES IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The Palestine question dominated discussions of the Security Council in 1955 and early 1956. Among the issues were numerous violations of the 1948-49 General Armistice Agreements (GAA) by all sides, continued armed hostilities, and increasing numbers of Palestinian refugees. Secretary-General Hammarskjöld’s trip to the Middle East in April and May of 1956 set the stage for

continued Security Council negotiations in this area, including calls for renewed efforts at cease fires and compliance with the Armistice Agreements.

The Palestine Question: Incidents on Lake Tiberias

Incidents on the disputed Lake Tiberias, located along the Armistice line, were the basis of conflicts between Syria and Israel in 1955 and early 1956. In



December, 1955, Israeli armed forces attacked Syrian civilians and military personnel on the shores of Lake Tiberias from both the land and sea.

These attacks were documented by United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO) personnel stationed in the region. The UNTSO reports noted that Israel deliberately violated provisions of the GAA by engaging in government-authorized military operations in the lake region. The report also noted, however, that Syrian authorities had, over the past year, interfered with legitimate Israeli commercial and civilian activities on the lake in violation of the GAA provisions. Israel claimed this violation as the basis for its military actions in December, but was rebuked by both the UNTSO report and the Security Council.

On 19 January 1956, the Security Council passed Resolution III (S/3538) condemning Israel for its attacks on Syria and calling for a cessation of hostilities and return to the terms of the GAA. The resolution passed unanimously, and all members of Council also verbally condemned the Israeli attacks. While hostilities remain high in the region, no further attacks have been noted through 1 July.

The Palestine Question: Status of Compliance with Armistice Agreements

The most difficult question facing the Council in 1955/56 involved the overall status of compliance with the GAA, in particular issues arising along the Egyptian and Israeli borders. Throughout 1955, the Council discussed several aspects of this portion of the Palestinian Question, focusing around Israeli and Egyptian military incursions into the Gaza Area, which was formally laid out in the GAA as a demilitarized zone (DMZ).

On 29 March 1956, the Council passed Resolution 106 (S/3378) which condemned recent attacks by the Israeli regular military against Egyptian regular military forces in the Gaza area. With tensions heightening, on 30 March the Council also passed Resolution 107 (S/3379) requesting the assistance of the UNTSO Chief of Staff in consulting with the governments of both parties on ways to lessen the strain in the area and maintain the Armistice provisions. Following the apparently successful efforts of the Chief of Staff in negotiations with Israel and Egypt, the Council on 8 September also passed Resolution 108 (S/3435), calling for a cease fire (which had already been accepted by the parties) and the free movement of UN observers in the Gaza area. While steps taken by the Council in 1955 led to verbal declarations of lessened hostility, actual levels of tension along the lines of demarcation remained high moving into 1956.

In 1956, the Council held discussions throughout March and April on the compliance with Armistice Agreements. Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon and Syria

were all invited participants in these discussions. The general consensus at this time was that steps to reduce tensions taken in 1955 had not been carried out, and that further actions were needed. On 4 April 1956, the Council adopted Resolution 113 (S/3575) on these issues. This document requested the Secretary-General's (SG) assistance in completing an "enforcement survey" of the GAA provisions, and in seeking discussions by all parties to adopt already accepted GAA measures. It also requested the withdrawal of all forces to demarcation lines, the continued freedom of movement of observers, and the creation of local arrangements, in each area, for the prevention of future incidents. The Council realistically noted the improbability of full compliance with the GAA, but stressed the importance of all parties' attempts to comply whenever possible.

From 10 April through 3 May 1956, SG Hammarskjold traveled to all of the countries involved in the Armistice Agreements, seeking the cooperation requested by the Council. In his reports of 2 May and 9 May, the SG noted that he regarded his mandate to include negotiations between the parties to reestablish full compliance with the Armistice Agreements, and he also reported generally positive results. While the Council had not specifically sought to include the SG in "negotiations," they did respond positively to the results of the trip.

The SG's reports noted that, while all parties accepted the GAA provisions as in their overall best interests, political and practical circumstances had led to the current state of affairs in the region. Namely, mutual mistrust, combined with an inability to guarantee compliance by any given party, were contributing greatly to tensions which all parties stated they would rather avoid. The SG received personal assurances from each party that they would unconditionally observe the cease fire clauses in the GAA and subsequent Council resolutions, reserving only the right to self defense. This specifically included the idea that the parties would not respond with military force to anything less than an attack by the regular military of another party.

As a show of good will on this issue, the SG also reported that Egypt and Israel, on 18 April had both sent orders which served to relieve tensions along the Gaza demarcation line. Additionally, Egypt and Israel provided specific assurances that they would seek to actively prevent crossing of the demarcation lines, including both the Gaza DMZ and the contested El Auja region, in which both sides had a military presence in violation of the GAA provisions.

The SG noted two key issues left unanswered by his trip. The first was the issue of Egyptian interference in Israeli shipping through the Suez Canal and the Straits of Tiran. This issue was first raised in September 1951, and was still on the table through early 1956. Both the harassment of Israeli vessels, and the possible cut off of



this vital shipping lane by Egypt were noted as potential sources of tension in the future. The second unanswered issue involved a recent Israeli plan for diversion of the Jordan River, which would be disastrous for Jordan and another likely precursor to renewed conflict in the region.

On 4 June 1956, the Council passed Resolution 114 (S/3605), commending the SG on this report, endorsing the view that full compliance with the GAA provisions was the key to peace in the region, and asking the SG to continue his Good Office efforts to ensure the cease fires and bring the parties closer to full Armistice compliance in the future.

ISSUES IN AFRICA

The Situation in Algeria

The situation currently existing in Algeria involves possible threats to peace and flagrant violations of human rights undertaken by France in the colonial area of Algeria. This extremely contentious question is the most violent of many colonial situations occurring in 1956. At issue is the right of France to govern its territory of Algeria as it sees fit, including the violent repression of uprisings when needed.

In April of 1956, seventeen Asian and African member States brought before the Security Council a request to discuss the situation, which was ultimately not brought to the floor. The question within the Council revolved around the body's competence to discuss an issue described by France as a domestic jurisdiction issue completely within France's sovereignty, versus its description by opponents as a threat to peace, flagrant violation of human rights, and question of legitimate self-determination for the peoples of Algeria.

In debate prior to bringing the topic to the floor, discussion revolved around France's policy of repression and extermination of the Algerian people, including a possible question of a violation of the Genocide Convention. The significant increase of French troops in Algeria in 1955 and early 1956, from approximately 150,000 to reports in excess of 400,000, was noted as the significant "threat to peace" in the area.

On the opposite side, France noted a basically peaceful situation, with Algeria under undisputed French control for the past 120 years, which had been interrupted by foreign intervention. This included both arms deliveries and distribution of anti-French propaganda, with Egypt's being named in discussions as the primary party to these acts. France continually stressed its right to govern French territories as it sees fit, and reminded the body that sovereignty forms the basis of all UN actions.

By a vote of seven to two (Iran, USSR) with two abstentions (China and Yugoslavia), the Algerian question

was not included on the agenda in June 1956, although the situation continues as described.

The Situation in Southern Africa

The treatment of peoples of Indian origin in South Africa is one of two issues in this area being confronted by the UN. While most discussions have taken place in the General Assembly, the possibility of increased violence makes this an issue of interest for the Security Council. The key question revolves around the oppression, both official and incidental, of Indians remaining in South Africa following the colonial period. India made several attempts in the GA to resolve the issue, but South Africa felt strongly that this is a two party issue to be resolved between India and South Africa, with no outside intervention necessary.

A related question facing the UN in South Africa involved the policy of Apartheid officially practiced by the South African government, and its possible international repercussions in the region. Once again, the GA has been the main body to discuss Apartheid, but the Security Council has been kept apprised of events as they occur. The deteriorating racial situation in South Africa, combined with the government's public refusal to redress the issues, creates a difficult situation for the UN. South Africa went even further in formalizing Apartheid through various laws, including the Bantu Education Act of 1953, limiting and separating educational opportunities, and the Separate Registration of Voters Act of 1951.

There are three main schools of thought among UN member States on the best way for the international community to deal with the Apartheid issue. The first holds that the General Assembly (and potentially the Security Council) should exert influence to encourage the removal of Apartheid policies. A second group doubts the GA's competence to discuss the issue, and seeks an International Court of Justice decision placing the Apartheid under the competence of the GA or the Council. A third group feels that a more conciliatory approach is needed, stressing negotiations without the need for formal condemnations or pressure, which they feel would be counterproductive. To date, outside of debating the issue the UN has not gone further than attempting to create an atmosphere which would facilitate resolution of the matter through diplomatic discussions.

ISSUES IN ASIA

The Question of the Representation of China

Since the inception of the United Nations, the Republic of China has held the official Chinese seat at the UN, including in the Security Council. The rise of the

Peoples Republic of China on the mainland, however, has raised an issue of legitimacy concerning this representation. This issue has been most strongly stressed by the Soviet Union in discussions before the Council. The discussion was first raised in January of 1955, when the Council invited a representative of the central government of the Peoples Republic of China to participate without a vote in its discussion of the issue. Complicating this issue are continued acts of violence between the forces of the two Chinas, particularly in the seas surrounding the island of Formosa/Taiwan. To date, the Council has decided to take no action on seating mainland China, and a representative of the Republic of China remains in the UN seat.

The Situation in West Irian (West New Guinea)

West Irian (West New Guinea) is one of many colonial disputes in the world which has been accompanied by minor international hostilities. In this case, West Irian is a colonial possession of the Netherlands, but its political status is currently an object of contention between the Netherlands and Indonesia. Indonesia feels that West Irian should either be ceded to Indonesia, or given the right of self-determination, and some hostilities have arisen over the issue.

OTHER ISSUES

The Situation in Cyprus

Cyprus is another colonial territory embroiled in a dispute over the right to self-determination. This colony of the United Kingdom, which has a significant Greek population, is currently seeking independence from the UK. This has so far been denied due to the island's significance as a military base in close proximity to the Middle East. Incidents which most concern the Security Council in this situation are a rise in terrorism on the island, apparently incited by Greece against the UK government on Cyprus, and continued calls by Greece and peoples inside Cyprus for the right to self-determination.

Admission of New Member States

With many former colonial territories gaining their independence, and more expected in 1956, the Security Council has been dealing with the issue of admitting new member States to the United Nations. In 1955 alone, Resolution 109 (S/3509) of 19 December recommended the admission of sixteen new members to the UN, including: Albania, Jordan, Ireland, Portugal, Hungary, Italy, Austria, Romania, Bulgaria, Finland, Ceylon, Nepal, Libya, Cambodia, Laos and Spain. The question was

addressed once in 1956, with Resolution 112 (S/3546) of 6 February recommending the admission of Sudan. The recent independence of Morocco and Tunisia may also lead to their request for admission in the near future. It should be noted that, following the submission of a request for admission to the Secretary-General, potential member States must be recommended by the Security Council before they can be accepted into the UN by a vote of the General Assembly.

Other Open Issues

Any issue on the world scene in 1956 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 July 1956.

Bibliography:

Please note: The books and documents listed below provide both contemporary and historical information on the years 1955 and 1956. Any information provided for dates after 1 July 1956 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 1955 and the first half of 1956. 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.

- Ambrose, Stephen E. *Eisenhower the President*. Simon & Schuster, 1984.
- The Blue Helmets: A Review of United Nations Peace Keeping* (Second Edition). New York: United Nations, 1990.
- Burns, William J. *Economic Aid and American Policy Toward Egypt*. SUNY Press, 1985.
- Dimbleby, David and Reynolds, David. *An Ocean Apart: The Relationship Between Britain and America in the Twentieth Century*. Random House, 1988.
- Djonovich, Dusan J, ed. *United Nations Resolutions: Series II, Resolutions of the Security Council; Volume III*. New York: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1989.
- Durch, William J., ed. *The Evolution of UN Peacekeeping*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993.
- Eagleton, Clyde and Swift, Richard. *Annual Review of United Nations Affairs*. New York: New York University Press, 1957.
- Eisenhower, Dwight D. *The White House Years: Waging Peace*. Heinemann, 1966.
- Finer, Herman. *Dulles Over Suez: The Theory and Practice of His Diplomacy*. Quadrangle Books, 1964.
- Horne, Alistair. *A Savage War of Peace: Algeria*. Penguin Books, 1977.



- MacMillan, Harold. *Riding the Storm*. MacMillan, 1971.
- Murphy, Robert. *Diplomat Among Warriors*. Doubleday, 1964.
- Neff, Donald. *Warriors at Suez: Eisenhower Takes American into the Middle East*. Linden Press, 1981.
- Neustadt, Richard E. *Alliance Politics*. Columbia University Press, 1970.
- Shuckburgh, Evelyn. *Descent to Suez: Diaries*. Weiden- field, 1986.
- United Nations Department of Public Information. *Yearbook of the United Nations*. New York: United Nations Publications, 1956.
- United Nations Department of Public Information. *Yearbook of the United Nations*. New York: United Nations Publications, 1957.
- Urquhart, Brian. *Hammarskjold*. New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1972.
- Urquhart, Brian. *A Life in Peace and War*. New York: Harper and Rowe, 1987.
- UN Documents*, :
- SC Res 106 (S/3378): The Palestine Question
- SC Res 107 (S/3379): The Palestine Question
- SC Res 108 (S/3435): The Palestine Question
- SC Res 109 (S/3509): Admission of New Member States
- UN Documents*, :
- SC Res 111 (S/3538): The Palestine Question
- SC Res 112 (S/3546): Admission of New Member States
- SC Res 113 (S/3575): The Palestine Question
- SC Res 114 (S/3605): The Palestine Question
- S/3589: Letter of 12 April from seventeen member States concerning Algeria
- S/3594: 2 May progress report of the Secretary-General
- S/3596: Report of 9 May by the Secretary-General on Compliance with Armistice Agreements
- S/3609: Letter of 13 June from thirteen member States concerning Algeria
- A/3120: Letter from Greece to the GA concerning Cyprus

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)

PREVENTION OF THE VIOLENT DISINTEGRATION OF STATES

Since the end of the Second World War, the nature of international conflict has undergone a major transformation. Clear battle lines between nations were drawn and the enemy was often found at the border. Fewer and fewer modern conflicts follow the classic model. The majority of conflicts that have occurred since the end of the Cold War are predominately intrastate, rather than interstate in character. Rapid demographic, environmental and political changes have created conditions that economic and governmental infrastructures were not ready to properly address. As a result of this vacuum of leadership, nationalism created a powerful force around which to rally and conflict began, leading toward the violent disintegration of States.

Ethnic and religious identification became powerful motivators, in addition to enormous pressures created by population growth, stress on global life-support systems and the globalization of the economy. These pressures helped to create some of the most bitter social unrest and ethnic conflicts in areas such as Bosnia, Rwanda, Chechnya, Israel and Afghanistan. It is this unrest, and occasionally violent exchanges which follow, that has become a new threat to international security.

The violent disintegration of States can often result in human rights abuses, economic stagnation, and social discontentment. The implosion of national law, authority and order can result. As a result of a weakness of national structures and order, citizens look to whomever will create some semblance of normalcy. One controlling group or a weak government may form rules that benefit their particular ethnic or religious group. This may inspire further violence and result in a real or perceived suppression of an another group's rights. This real or perceived situation may lead to riots, terrorist attacks, and secessionist movements.

People who perceive a threat to their families' safety may choose to flee, either to another part of the county or across a border, where they feel safer. These refugees are often a source of further conflict. Additionally,

refugees can place a large strain on the resources of the country to which they flee. To further complicate matters, in places of extreme conflict, humanitarian organizations that fear for the safety of their personnel are in a difficult position. They have to choose whether to fulfill their mission or place people in unreasonable danger when they have to travel to places in which they are unwelcome.

While the violent disintegration of States may appear to be internal, movements are often unsuccessful without the support from outside groups or other States. States which feel an ethnic kinship to a dissenting group or which are not on friendly terms with another state may for their own purposes support and shelter groups which seek to topple the current government. Global and regional powers therefore have a great effect on the outcome of ethnic conflict.

These severe conflicts have led to the United Nations' classifying the prevention of the violent disintegration of States as a key issue to the maintenance of international peace and security. The UN has stressed the importance of the development of good-neighborliness and friendly relations among States and reaffirmed the principle of the inviolability of international borders. It has also acknowledged and encouraged the contributions of current UN organs, regional organizations, and member States in their efforts to prevent the violent disintegration of States.

The UN continues to examine this topic as the nature of ethnic conflict grows and evolves. Additional measures may help to prevent the growth of this type of ethnic conflict. Recently, the UN held a conference to curb the trafficking of small arms. Later this year, a conference will be held to address racism and xenophobia. In the fall, the Food and Agricultural Organization will hold a World Food Summit. These conferences will help to bring attention and to address some of the issues that are the root of internal conflicts. A multi-faceted approach must be taken where the causes of conflict may be a competition for resources, but ethnic identification makes an easy scapegoat and



the ease of obtaining weapons makes the expression of frustration violent.

The right of a group to self-determination is largely accepted by the world community. However, this right does not give license for one idealistic or nationalistic group or government to suppress another. The continued examination of this issue from many angles must continue to properly prevent the violent disintegration of States.

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

- How can the UN prevent the violent disintegration of States without suppressing an ethnic group's right to self-determination?
- At what point should the UN intervene? What factors (i.e. human rights abuses) may overrule the sovereignty of the state?
- Which solutions to ethnic conflict have been successful in your country or region? Which solutions to ethnic conflict have been unsuccessful in your country or region?
- How do demographic and environmental changes impact civil strife?

Bibliography:

"Autonomy Plan Signed; Violence Continues." *UN Wire*, 6 May 1999.

Frckoski, Ljubomir. Statement before the North Atlantic Cooperation Council in Ministerial Session." Brussels, 11 December 1996.

International Committee of the Red Cross. "New Conflicts - Armed Conflicts linked to the disintegration of State Structures." January 1998.

Kahl, Colin H. "States, Scarcity, and Civil Strife in the Developing World." Institute of War and Peace Studies. Columbia International Affairs Online, April 1999.

"UN Envoy Argues For Broader Peace In Balkans." *UN Wire*, 20 January 2000.

"UN Will Face Big Challenge In Peacekeeping." *UN Wire*, 1 February 2000.

United States Institute of Peace, Peaceworks #9

"Yugoslavia, Serbs Criticize Tomorrow's Vote." *UN Wire*, 27 October 2000.

UN Documents:

A/54/571

A/54/PV.69

A/RES/55/27

A/RES/54/62

A/RES/53/71

A/C.1/54/PV.3 through A/C.1/54/PV.27

A/C.1/53/L.44/Rev.1

A/C.1/53/L.32/Rev.2

Press Release GA/DIS/3129

Additional Web Resources:

www.oneworld.org/euroconflict

www.cc.columbia.edu/cu/cria/SigTops/ciaoTxt.html

PRESERVATION OF AND COMPLIANCE WITH THE TREATY ON THE LIMITATION OF ANTI-BALLISTIC MISSILE SYSTEMS

As a bilateral agreement, the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems (ABM Treaty) is typically outside the realm of United Nations discussion. The broad-ranging significance of the ABM Treaty, however, has often placed it on the agenda of the GA. In particular, the cessation of this treaty by one or both of its parties could have serious security repercussions for the entire international community.

The ABM Treaty was signed between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in 1972. It is considered to be one of the beginning points of a long series of strategic arms control accords between the US and the USSR. The ABM Treaty bans the deployment of systems to provide defense from ballistic missile attack on a national scale. However, the Treaty does permit some basic research of such systems and originally permitted each party to the Treaty to protect two areas from ballistic missiles, one set of missile silos and to protect each party's national capital. The Treaty has since been amended to limit defenses to one site and the parties to the treaty now include several former Soviet republics.

In the 1980s, US President Ronald Reagan proposed the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) which would have created a comprehensive shield from ballistic missile attacks, based largely on space-based lasers that would be able to shoot down incoming missiles. SDI, known as "Star Wars" by its critics, would have violated the ABM Treaty and although research was conducted, deployment of the system never occurred. While research into alternative systems continued under President Bush, the Gulf War became a distraction.

The Patriot Air Defense system that was employed during the Gulf War spurred a US Republican Congress to pass the 1996 National Missile Defense Act. Missile defense was not a large priority for the Clinton administration and President Clinton ultimately chose to postpone an ultimate decision on a National Missile Defense (NMD) System to the next president. He cited several reasons for not proceeding with a NMD including the lack of reliable technology, the refusal of the Russian Federation to revise the ABM treaty to accommodate a US NMD and a lack of political support from US allies.



US President George W. Bush, however, is a strong advocate of deploying a NMD and has made it clear that he is willing to abandon the ABM Treaty if necessary for deployment. Since President Bush took office in January of 2001, the US Government has conducted one partially successful test of a NMD system and says that it may be necessary to amend or to abrogate the ABM Treaty sometime this year.

Proponents of developing a NMD system argue that since the end of the Cold War, a possible nuclear attack from Russia no longer signifies a potential threat to US national security. Rather, new threats such as attacks from “rogue States” or terrorist organizations warrant the deployment of a missile shield. They further argue that the ABM Treaty represents old thinking about strategic issues and that it is time to re-contemplate strategic arms control in general.

Opponents of the NMD system, including the Russian Federation and the European Union (EU), argue that deploying such a system will be harmful for two main reasons. First, they claim that the ABM Treaty is the cornerstone of all strategic arms control and that abrogating it would seriously undermine, if not destroy, strategic arms control. Additionally, cessation of the treaty would likely bring about a new arms race, with both the Russian Federation and China potentially involved. Further, they argue that the space-based portions of the system will spur a new type of arms race, leading to the weaponization of outer space.

The General Assembly has in recent years adopted resolutions calling for the preservation of the ABM Treaty. One concern to address is whether or not this is a bilateral US-Russian Federation issue and is thus not an appropriate topic for UN discussion. With regard to future UN action, balance needs to be found between the maintenance of international peace and security without prejudicing possibly on-going strategic negotiations between the parties directly involved.

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

- What role should the UN and other multilateral organizations play with regard to the ABM Treaty and missile defense systems?
- How has the international strategic climate changed since the end of the Cold War? Is there a need to rethink how arms control and nonproliferation is enforced?
- What steps, if any, can and should be taken to prevent the weaponization of outer space?

Bibliography:

This topic is very timely and this list represents just a small sample of relevant articles. The following publications are highly recommended for research on this topic (in addition to standard periodicals):

- *Arms Control Today*
- *The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*
- *Disarmament Diplomacy*
- *The Non Proliferation Review*
- Pravda on-line (english.pravda.ru/): good source of Russian perspectives on this and other current issues

Boese, Wade. “Top Pentagon Officials Make Case for Layered Missile Defense.” *Arms Control Today*, April 2001

Dewar, Helen. “Russia Denounces U.S. Missile Test.” *Washington Post*, 16 July 2001

Galbraith, James. “The Dangers of National Missile Defense,” *Boston Globe*, May 16, 2001

Jaffe, Greg and Robbins, Carla Anne. “Bush’s Planned Missile-Shield Program May Violate ABM Treaty Within Months.” *Wall Street Journal*, 12 July 2001

Krauthammer, Charles. “The Bush Doctrine.” *The Weekly Standard*, 4 June 2001

“Pakistan Warns US Against Missile Defense Plan.” *UN Wire*, 26 January 2001

Sanger, David. “Bush and Putin Tie Antimissile Talks to Big Arms Cuts.” *The New York Times*, 23 July 2001

Smith, Col. Daniel (Ret.). “A Brief History of “Missile” and Ballistic Missile Defense.” Center for Defense Information - Various Official Documents Related to the ABM Treaty.

“UNU Official Outlines Drawbacks Of US Plan.” *UN Wire*, 17 May 2001

UN Documents:

A/RES/55/33B (20 November 2000)

A/RES/54/54A

A/RES/52/30

A/RES/50/60

GA/DIS/3193

GA/DIS/3183

GA/DIS/3171

Additional Web Resources:

www.cdi.org/hotspots/issuebrief/ch2/index.html

www.state.gov/www/global/arms/treaties/abmpage.html



THE SECOND COMMITTEE (ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL)

EXTERNAL DEBT CRISIS AND DEVELOPMENT

The debt crisis of the world's Less Developed Countries (LDC) began in the late twentieth century. Rising oil prices and falling commodity prices left developing nations with current account deficits, often financed by foreign loans. At the same time, most developing nations also borrowed for investment and development. Many of the loans made by banks, foreign governments, and international institutions failed to generate intended revenue and left countries without resources to repay what they had borrowed. Whether the money was lost to theft by a corrupt government, wasted in failed import-substitution schemes, or spent on military buildup to fight a war, by 1990 most of the Highly Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) were unable to make payments on their debt.

The International Monetary Fund and World Bank, along with the Paris Club lenders rescheduled most of the debt. In effect most of the private debt (owed to large western banks and corporations) was paid off through new loans from international or bilateral lenders. Now, at the beginning of the new millennium developing nations are again facing mounting problems making debt payments, only to a new group of lenders.

While most nations are current in their debt payments, it is often at the expense of basic government services. Many LDCs are spending more on debt repayment than basic health services and education. The cycle of debt hinders investment in human capital and creates an impediment to development. For some nations, the debt burden has become unsustainable, meaning that current revenues are not sufficient even to make payments on foreign debt.

Secretary-General Kofi Annan wrote in his Millennium Report, "debt relief must be an integral part of the international community's contribution to development." He highlighted the need to declare a moratorium or cancel debt for nations that were involved in major conflicts or experienced natural disasters that left them unable to meet debt payment schedules.

The HIV/AIDS crisis compounds the debt crisis of the developing world. To stop the spread of the virus LDCs need money for basic health services and education/prevention, but none is available. While governments may have more funds to spend on health services after debt relief, they are faced with withering foreign aid since the end of the Cold War.

In an attempt to find a humanitarian response to the crisis, several plans by individual governments and multinational organizations have attempted to alleviate the debt burden. These plans have the dual goal of providing relief to the developing world by reducing the

debt burden, and increasing national governments spending on development.

In September 1996, the IMF and World Bank launched a program called The Initiative for the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries to provide assistance to countries with unsustainable debt burdens. The program is open only to countries facing a debt burden beyond available debt relief mechanisms and willing to reform their macroeconomic policies. A country must agree to a Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper, which usually includes provisions to increase tax revenues, reduce protectionism in trade, and allow less government interference in currency markets. Many call the conditions placed on debt relief unfair. These programs do not provide emergency relief because the "decision point" date, when debt relief will begin, is set to allow time for a country to implement macroeconomic policy changes. Because the program is only open to the poorest countries, many middle income nations hindered in development due to large debt burdens are excluded.

The most dramatic of the plans, developed by the Paris Club group of lenders, called for a complete write-off of the official bilateral debt for the world's poorest countries. Although this promises to reduce the debt burden for the world's poorest countries, it must be funded through the national budgets of the industrialized nations. The IMF and World Bank do not endorse widespread debt cancellation because they assert it will undermine the confidence of foreign investors in the creditworthiness of developing nations. In the last decade private capital flows have become the main source of new investment for developing nations, and are considered essential for long-term economic growth. Also, widespread cancellation of multilateral debt would impose a sizeable burden on the industrialized nations that are the main contributors to both the IMF and the World Bank. No countries have received actual debt relief under this plan.

One alternative to cancellation is debt swapping. Under debt swapping programs industrialized nations cancel part of a debt in exchange for a readily available resource. The earliest of these plans canceled debt to some Latin American countries in exchange for long-term leasing of rainforest land to aid conservation. These programs usually have requirements debtor nations can easily meet. However, such programs have failed to materialize into global relief.

With the Millennium Declaration (A/RES/55/2), the General Assembly recognized the debt burden faced by the low- and middle-income developing countries as an impediment to development. In addition to debt relief the resolution introduced the suggestion of duty- and quota-free access for essentially all exports from the



LDCs. This would allow them to earn foreign currency to help repay their debt.

In Resolution 55/184 the General Assembly called on industrialized nations to agree to cancel all bilateral official debts of the HIPC. This resolution further emphasized that debt cancellation and rescheduling should not be considered a substitute for development assistance and foreign aid. It also stressed the need for the HIPCs to participate in planning that will redirect money spent on debt payments to poverty reduction programs.

A solution to the debt crisis is necessary for the world's poorest countries to be able to move forward with development goals. Any feasible solution must address the different types of debt faced by a wide range of countries. Integral to solving the debt crisis is a mechanism to prevent future unsustainable borrowing. Without action the LDCs will be forced to continue deciding between paying creditors and serving the needs of their citizens.

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

- What is your government's position on debt cancellation programs? What is your government's current position within the IMF and World Bank?
- What nations should be eligible for debt reduction or cancellation? Should eligibility be based on per capita income or other development indicators?
- How can the international community be assured that the money saved by debt alleviation is spent on reducing poverty and providing basic social services?
- What are appropriate concessions that the industrialized world can expect in exchange for debt alleviation programs? What are the responsibilities of creditor nations in making unsustainable loans?
- What alternatives to cancellation exist? What are possible ways to expand debt-swapping programs?
- What implications for private capital flows do debt-alleviating programs have? What is the net influence of debt reduction on the development of a country?

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
- Debt Relief under the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries HIPC Initiative*: A Fact sheet of the International Monetary Fund. April 2001. www.imf.org/external/np/hipc/hipc.htm
- Jeter, Jon. "When Cutting Debt Brings Little Relief." *Washington Post*, 5 June 2001.
- Kahn, Joseph. "Wealthy Nations Plan a Doubling of Debt Relief." *The New York Times*, 17 September 2000.
- "Reform School." *The Economist*, 7 April 2001.
- The Oxfam Poverty Report*. Oxford: Oxfam Printing, 1996.

Wade, Robert. "Global Inequality." *The Economist*, 28 April 2001.

The World Bank. *Can Africa Claim the 21st Century?* New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Wren, Christopher. "The U.N. Offers 87 Remedies To Help Poor Nations Develop." *The New York Times*, 4 February 2001.

UN Documents:

- A/RES/55/422
- A/RES/55/216
- A/RES/55/184
- A/RES/55/2
- A/RES/54/202
- GA/9848
- GA/9758
- GA/9694
- E/CN.4/RES/2000/82

Additional Web Resources:

- www.jubileepius.org
- www.dropthedebt.org
- www.bicusa.org
- www.oxfamamerica.org/news
- www.worldbank.org/ida
- www.imf.org/external/np/exr/facts/hipc.htm

WATER SUPPLY AND SANITATION

While it has remained a relatively low profile issue in the eyes of the American public, water supply and sanitation is, for many countries, a matter of national security and one of national survival. In spite of the fact that the Earth is called a "blue planet" because of the amount of water in its oceans, only about 0.26% of the earth's water is accessible for human use. This limited water supply is under increasing stress with the increasing human population, and the loss of fresh water supplies due to pollution and climate change.

The global water-related statistics provided by the United Nations Environment Programme are sobering. Currently, 20% of the world's population faces water shortages. That figure will rise to 30% by 2025, and affect fifty countries. In Africa, twenty-five countries will face water stress or scarcity by 2025. In Asia, one in three people lacks access to safe drinking water. More than half of Europe's cities are over-exploiting groundwater reserves. As a result, not only are there groundwater shortages, but countries report groundwater pollution by nitrates, pesticides, heavy metals and hydrocarbons. West Africa faces particular pressure on groundwater resources as the volumes withdrawn far exceed natural recharge rates.

Water scarcity has many causes, including inefficient use and degradation of available water by pollution and



the over-consumption of water in underground aquifers. Many of the problems that are now being faced by those in the water sanitation and supply industries have human causes. Thus it is up to humans and human institutions, such as the United Nations, to construct solutions.

To this end, the UN has taken several steps. In 1977, the nations of the world met in Mar del Plata, Argentina, to discuss fresh water matters. In 1992, they met again, first in Dublin and later that year in Rio de Janeiro at the UN Conference on Environment and Development. Agenda 21 of the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro is considered the first comprehensive set of water-related objectives adopted by the world community. In 1993, the General Assembly established 22 March as World Water Day, in order to draw more attention to global water management issues. The latest action taken by the UN was a conference on fresh water issues in March 2001 in Singapore.

In 1997, five years after the Earth Summit, the UN General Assembly met in special session to review the progress of the global community in achieving the goals of the Earth Summit. From this session came the *Comprehensive Assessment of Freshwater Resources of the World*, the first report of its kind. The report detailed the impact poor land and water use decisions are having on human and natural environments. A second report, which will be released in 2002, was commissioned, and plans were made for a conference on freshwater issues, also to take place in 2002.

There are wide repercussions of ineffective water supply management. Some potential environmental disasters are expected because of specific water management decisions. One such issue is the Euphrates Project in Turkey, which threatens to completely cut off drinking water and irrigation supplies to several Middle Eastern States; one nation's choice may impact an entire region. Another example is the hard mineral dumping in Tibet, which threatens two of China's major sources of fresh water, which could impact nearly a billion people.

Other issues are far wider in scope - and more far-reaching in their policy implementation. Many nations must look at their use and protection of water resources and drastically decrease their water consumption. Plans for the reduction or complete cessation of waste water discharge into hydrological systems must be created. Other avenues to be explored include more use of local waters through seasonal and long-term river runoff regulation, salt and brackish water purification, use of secular storage in water bodies, and spatial and temporal redistribution of water resources.

However, none of these policies are without cost. All of these measures will require rather large expense on the part of participating countries; not only must nations find funding, in some cases they must change consumption patterns. Current and future measures will have far-

reaching ecological consequences. The Three Gorges Dam Project in China could displace several hundred thousand people through flooding, without creating a consumable freshwater source because of current ground pollution. In other words, effective policies must be created before more of the world faces great water stress.

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

- What is the status of your country's water supply, and how might that change in the next ten to twenty years?
- What kinds of incentives and resources must be provided by UN member States to promote responsible water policies?
- On whom should the primary burden of providing the resources necessary to shore up adequate fresh water resources rest?
- How can the United Nations provide the information and resources necessary to alleviate current fresh water crises and prevent future ones?

Bibliography:

"As World Day Marked, UNEP Warns of Shortages." *UN Wire*, 22 March 2001.

"International Conference Looks for Solutions to Shortages." *UN Wire*, 21 March 2001.

"Looming Shortages Could Cripple Much of the World." *UN Wire*, 8 February 1999.

"Municipal Authorities Meeting on Water Management." *UN Wire*, 8 December 2000.

"UN World Water Development Report: 24 UN Organizations Combine Efforts to Create Biennial Assessment of World's Freshwater." News Release, UNESCO, www.unesco.org

UNEP. "United Nations Environment Programme Water Strategy." UNEP Program Paper. www.unesco.org

UNESCO. "Message from the Director-General of UNESCO on the occasion of World Water Day 2000," World Water Day 2000. www.unesco.org

UNESCO. "Safeguarding the Future." World Water Day 2000. www.unesco.org

UNESCO. "Water for the 21st Century." World Water Day 2000. www.unesco.org

UN Documents:

A/Res/47/193

A/Res/55/196

A/Res/55/204

A/Res/54/223

A/Res/53/191

GA/EF/2925

UNEP/65

ENV/DEV/401PI/987



THE THIRD COMMITTEE (SOCIAL, HUMANITARIAN AND CULTURAL)

REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES, QUESTIONS RELATING TO REFUGEES, RETURNEES AND DISPLACED PERSONS AND HUMANITARIAN QUESTIONS

The United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) was established by the General Assembly in 1950 to address the situation in Europe following the conclusion of the Second World War. Originally given a limited mandate to help resettle millions of European refugees, its scope was extended as refugee crises increased around the globe. As interstate and intrastate conflicts caused many peoples to flee their home country to escape political, racial, religious, national and/or social persecution, UNHCR stepped in to provide protection and assistance to both refugees and host countries. In the last fifty years, UNHCR has provided assistance to at least fifty million people.

Recognized as one of the world's principal humanitarian relief agencies, UNHCR has provided assistance in almost every corner of globe. It continues to address the issues of protection, the prevention of refoulment (the forced repatriation of refugees) and seeks long-term durable solutions through voluntary repatriation or integration in a third country. Guided by the 1951 Convention on the Status of Refugees and the 1967 Protocol, UNHCR seeks to safeguard the rights of all refugees based on established principles of international law. Its humanitarian activities are thus apolitical and are characterized by impartiality. Although its mandate clearly defines who can be considered a refugee, at times UNHCR has been authorized to assist groups internally displaced because of civil conflict or political oppression, or groups which are considered stateless peoples.

Recently, a several issues concerning the fate of refugees have begun to complicate the efforts of UNHCR to effectively carry out its mandate. Given the changing nature of conflict, from interstate to intrastate, the ability of UNHCR to provide protection to refugees under international and national law has become uncertain due to a lack of respect for the rights of refugees by many nations around the globe. As most conflicts originate in the developing world and most refugees are themselves constituents of developing nations, the socioeconomic, environmental, and political impacts of refugees are taking a heavy toll on these nations. Although UNHCR provides both protection and assistance in the management of refugees, the issues of burden sharing, financial assistance, and material and logistical support have hampered efforts in some cases.

In addition, as highlighted by the conflicts in the Balkans, the Great Lakes Region in Central Africa, and in other volatile regions, the safety and security of UNHCR

personnel and other UN-sponsored humanitarian personnel have been the focus of both the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Secretary-General. In particular, over forty UNHCR personnel have lost their lives in the last four years alone, underscoring the need to find a way to better protect UNHCR humanitarian missions.

Under the direction of the new UN High Commissioner for Refugees, Ruud Lubbers, a renewed emphasis on the environmental impacts of refugees is expected. Already UNHCR missions take into account the needs of the host country in allowing refugee camps to be established and the possible environmental impacts to the area these camps occupy. As more and more missions address issues of basic needs, education, employment, and other long term concerns associated with peace building, the environment in which these issues are addressed plays a central role in manner in which refugees are received and repatriated.

Finally, two key issues remain unsolved as UNHCR continues to provide protection and humanitarian assistance: providing temporary assistance and ensuring State compliance with respect to current international laws regarding the safety and status of refugees. Any solutions generated by this committee need to address these issues as they have been the focus of both the Secretary-General and the Security Council.

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

- How can UNHCR better serve its mandate via new internal coordination efforts on the part of the UN?
- How can the UN guarantee the safety and security of its own personnel in humanitarian operations without losing its impartiality?
- What role does the UNHCR have in protecting the environment?
- How can the UNHCR secure great sources of funding for its humanitarian operations?

Bibliography:

- "UNHCR Mission Statement." 25 June 2001. www.unhcr.ch/un&ref/mission.htm
- "What is UNHCR?" 25 June 2001. www.unhcr.ch/un&ref/what/what.htm.
- Lubbers, Ruud. "The Environment in Refugee Operations: We Need to Care." 16 July 2001. Interview. www.unhcr.ch/un&ref/lubbers/envir.htm
- "Funding and Donor Relations. 1999 Global Appeal." 16 July 2001. www.unhcr.ch/fdrs/ga99/protect.htm

UN Documents:
A/54/600



A/54/414
A/54/286
A/RES/55/77
A/RES/55/74
A/RES/54/143 through A/RES/54/147
A/RES/53/124
S/1998/883

RIGHT OF PEOPLES TO SELF-DETERMINATION

Although the United Nations was heavily involved with decolonization and trusteeship during the Cold War, since 1990 a new emphasis has been placed on the rights of peoples to self-determination. Civil wars and internal conflicts, driven by ethnic, religious and other tensions, have led to new calls for independence by sub-national groups in many parts of the world. Problematically, the question of self-determination has come face-to-face with the rights of territorial sovereignty of each state as embodied in the UN Charter.

There are still seventeen territories under the control of the UN. These territories are overseen by the Special Committee of 24. Members of this group are elected by the General Assembly. The role of this Special Committee has changed over the last few years as the UN has also begun to change its role. Today the role is one of nation-building rather than simply aid. A specific case of this is that of East Timor which was rocked by violence and left in ruins.

The General Assembly in 1960 passed two resolutions, 1514 and 1540 (XV), which deal specifically with the rights of peoples to self-determination. These resolutions define the roles of the administering States as well as the native people. These are the building blocks that territories seeking independence use to build a case for support from the UN.

In the 1990s, however, the violence in the Former Yugoslavia and East Timor placed the question of self-determination on the world stage. In February 2000, the General Assembly passed a *Universal Realization of the Right of Peoples to Self-Determination*. This resolution calls continuing attention to the plight of refugees, the negative impact of foreign military intervention and the associated human rights violations. The General Assembly implores governments to cease such activities.

Most importantly though, self-determination was reaffirmed as a human right. "...The universal realization of the right of all peoples, including those under colonial, foreign and alien domination, to self-determination is a fundamental condition for the effective guarantee and observance of human rights and for the preservation and promotion of such right."

This right is not universally upheld. Several nations feel that allowing ethnic minorities self-determination is an administrative challenge that may upset internal power structures. The issue of self-determination in Kashmir has caused a ceaseless conflict. Similarly, there does not appear to be a settlement between Israel and the Palestinians on the foreseeable horizon.

The General Assembly has, therefore, suggested continuing progress reports. Work on the effects of mercenaries and foreign military actions will continue. Progress to protect the rights of people to self-determination, in other words, has hurdles to jump, but keeps moving in the right direction.

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

- How does your government define the "right to self-determination?"
- How far should the UN intervene with territories seeking independence?
- How may racism and the struggle for self-determination be linked?
- What are some of the challenges to realizing self-determination as a human right?

Bibliography:

- "Independence Groups Pledge To Share Power." *UN Wire*, 2 July 1999.
- "Leaders Want UN To Speed Transition To Local Rule." *UN Wire*, 24 May 2000.
- "Panel Hears Reports On Self-Determination, Mercenaries." *UN Wire*, 23 March 2001.
- "UN Caught Between Conflicting Values." *UN Wire*, 20 Sep 1999.
- "UN Commission Supports Palestinian State." *UN Wire*, 9 April 2001.
- "UN Seminar Opens In Cuba." *UN Wire*, 24 May 2001.

UN Documents:

- A/C.3/55/L.23
A/C.3/55/L.2
A/53/338
A/53/280
A/Res/54/155
A/Res/52/113
A/Res/52/112
GA/SHC/3536
GA/SHC/3492

Additional Web Resource:

www.unhcr.org



THE SIXTH COMMITTEE (LEGAL)

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE STRENGTHENING OF THE ROLE OF THE UNITED NATIONS RELATED TO ECONOMIC SANCTIONS

As the work of the United Nations continues to evolve in the wake of political, environmental and economic changes, so must the organization. Consequently, one of the issues on the agenda of the Special Committee on the United Nations Charter on Strengthening the Role of the Organization is the question of economic sanctions.

Economic sanctions consist of a deliberate government withdrawal, or threat of withdrawal, of customary trade or financial relations. Sanctions have been used to pressure nations into abandoning an unpopular practice. Currently, the UN has economic sanctions against Iraq to pressure Saddam Hussein into cooperating with the international community.

Economic sanctions are allowed under Chapter VII of the UN Charter, and must be imposed by the Security Council. Article 49 mandates universal compliance with economic sanctions imposed by the Security Council. However, Article 50 requires the consideration of the effects of sanctions on other member nations: "If preventive or enforcement measures against any state are taken by the Security Council, any other state, whether a Member of the United Nations or not, which finds itself confronted with special economic problems arising from the carrying out of those measures shall have the right to consult the Security Council with regard to a solution of those problems."

This universal compliance introduces an unintended consequence. In a global marketplace, economies are sometimes inextricably linked. Because of this, adjacent nations can be negatively impacted by sanctions imposed upon a neighbor. It is clearly the intent of the Charter to consider these negative effects. Therefore, it becomes imperative to fully address this challenge.

The Special Committee, therefore, examined these issues and created several reports. The reports included suggestions ranging from creating financial trust mechanisms for relief efforts to monitoring the effects on third states to consulting with affected nations prior to imposing sanctions. It is the improved monitoring practices, increased consultation with affected states and more technical assistance to affected states that has the most international political support.

As a result of the work of the Commission and the Sixth Committee, the Security Council and its Sanctions Committees have taken actions. In Resolution 55/157, the efforts of the Security Council to improve the flow of communication and improve the transparency of the sanctions committees were recognized. Yet, this

resolution also recognized that there is more work to be done, and encouraged the Security Council to establish further mechanisms and procedures in which to better analyze the impact of sanctions on third states.

The General Assembly also looked to the Secretary-General for action on addressing the challenges related to economic sanctions. The General Assembly called upon the Secretary-General to continue developing monitoring mechanisms to determine the impact of sanctions and to provide better technical assistance regarding international assistance. An important consideration in many countries facing sanctions involves the human rights and needs of the target populace. Sanctions tend to have a highly adverse effect on the poorest segments of society if not well targeted toward the leadership. Additionally, the possible detrimental effects of sanctions on third states who lose trade or are otherwise negatively impacted are key issues. The General Assembly has both commended the recent progress and looked to the future for further developments.

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

- Are economic sanctions ever an effective tool for use by the UN? If so, under what circumstances should sanctions be applied? What form should sanctions take?
- How can sanctions be better targeted at leadership to avoid harming the innocent citizens of the affected country?

Bibliography:

- "Annan Advocates More Effective, air Measures." *UN Wire*, 16 November 2000.
- "Committee Finalizes Report To General Assembly." *UN Wire*, 20 April 2000.
- Doxey, Margaret P. *United Nations Sanctions: Current Policy Issues*. Halifax, Nova Scotia: Dalhousie University, 1997.
- "Egypt, Turkey, Syria Defy UN Sanctions." *UN Wire*, 12 October 2000.
- "Former UN Aides Say Sanctions Amount to Genocide." *UN Wire*, 18 June 2001.
- "Infant Mortality Rates Doubled Since Gulf War_Report." *UN Wire*, 26 May 2000.
- Norström, Ambassador Per, Deputy Permanent Representative of Sweden on behalf of the European Union. Statement to the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nation and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization. 2 April 2001.
- "Russian Flight Lands Without UN Approval." *UN Wire*, 21 August 2000.



“Sanctions Continue to Exacerbate Poverty, Health.” *UN Wire*, 13 July 1999.

“Sanctions Drive Children From School, UNICEF Says.” *UN Wire*, 14 June 2000.

“Sanctions Talks Begin At UN Headquarters.” *UN Wire*, 26 February 2001.

“Second UN Relief Official Resigns Over Sanctions.” *UN Wire*, 16 February 2000.

“Security Council To Review Policy.” *UN Wire*, 18 April 2000.

“Study Finds UN Sanctions Affected Child Mortality.” *UN Wire*, 30 March 2000.

“UN Considers Changing To More Targeted Measures.” *UN Wire*, 9 February 2001.

United Nations Association of the United States of America. *A Global Agenda: Issues before the 47th General Assembly of the UN*. Lanham, MD: Rowan and Littlefield, 1998. 301.

“UNHCR Laments Donor Apathy, Refugee Fatigue.” *UN Wire*, 21 December 2000.

UN Documents:

A/RES/55/157
A/RES/55/156
A/RES/54/1
A/RES/54/107
A/RES/50/361
A/RES/49/58
A/RES/48/36
GA/L/3147
GA/L/3145

Additional Web Resource:

Global Policy Forum - UN Sanctions Committees, Statements, Working Papers and Press Releases:
www.globalpolicy.org/security/sanction/indexun.htm

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DOMESTIC COURTS AND INTERNATIONAL CRIMES

An increasing area of interest within the UN system involves the process of encouraging states to bring their national laws into compliance with international agreements, and to ensure that their domestic courts are properly enforcing international laws to which the state is a party. This effort has received special emphasis recently in two very different areas: the application of the International Criminal Court (ICC), and the question of how international agreements on women’s rights are codified into national law. Domestic courts are also often mentioned in areas like small arms, children’s rights and human rights in general, but this paper will focus primarily on the ICC and women’s right issues.

International law, with only a few exceptions (such as trade agreements) rarely includes provisions for non-

compliance with that law. Typically, the moral persuasive authority of the law, possibly combined with a threat of violence or of sanctions by one or more members of the international community if a nation abuses certain laws, are the only compliance mechanisms available. In most cases, nations obey international laws because they consider it to be in their best interests to do so, with the understanding that other nations will also be obeying these laws.

Thus in many cases, international law assumes the compliance of nations which ratify international agreements. In reality, this often translates into a significant influence by the domestic courts of each country on whether and how international law is enforced. In areas such as extradition, human rights (including women’s and children’s rights), terrorism and sometimes even war crimes, domestic courts must often take the lead in enforcing international commitments made by states. The constitutions of many countries include provisions which accept all ratified international agreement as national law; some other countries must first put international agreements formally into law though legislative action before they take effect. Also, states with a federal model sometimes face additional challenges in implementing international agreements into law, as in some cases federal units (like the fifty states comprising the US) must each incorporate parts of an international agreement into the laws of their more limited territories. Regardless, according to the Vienna Convention on Treaties (1969), which is widely recognized as customary law even for those states which are not parties, it is the responsibility of each state to enforce within its boundaries the international agreements which it ratifies.

It should be noted that no one topic typically covered by the 6th Committee deals with all of these issues. Rather the question of domestic application of international law is a cross-cutting issue which arises in many different areas. Thus participants may wish to focus their research on documents related to the ICC and women’s rights, searching for documents on the areas in which domestic courts play a part in these issues.

The International Criminal Court ICC

One of the key questions remaining in the implementation of the ICC Statute involves working out how domestic courts will interact with the ICC. Article 17 of the Statute deals with “Issue of Admissibility,” particularly referring to the relationship between domestic courts and the ICC. Three areas are listed in this article in which the court would not have jurisdiction:

- (a) if the case is being investigated or prosecuted by a state with jurisdiction over it;



- (b) if the case has been investigated by a state with jurisdiction, and that state decided not to prosecute on the basis of that investigation; or
- (c) if the person has already been tried for the conduct which is the subject of the complaint.

An important caveat to each of these subclauses, however, involves states which are “unwilling or unable genuinely to carry out the investigation or prosecution.” (Art. 17.a) In these cases, the ICC could decide that it has jurisdiction over the crime in question. While unwillingness can be determined, a key issue in the implementation of the ICC Statute is the question of when a state is genuinely unable to carry out an investigation. This might involve a non-functioning government, as many argue was the case in Somalia in the early 1990s, or it may be a case in which a corrupt or heavily politicized and biased judiciary makes a “genuine investigation” impossible. In each instance, however, the challenge for the ICC will be to carefully avoid the impression of politicization, or of being drawn into a domestic or international dispute which is political rather than legal.

Women’s Rights

Integrating and mainstreaming the human rights of women, along with providing a gender perspective, have been primary foci of the UN system in recent years. This includes the work of many UN agencies, such as the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, the Commission on Human Rights, the United Nations Population Fund and the United Nations Children’s Fund. Outside of the UN system, there is an increased understanding in recent years that national policies and laws, more than anything the UN system can do, will be largely responsible for the equality and advancement of the women living in each UN member state.

The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) has been ratified or acceded to by 165 countries (as of this writing) and its full implementation has been promoted by the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women. Nonetheless, the remaining challenge is to encourage each of these countries to fully implement CEDAW, and especially to integrate it into their national laws so that it can be enforced by domestic courts. This is an issue which is important in all areas of the world; industrialized countries, which may have more developed legal systems, can sometimes face a greater challenge than developing countries when attempting to put these laws into legislation, and then when enforcing them at the local level. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women receives regular country reports from all parties to CEDAW, and these provide

excellent details on implementation progress in each country.

The recent Beijing +5 Conference platform provided many examples of the direction which governments are encouraged to take in implementing women’s rights. First, it notes that the implementation of the platform and of women’s rights issues into national law is the sovereign responsibility of each state. It also outlines many actions expected at the national level, including to “develop, review and implement laws and procedures to prohibit and eliminate all forms of discrimination against women and girls;” (Para.68.f) and to “treat all forms of violence against women and girls of all ages as a criminal offence punishable by law.” (Para.69.c)

The international community, in the platform and other instruments, also recognized many obstacles to the implementation of women’s rights on a national level. These include the need for improved legislation, policies, programmes and enforcement in the areas of violence against women and girls (including domestic violence) and the prosecution of perpetrators. Also, education for law enforcement, judicial, health care and welfare personnel is extremely important.

Other obstacles include discriminatory legislation, harmful traditional practices and persistent negative stereotyping of women. In addition, family, civil, penal, labor and commercial laws or codes in many states have still not fully integrated a gender perspective. This leads to a variety of legislative gaps, as well as lack of implementation and enforcement of legislation and regulations. According to the platform, together these serve to “perpetuate de jure as well as de facto inequality and discrimination, and in a few cases, new laws discriminating against women have been introduced.” Very often, illiteracy among women leads to lack of access to legal resources and information, thus further perpetuating gender bias. Additionally, a simple lack of awareness of the human rights of women by law enforcement officials and the judiciary exacerbates the issue, particularly when these parties fail to respect the rights of women as human beings. In many states there is also insufficient recognition of reproductive rights for women and girls. Finally, factors of race, language, ethnicity and other social considerations also serve to exacerbate women’s rights problems.

While many governments have made very positive strides in mainstreaming women’s rights into their national legal systems, no state has yet fully implemented all of the CEDAW provisions, and many states have a long way to progress.

Questions to consider from the perspective of your government on this issue include:

- In implementing the ICC Statute, is a state unable to carry out investigation or prosecution only if it does



not have a functioning government? If so, what constitutes a “functioning government?”

- Alternately, can rampant corruption or bias in the judiciary invalidate a state’s ability to carry out its own judicial process, and how can this be fairly determined?
- How can states be better encouraged to more quickly implement CEDAW provisions and other internationally recognized women’s rights into their national laws?
- What steps can be taken to better ensure that domestic courts are willing and able to enforce international agreements on women’s rights?

Bibliography:

- “African Countries Explore Problem.” *UN Wire*, 14 December 1999.
- “Allay Asian Sovereignty Fears -- Essay.” *UN Wire*, 6 May 1999.
- “Countries Crack Down on Crimes Against Women.” *UN Wire*, 29 October 1999.
- “Legalization Trend Leaves Other Issues Unaddressed.” *UN Wire*, 1 April 1999.
- “New Law Cracks Down on Abuse of Women, Children.” *UN Wire*, 3 February 2000.
- “Not Considered a Crime in Many Countries.” *UN Wire*, 17 August 1999.
- “Pakistan, Jordan Under Pressure to Protect Women.” *UN Wire*, 8 October 1999.
- “Sierra Leone Ratifies Treaty; more.” *UN Wire*, 20 June 2000.
- “South Africa, Germany Ratify Statute; more.” *UN Wire*, 30 November 2000.
- “UN Committee Passes Action Plan; More.” *UN Wire*, 25 October 1999.
- “UN Initiatives Noted at US Conference.” *UN Wire*, 13 March 2000.
- “UN Panel Makes Recommendations.” *UN Wire*, 1 August 2000.

UN Documents:

- A/S023/10/Rev.1, 10 Jun 2000, Report of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Whole of the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly (Twenty-third special session), Supplement No. 3 (Beijing +5 final report)
- WOM/1181, 1 Mar 2000, Commission on Status of Women Holds Panel Discussion on Obstacles and Issues Relevant to Women’s Empowerment
- GA/L/3153, 20 Oct 2000, Legal Committee is Told of Link Between Observance of Geneva Conventions and Creation of International Criminal Court
- GA/9479, 14 Oct 1998, Assembly Urges States to Repeal or Invalidate Laws with Extraterritorial Effect on Sovereignty, Free Trade, Navigation of Other States
- WOM/1035, 4 Mar 1998, Needs of Girl Child Focus on Panel Discussions at Commission on Status of Women
- UN Press Briefing, 6 Jun 2000, Press Conference on Discriminatory Laws Against Women
- HR/CN/926, 22 Apr 1999, Human Rights Commission Concludes Debate on Promotion of Human Rights...
- WOM/1154, 17 Jan 2000, Committee on Elimination of Discrimination Against Women Opens Twenty-Second Session

Additional Web Resources:

- ICC home page: www.un.org/law/icc/index.html
- Preparatory Commission for the ICC: www.un.org/law/icc/prepcomm/prepfra.htm
- Rome Statute: www.un.org/law/icc/statute/romefra.htm
- UN Womenwatch page: www.un.org/womenwatch/
- Beijing +5 homepage: www.un.org/womenwatch/confer/beijing5/ (includes final report)
- Commission on the Status of Women page: www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/csw/ (includes country specific reports)
- UNIFEM page: www.unifem.undp.org/

CHAPTER V.

FAO: THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION

INTRODUCTION TO FAO

In keeping with the tradition of presenting one “unique” simulation of a United Nations or affiliated organization each year, AMUN 2001 will simulate the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Participation will be voluntary and open to one Representative from any interested delegation attending AMUN. FAO will meet for all four days of the Conference. While the range of subject matter before FAO may seem daunting, significant work on the topics of discussion is nonetheless achievable with thoughtful preparation.

Before delving into the substantive issues which will be discussed, Representatives should understand why this committee is “special.” In the tradition of AMUN Special Committees, FAO will give participants a different, 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. To most fully participate in the simulation, it will be imperative that Representatives have a working knowledge of the structure and mission of the FAO, the relevant policies of the state they represent, and an awareness of global food security and productivity issues.

ABOUT FAO

The Food and Agricultural Organization of the UN was founded in 1945 as a specialized agency to address the issues relating to agriculture, forestry, fisheries, and rural development. In the agency’s own words, one of its primary missions is “encouraging sustainable agriculture and rural development, a long-term strategy for increasing food production while conserving and managing natural resources. The aim is to meet the needs of both present and future generations by promoting development that does not degrade the environment and is technically appropriate, economically viable, and socially acceptable.”

FAO employs a staff of approximately 3,700, and its 2000-01 program budget was funded at \$650 million. The organization is governed by the FAO Conference, a body composed of its membership of 180 States, and one member organization. Meeting biennially, the conference is responsible for policymaking, goal and budget setting, and the election of the agency’s Director-General and the chairperson of the FAO Council. Executive operations are overseen by the FAO Council. The council is composed of forty-nine States chosen on regional representation scheme to three-year terms. The council will typically meet at least three times between regularly scheduled conference meetings.

The agency reports that since the early 1960s, the proportion of hungry individuals in the developing world has declined from more than 50% to approximately 20%. Despite such dramatic and hard won victories, more than 800 million people, including 200 million children, go to bed hungry. Further, agency efforts following the 1996 World Food Summit to implement the Rome Declaration and Plan of Action are expected to fall short of the goal of halving the number of undernourished to 400 million people by 2015. FAO estimates that at the current rate of reducing the number of hungry by eight million per year, rather than the planned twenty million, the goal will instead be met in 2030, or fifteen years later than was initially intended.

Implementation of the Rome Declaration and Plan of Action is in jeopardy for multiple reasons. The FAO has been openly critical of developed and developing States for their lack of effective participation in enacting policies to support the plan, saying, “both developing and developed countries have failed to demonstrate their commitment to set aside the resources required to achieve the eradication of hunger.” Further the agency points to a post-Cold War trend for States to support only short-term relief operations, receiving extensive media coverage, rather than the comprehensive approach of prevention, preparedness, and long term sustainable development favored by FAO. In several recent emergencies, FAO reports that the funding for agricultural relief has amounted to approximately 1% of the value of emergency food aid, and a paltry 3% of funds requested for that purpose by FAO.

For its part, the FAO has also received criticism for moving too slowly to reorganize itself and recognize the complementary linkage between relief and assistance efforts. Further, the agency finds itself in competition with other UN agencies for sponsor-based funding.



It is against this background that the FAO Conference will host the World Food Summit +5 during its biennial meeting in November 2001 in an attempt to renew commitments made at the 1996 World Food Summit. The Summit +5 will focus specifically on issues and commitments related to the Rome Declaration and Plan of Action.

THE SIMULATION

During the 2001 conference we will simulate the FAO Conference meeting and its hosting of the World Food Summit +5. In the interests of providing a fulfilling experience that strikes a balance between the highly detailed and technical discussions likely to result at such a meeting, and the time constraints imposed by the AMUN Conference schedule, the simulation will debate three commitments of the Rome Declaration and Plan of Action, rather than all seven. In addition, to encourage Representatives to develop both breadth and depth of knowledge in some elements of the topic areas, they may have the opportunity to discuss two topics of smaller scope both within the body, and possibly in consultation with another simulated entity.

PREPARATION

As a foundation for subsequent research, Representatives are strongly encouraged to familiarize themselves with the Rome Declaration, associated Plan of Action, and supporting documentation. 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.

Additional information will follow in a separate mailing in October. This material will more fully address some of the topic areas, and discuss such issues as the work product of the body and rules of procedure.

BACKGROUND RESEARCH

REVIEW OF THE ROME DECLARATION AND PLAN OF ACTION

Commitment Two:

We will implement policies aimed at eradicating poverty and inequality and improving physical and economic access by all, at all times, to sufficient, nutritionally adequate and safe food and its effective utilization.

According to the World Food Summit, food security exists when all people, at all times, have physical and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food to meet their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life. In developing countries, approximately 20% of the population, or 800 million people, are malnourished.

According to FAO Special Program for Food Security (SPFS), "Chronic under nutrition and food insecurity are principally caused by low productivity in agriculture, frequently caused in part by policy, institutional and technological constraints; high seasonal and year-to-year variability in food supplies, often the result of unreliable rainfall and insufficient water for crop and livestock production; and lack of off-farm employment opportunities, contributing to low and uncertain incomes in urban and rural areas. The causes and consequences of food insecurity and poverty are inextricably linked."

SPFS takes a two-phase approach to improving food security for Low Income Food-Deficit countries (LIFDCs). Water control, intensification of sustainable plant production systems, diversification of production,

and analysis of socio-economic constraints to food security with special attention given to gender and vulnerable groups are the four separate but interrelated components responding to the challenges facing small farmers addressed in the Pilot Phase. A Second Phase should replicate on a wider scale the innovative approaches identified during the Pilot Phase. It covers the assistance to governments to improve their food security and agricultural policy, to prepare agricultural investment programs to overcome the physical constraints, including infrastructure, and to develop feasibility studies of bankable projects, which would increase the flow of private and public financing of agricultural activities and services.

FAO and SPFS have had notable success in the pilot phase in Tanzania, China, Zambia, Nepal, Senegal and Cambodia. Tanzania in particular showed that income and production can be increased by addressing diversifying production and technology training.

Questions to consider from the perspective of your government on this issue include:

- What is the role of FAO, SPFS, WPD, IFAD, NGOs and private organizations in the development of policy where there has been local community success in increasing food security?
- Why have countries been reluctant to change policies related to food security while agreeing to the resolutions of the World Food Summit?
- What can be done for LIFDC's that have not had success with Phase I?



- How do the other issues of women owning land, HIV/AIDS, natural disasters and military conflict impact on Phases I and II?

Bibliography:

- “FAO Announces Theme for World Food Day 1998.”
FAO Press Release.
- “FAO Proposes a Food Safety and Quality Facility for Least Developed Countries.” FAO Press Release, May 2001. www.fao.org/WAICENT/OIS/PRESS_NE/PRESSENG/2001/pren0129.htm
- “FAO Signs Agreements with WFP and IFAD to Strengthen Cooperation in Support of World Food Security.” FAO Press Release, March 1999, www.fao.org/WAICENT/OIS/PRESS_NE/PRESSENG/1999/pren9915.htm
- “FAO Special Report Forecasts Continued Improvement in Food Outlook for Much of Sub-Saharan Africa, but Warns War and Civil Strife Threaten Agricultural Production in Angola, Somalia, the Great Lakes Region, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Sierra Leone and Guinea Bissau.” FAO Press Release, April 1999, www.fao.org/WAICENT/OIS/PRESS_NE/PRESSENG/1999/pren9923.htm
- “FAO Warns Kosovo Crisis Will Have Far-Reaching Implications for the Region’s Future Food Security.” FAO Press Release, April 1999.
- “Women Feed the World.” March 1998. www.fao.org/WAICENT/OIS/PRESS_NE/PRESSENG/1998/pren9816.htm

Additional Web Resources:

- Committee on World Food Security at www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/003/Y0527E.htm
- FAO Special Program for Food Security website at www.fao.org/spfs/
- FAO-NGO website at www.fao.org/tc/ngo/
- The International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) website at www.ifad.org/
- The World Food Program (WFP) web site at www.wfp.org/index2.html

Commitment Three:

We will pursue participatory and sustainable food, agriculture, fisheries, forestry and rural development policies and practices in high and low potential areas, which are essential to adequate and reliable food supplies at the household, national, regional and global levels, and combat pests, drought and desertification, considering the multifunctional character of agriculture.

There is no other human activity that exemplifies the intricate link between human and nature than agricultural activities aimed at food production. In some areas of the

world, it is so important to coax food from the earth that farmers will resort to practices that slowly kill the land they are working. The problem is that many of these practices almost ensure that the supply or quality of food will diminish from year to year. Overgrazing, over watering, forest removal, ill use of pest- and herbicides and over fishing are just some of the unsustainable practices that compromise future food security.

Sustainable agriculture is a natural resource management issue which is a key piece of overall sustainable development. The use of any natural resource has an impact on the use of other natural resources. The basic principles of ecology tell us that all parts of an ecosystem are connected. For example, land which is stripped of its trees has a detrimental impact on the water resources and agricultural production of an area. When trees are removed, the roots of the trees that act as a soil stabilizer are removed, so the soil is more susceptible to erosion. Soil can be stripped by wind or water erosion. Wind erosion causes soil to be stripped and particles to become airborne. These conditions can cause respiratory problems in local populations. Water erosion can cause streams and drainage systems to become clogged with sediment, with serious implications for potable water quality, but can also damage fishing beds. More alarmingly, the soil left after the effects of erosion is of poorer quality and must be treated with fertilizer and pesticides. These harmful chemicals run off into streams and groundwater supplies because of erosion and because of the lack of roots to stabilize the soil. And as the vicious circle compounds itself, the result is often desertification.

Commitment Three looks not merely to approach sustainable agriculture from a human or technological standpoint, but looks at an integrated approach. It was recognized that rural poverty is an impediment to sustainable agricultural development, including forestry and fisheries. It was acknowledged that many rural development problems could not be adequately addressed without the transfer of available technologies and the development of new technologies. The lack of strong or integrated policies on water and land use management was further acknowledged as an impediment to sustainable agriculture. Most importantly, the document specifically points to poverty and the massive impact of a lack of rural infrastructures as a root impediment to the successful implementation of sustainable practices.

The document calls mostly for cooperation. Many technologies such as drip irrigation systems and effective monitoring systems, including remote sensing and geographic information systems, already exist. It is through cooperative effort that these technologies can be utilized in regions that need assistance in resource management. In addition, the document also calls for comprehensive policy changes. These policy changes include the empowerment of women - the majority of



agricultural workers worldwide - as well as integrated land management and sound rural development policies.

However, as we look to the future, there are severe impediments to achieving the goals and objectives as outlined in Commitment Three. They are the impediments that have daunted both short and long range relief and development efforts, specifically, the lack of adequate funding and lack of political will on the part of developed and developing States. Despite the longevity of such impediments, solutions must be found.

Questions to consider from the perspective of your government on this issue include:

- What agricultural practices and technologies provide the best opportunities for developing countries?
- How can countries be better encouraged to develop realistic goals for food production?

Bibliography:

Agenda 21 (UN Sustainable Development Plan of Action).
www.un.org/esa/sustdev/agenda21.htm

“At Odds With Sustainable Development?” *UN Wire*, January 2000.

“Desai Meets US Leaders About UN Initiatives.” *UN Wire*, 13 April 2001.

“FAO agricultural policy and economic development series 4: Guidelines for the integration of sustainable agriculture and rural development into agricultural policies.” www.fao.org/docrep/W754IE/W754IE00.htm

“Ministerial Conference On Small Island Developing States Pledges To Help Foster Development Policies And Programs To Secure Sustainable Agriculture, Fisheries And Forestry In The Island States.” FAO Press Release, 12 March 1999. www.fao.org/WAICENT/OIS/PRESS_NE/PRESSENG/1999/pren9912.htm

Rio Declaration On Environment And Development, Report Of The United Nations Conference On Environment And Development. www.un.org/documents/ga/conf151/aconf15126-lannex1.htm

“Sustainable Development Fails Nature-Author.” *UN Wire*, 18 January 2000.

“To Cooperate On Sustainable Development.” *UN Wire*, 12 April 1999.

“UN Body Examines Sustainable Development Plans.” *UN Wire*, 20 January 2000.

“UN Commission Continues Discussions.” *UN Wire*, April 2001.

“UN Reform Supports Sustainable Development Goals.” *UN Wire*, February 1999.

Additional Web Resources:

EARTH SUMMIT+5, Special Session of the General Assembly to Review and Appraise the Implemen-

tation of Agenda 21 website, www.un.org/esa/earth-summit/

RIO + 10 Website, www.un.org/esa/sustdev/csduprio/index.html

UN Commission on Sustainable Development's Web site, www.un.org/esa/sustdev/csd.htm

Commitment Five:

We will endeavor to prevent and be prepared for natural disasters and man made emergencies and to meet transitory and emergency food requirements in ways that encourage recovery, rehabilitation, development and a capacity to satisfy future needs.

Many of the countries that are struggling with poverty are also experiencing conflict (political and military). Many of the world's twenty poorest countries have experienced violent conflict in the past decades, according to the UNDP Emergency Response Division. In Africa alone, twenty-nine of the forty-five UNDP program countries are experiencing some form of political or civil crisis.

Ongoing armed confrontations and internal conflicts around the world now result in large numbers of refugees and internally displaced persons. This in turn is resulting in food shortages, water shortages and health issues. FAO states that in 1984, man-made disasters contributed to only about 10% of total emergencies. Now it is more than 50%.

Another issue is communications between all of the organizations that assist with disaster relief. The Pan American Health Organization (PAHO) states that while disaster-stricken countries appreciate external assistance, too much of the assistance is directed to non-issues or myths. A common myth is that any kind of international assistance is needed immediately, while experience shows that a hasty response that is not based on familiarity with local conditions and meant to complement the national efforts only contributes to the chaos. Often, it is better to wait until genuine needs have been assessed.

Drought in several of the countries hardest hit by poverty is a natural disaster that is difficult to prevent. In many cases, the countries suffering from drought are facing larger food shortages than the previous years. In Ethiopia, large numbers of people are now depending solely on food assistance for survival because they have lost their livestock and livelihoods due to drought and in Burundi, insufficient and badly distributed rains have reduced yields of cereal and pulse crops.

The nutrition situation in Africa continues to worsen compared with the rest of the world as the number of malnourished and hungry people continues to grow. It is estimated that by 2010, there will be 300 million malnourished people in Africa, which occupy one-third of the population on the continent. Drought and lack of

water are partly responsible for this situation but armed conflict is also very largely responsible.

The issues of civil unrest and conflict, as well as the issues of natural disasters and communication between the major players in disaster relief need to be addressed while looking at issues of poverty and hunger.

Questions to consider from the perspective of your government on this issue include:

- What can be done to enhance the communication between the various UN organizations, the church-based organizations, and other organizations?
- How can drought be better forecast to allow for relief efforts and planning?
- How can human-made disasters be prevented and what other organizations are needed to assist with the eradication of poverty?
- How does the continuation of human-made and natural disaster impact the overall goal to reduce hunger by 50% by 2015?

Bibliography:

- "Africa's Nutrition Situation Continues to Worsen." *Xinhua News Agency*, 20 March 2001.
- American Red Cross. "Disaster Services." www.redcross.org/services/disaster/
- "Crises Have Spawned 'Disaster Industry.'" *UN Wire*, 6 May 1999.
- "Global Conference Opens In Japan." *UN Wire*, 5 February 2001.
- "Joins Forces With German Agency On Disaster Relief." *UN Wire*, 24 May 2000.
- "Most food shortages are man-made." *AP Worldstream*, 1999.
- "PAHO Focuses On Variety Of Problems." *UN Wire*, 29 September 1999.
- SMEC. "Disaster Reconstruction." www.smec.com.au/technical/disaster/dr.htm
- "UN Continues Aid Coordination." *UN Wire*, 24 August 1999.
- UNDP. "Sharing New Ground In Post-Conflict Situations - The Role Of UNDP In Support Of Reintegration Programmes." www.undp.org/dpa/publications/pdffinal.pdf
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). *Global Appeal Strategies and Programmes*. www.unhcr.ch/fdrs/ga2001/toc.htm
- World Health Organization (WHO) Emergency and Humanitarian Website, www.who.int/disasters/tg.cfm?doctypeID=1
- "WHO Report Slams Futile Aid." *UN Wire*, 6 September 2000.

THE URBAN POOR

Most cities in developing countries face the prospect of increased malnutrition and health risks if they do not improve people's access to adequate and safe food. The concentration and increasing number of poor people in cities in developing countries makes food insecurity an extremely pressing social and political issue. The number of unemployed people, poor women, the elderly and children living in cities is growing. This population is referred to as the urban poor.

At the World Food Summit in 1996, it was decided that the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (UNHCHR) should better define the rights related to food and to propose ways to implement and realize these rights. In May 1997, the Director-General of FAO and the UNHCHR signed a Memorandum of Understanding for cooperation in this regard. The UNHCHR took the first major steps toward fulfilling the mandate given by the Summit in December 1997, when consultations on the right to adequate food as a human right were held.

Many of the poorest countries with concentrations of the urban poor are engaged in conflicts which sap their resources and energy. Others have been beset with massive natural disasters. Others realized in the mid-1990s the enormity of the social and economic impact of HIV/AIDS. Some have struggled to maintain fledgling democracies in the face of public discontent over austerity measures. Some countries struggle with corruption in government and infrastructure issues, such as the inability to handle population growth in cities and adequate food supplies and storage. As a result, most developing countries tend to make resource allocation decisions with the aims of cutting budget deficits and maximizing the rate of economic growth on the assumption that this would eventually contribute to a reduction in poverty even in the absence of measures for asset and income redistribution. The result has been that few countries, in spite of their pledges at the Summit, embarked on purposeful large-scale programs for improving food security.

One initiative that FAO has been successful in implementing is the identification of the malnourished and the reasons for their lack of food or for their hunger. The belief is that if there is improved information, it will produce better results in reducing the number of undernourished. In addition to identifying the hungry and those at risk of becoming hungry, the systems also provide information on the causes of food insecurity and vulnerability. Ghana and Thailand are evidence of how this has been successful. In Thailand, the Food Insecurity and Vulnerability Information and Mapping Systems (FIVIMS) provided the national government with information on the malnourishment of infants and children, which traced back to the inadequate levels of



nutrition in pregnant women. This information allowed the government to assist community action to address these issues.

Despite all of these initiatives, it has been noted that around 50% of the urban populations in Africa live in poverty, in Latin America around 40% of all urban households are poor. The population living below the poverty level in Sao Paulo is estimated to be between 60 and 70% of the total population. In Calcutta, the proportion of urban poor is around 70%, and 45% in Karachi. (FAO press release, 4 June 2001)

One issue that the FAO has not been able to address on a large scale is the issue of urban dwellers' purchasing most of their food. This is different from the rural poor because even those who do not live on farms grow at least some of their food. Consumer food prices and the ability to earn a cash income are, therefore, much more important in cities. The urban poor typically work in low-paying jobs where they earn and spend wages daily; they often can only afford to buy small quantities of food at a time, which means they generally pay higher per-unit prices than if they could buy in bulk.

Another example of an issue that has not been resolved and addressed is HIV/AIDS. HIV/AIDS in developing countries has a two-fold effect on the urban poor. Those living with HIV/AIDS and their families in the rural areas are not able to grow food as a result of the illness and the need for family to take care of them. The lack of food production in rural areas means less food in the urban area for consumption. This causes higher prices and means that the urban poor are able to purchase less food. In addition, the urban poor with HIV/AIDS are unable to work and therefore their ability to purchase food is diminished. Neither of these populations is able to receive adequate health care.

Many countries have not included the right to adequate food as a human right in their constitutions. The countries that have incorporated this in their constitutions have not allocated the resources to address the issue.

Questions to consider from the perspective of your government on this issue include:

- What are the local conditions that impact on the urban poor?
- What are various governments doing to eliminate food embargos on developing nations?
- What collaboration between institutions and organizations is needed to impact on this issue?

Bibliography:

Brown, Lynn and McCalla, Alex F. *Global Urbanization Trends: Implications for Food Systems and Food Security*. "Conference on Sustainable Food Security for All by 2020." www.ifpri.org/2020conference/

Countries with Fundamental Rights to food in their constitution, map. www.fao.org/Focus/E/rightfood/right7.htm

Ethics in Food and Agriculture. www.fao.org/ethics/index_en.htm

"Food for the Cities: Food Supply and Distribution Policies to Reduce Urban Food Insecurity." www.fao.org/ag/ags/AGSM/SADA/pages/dt/dt4300e.htm

Foster, Phillips and Howard D. Leathers. *The World Food Problem: Tackling the Causes of Undernutrition in the Third World*, 2nd ed. Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1999.

Grigg, Viv. *Cry of the Urban Poor*. Marc Publications, 1992.

Niang, A. and Nana-Sinkam, S.C. "Africa: food self-sufficiency and food security - strategic planning and management of the interventions." *Food and Agriculture in Africa ECA/FAO Agriculture Division Staff Papers*, no. 4. ECA/FAO, 1993.

"Rural Poverty in Developing Countries: Implications for Public Policy." www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/issues/issues26/

"The State of Food Insecurity in the World." www.fao.org/docrep/x8200e/x8200e00.htm

Technical Documents from the World Food Summit in November 1996. www.fao.org/wfs/index_en.htm

"Understanding how the Urban Poor Learn to Communicate." www.wmin.ac.uk/builtenv/maxlock/KTweb/KT_Guide3.htm

"The Urban Poor: Complex Problems Face Developing Countries as Urbanization Rises." www.ifpri.cgiar.org/reports/00spring/00sprf.HTM

DESERTIFICATION

Desertification is a global problem that affects more than 110 countries and more than one-sixth of the world's population. Some of the major countries affected by desertification are Africa, China, Turkey, Chile, Cuba, Lebanon, Cambodia, Mexico and Yemen. More than 40% of the populations of Africa, Asia and South America live in the susceptible dry lands and 70% of the 5.2 billion hectares of dry lands used for agriculture are already degraded.

While the UN estimates that desertification costs \$45 billion (US) per year, the human cost is probably higher but cannot be directly measured. The human costs can include increased hunger, poverty, political instability, drought, population migration, increased illness and a drain on economic resources. Desertification also has an impact on more than the immediate area. Flooding, reduced water quality, reduction of food supplies, sedimentation in rivers and lakes, damage to equipment and respiratory health problems resulting from dust storms and poor air quality are a few examples of the impact on the non-immediate areas.



In 1977, the United Nations Conference on Desertification (UNCOD) adopted a Plan of Action to Combat Desertification (PACD). The question of how to deal with desertification was still a major concern at the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED). As a result, the UN General Assembly was called upon to establish an Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee (INCD) to prepare, by June 1994, a Convention to Combat Desertification in those countries experiencing serious drought and/or desertification, particularly in Africa. In December 1992, the General Assembly agreed by adopting Resolution 47/188.

The first conference was held in October 1997. The fourth conference was held in December 2000. National Action Programs (NAP) are one of the key instruments in the implementation of the Convention. They are strengthened by Action Programs on Sub-Regional (SRAP) and Regional (RAP) levels. National Action Programs are developed in the framework of a participative approach involving the local communities and they spell out the practical steps and measures to be taken to combat desertification in specific ecosystems.

Despite the development of an inclusive process focusing on national, sub-regional, and regional concerns and involvement, the local structures are weak in terms of their ability to represent the population. Their authority (for example for organizing land-use policy), and their resources (the size of the municipal budget), constitute a major obstacle to controlling desertification. In addition, many of the RAPs have not been developed. The participatory approach needs the existence of a balanced relationship of forces between the national, regional and local structures with the government facilitating the process. The development of balanced social structure is a long-term activity and desertification needs immediate action.

Questions to consider from the perspective of your government on this issue include:

- What can be done to strengthen the resolve of local structures to participate in the process?
- How are the global issues not being addressed in the framework established by UNCOD?
- How can the conflict of long-term development of social structures be balanced with the immediate needs of desertification?

- What can be done to encourage countries to implement their NAPs?

Bibliography:

- “Asian Countries Face Serious Problems - UN.” *UN Wire*, 8 November 2000.
- “Countries Assess Results Of Programs Worldwide.” *UN Wire*, 19 March 2001.
- “Day Of Observance Prompts Discussion.” *UN Wire*, 17 June 1999.
- “DESERTIFICATION: ADB Funds Program In China.” *UN Wire*, 2 August 2001.
- “Developing Countries Plan Joint Projects.” *UN Wire*, 10 March 2000.
- Knable, Friederike. “Losing Ground: The Race Against Desertification.” *Green*.
- Middleton Nick and Thomas, David, eds. *World Atlas of Desertification*, 2nd ed. UNEP For Life on Earth.
- Nevin, Tom. “Riddle of the Shifting Sands.” *African Business*. February 1999.
- “Program To Fight Desertification Approved.” *UN Wire*, 13 September 2000.
- Report on the World Social Situation United Nations*. United Nations, 1993.
- Smith, O. and Koala, S. *The Sahel Dust Bowl: Processes and Control Strategies*. London: The Novello Press, June 1999.
- Thomas, D.S.G. and Middleton N.J. *Desertification: Exploding the Myth*. John Wiley & Sons, 1994.
- UNDP. *Human Development Report*. Oxford University Press, 1997.
- UNEP. “Desertification Control Bulletin.” No.31, 1997. No.33, 1998.
- “UNEP Urges Political Action On World Day.” *UN Wire*, 18 June 2001.

Additional Web Resources:

- Desertification - International Development Research Center in Canada - www.idrc.ca/Media/Desertification_e.html
- FAO’s Desertification and drought - extent and consequences proposal for a participatory approach to combat desertification - www.fao.org/docrep/X5317E/X5317E00.htm
- United Nations Secretariat of the Convention to Combat Desertification Website - www.unccd.int/main.php



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

Algeria	Croatia	Honduras	Republic of Korea
Angola	Cuba	Indonesia	Romania
Argentina	Czech Republic	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Russian Federation
Austria	Democratic Republic of the Congo	Italy	Rwanda
Bahrain	Denmark	Japan	Saudia Arabia
Benin	Egypt	Mexico	South Africa
Bolivia	Ethiopia	Morocco	Sudan
Brazil	Fiji	Nepal	Suriname
Bulgaria	France	Netherlands	Syrian Arab Republic
Burkina Faso	Georgia	Nigeria	Uganda
Cameroon	Germany	Norway	United Kingdom
Canada	Greece	Pakistan	United States
China	Guinea-Bissau	Peru	Venezuela
Costa Rica		Portugal	

BACKGROUND RESEARCH

RIGHT TO EDUCATION

Since 1948, Article 26 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights has codified the right to education for all. This right includes compulsory and free elementary and fundamental education, as well as merit-based technical and professional educational opportunities. The right to education emphasizes the development of the human person and the promotion of tolerance and human dignity. All human rights covenants, treaties and declarations, especially the Convention on the Rights of the Child, also uphold the right to education for all.

The availability of education, or lack thereof, has two major implications. First, access to education opens the door of understanding to a host of other human rights such as the freedom of thought, an adequate standard of living, gender equity, freedom from discrimination, and the right to work and receive wages. Second, without the right to education, access to these rights and many others becomes almost impossible. In other words, individuals cannot exercise their rights without an awareness and understanding of them. It is education, therefore, that helps to prevent a person's subjugation. Further, the right to education overlaps the realms of political, civil, economic, cultural, and social rights.

The state's role in education, affirmed by international and domestic human rights law, is to protect education as a public service and good. Every state has a vested interest in the promotion of education for the development of their economic, social, and cultural

structures. However, States have traditionally not allocated adequate funds for primary elementary education, and the negative consequences have included high adult illiteracy rates, low elementary school enrollment rates, and high unemployment rates. Sustainable development and the eradication of poverty cannot be realized without universal access to adequate education. Over one hundred million children have no access to primary education. Approximately 900 million adults are illiterate, and two-thirds of the illiterate are women. Many obstacles to education exist: both widespread conflict and massive debt siphon valuable resources away from education. However, countries have realized that educated individuals are empowered individuals and that empowered individuals stimulate economic and social growth.

In 1990, 155 countries committed to lowering adult illiteracy rates and providing primary education for all children by signing the World Declaration on Education for All and the Framework for Action at the World Conference on Education for All, held in Jomtien, Thailand. In 1996, the International Consultative Forum on Education reviewed the Jomtien Conference, and while progress had been made, significant shortcomings were noted. The resultant Amman Affirmation established new goals for education on both local and global levels and further called all of the participants to set firm targets and timetables for achieving their goals. At the Dakar World Education Forum in April 2000, the heads of the five agencies responsible for the Education



for All Initiative (EFA) - UNESCO, the World Bank, UNDP, UNFPA, and UNICEF - specified two major goals. First, all children should be able to complete a full course of primary education by 2015. Second, gender disparity at all levels of education should be eradicated by 2005.

In order to accomplish these goals, more financial, human and material resources are needed, as well as firm commitments from country leadership, to coordinate education reform and expansion. The first challenge lies in coordinating a framework for cooperation between development and donor agencies and countries. Second, methods of management and efficiency are needed to encourage countries in the use of those resources. Third, more collaboration is needed on both the local and global levels to encourage aid and build momentum towards the set goals. Unless these challenges are addressed, thirty-two developing countries are highly unlikely to meet the above mentioned goals.

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

- How can the international community best assist countries in setting realistic education related goals and targets?
- What additional resources and assistance are needed to help countries achieve their goals? How can countries be best encouraged to meet their Education for All Initiative commitment?
- What specific problems do different regions face and what needs to happen to overcome or accommodate these challenges?
- How can global and local educational initiatives better coordinate their efforts?

Bibliography:

- "Education: Efforts Needed to Meet Universal Target, UN Says." *UN Wire*. 1 May 2001.
- "HIV/AIDS II: Teachers, Children Hit Hard By Epidemic, UNESCO Says." *UN Wire*, 4 May 2001.
- The People's Movement for Human Rights Education - The Human Right to Education. www.pdhre.org/rights/education.html
- Press Release of Commission on Human Rights 57th Session - Morning. 3 April 2001.
- UN Index to Economic and Social Development - Education. www.un.org/esa/subindex/uctgry.htm
- UNESCO Education For All. www.unesco.org/education/efa/
- United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights - Right to Education Information. www.unhchr.ch/html/menu2/i2ecored.htm

UN Documents:

- A/C.3/52/L.II/Rev.1- (29 October 1997) GA Resolution on Education for All
- E/2001/L.33, 24 July 2001, Suriname: draft resolution - Human Rights Education
- E/CN.4/2001/52, 11 January 2001, Annual report of the Special Rapporteur on the right to education
- E/2000/80, June 2000, Report of the Secretary General containing a draft text of an international development strategy for the first decade of the new millennium
- E/1997/74, Progress report on the implementation process of the education for all objectives
- E/1993/23, Resolution 1993/56 of the Commission on Human Rights
- HR/CN/865, 22 April 1998, "Commission on Human Rights Establishes Special Rapporteurs on Foreign Debt Burdens, Right to Education"

Additional Web Resource:

www.worldbank.org/education/

THE INTEGRATION OF GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS FOR WOMEN

The effort to further integrate women's and human rights is gaining more attention on both the national and global levels. Statistically speaking, escalating poverty among women has been correlated to their unequal situation in the labor market, their treatment under social welfare systems and their position in the family.

Despite the increased attention given to women's rights, women still retain inferior status in many societies. 70% of the 1.3 billion people living in poverty worldwide are women. Two thirds of the world's illiterate population, approximately 900 million total illiterates, are women, and that number is not expected to change in the next two decades. Women and girls comprise half of the world's refugees and, as refugees, are particularly vulnerable to sexual violence while in flight, in refugee camps and/or during resettlement.

Worldwide, women work more hours than men, although most of their work remains unpaid, unrecognized and undervalued. Women hold less than 20% of worldwide jobs in the managerial, administrative and manufacturing sectors. They receive a disproportionately small share of credit from formal banking institutions. The participation of women in economic and political decision making remains very limited. Women occupy only 10% of parliamentary seats and make up less than 5% of the world's heads of state. The starkest reflection of the low status accorded to women is the discrimination against them in the law. In many countries, the treatment of women, whether in terms of property rights, rights of inheritance, laws



related to marriage and divorce, or the rights to acquire nationality, manage property or seek employment, reflects their lesser position overall within the country and society.

Since its inception, the United Nations has attempted to address this issue. In 1946, the Commission on the Status of Women (CSW) was created to present problems and make recommendations involving the rights of women to ECOSOC. By examining various cases, the CSW attempts to discern patterns of when, where, and how women are mistreated. Essentially, by determining these patterns, the CSW then makes recommendations to solve larger problems that stem from a series of case studies.

Another organization, the Division of the Advancement of Women, was originally a section of the Human Rights Division and then the branch of the Promotion and Equality of Men and Women. They assisted the CSW and helped establish the groundwork for the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women.

The Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women was adopted by the General Assembly in 1979 to reinforce existing provisions and international instruments and thereby combat continuing discrimination against women. This Convention was more specific in its goals to integrate women into the global society, where women can enjoy full equality with men. Essentially, this Convention required States to recognize the important economic and social contributions of women within the family and to society as a whole. Recognition of this type can only be achieved if there is a change in perception of women. Therefore, the convention recommends educating both men and women to overcome prejudices and practices based on stereotyped roles.

The United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM), was created in 1976 as an innovative and catalytic fund. The Fund has supported and developed numerous projects throughout the developing world that promote the political, economic, and social empowerment of women. In particular, UNIFEM has developed an outreach program known as the Regional Programme Advisors (RPAs). The RPA serves as the front-line contact between UNIFEM and its partners and clients. With this UNIFEM is able to develop and oversee projects in twelve countries, while identifying trends and issues affecting women in the region. At this point, UNIFEM has three major goals: strengthening women's economic capacity, engendering governance and leadership, and promoting women's human rights. These principles were derived from the Beijing platform in 1995

The Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action was adopted at the Fourth World Conference for Women, held in 1995. It attempted to outline the important areas

in which women's rights needed to be improved, although it also acknowledged the advances that had been made. The declaration recognizes the important link between women's rights and poverty, and is dedicated to removing any obstacles that currently create inequality between men and women. It also states clearly that women's rights are human rights, and should be protected as such. The Beijing Platform identifies key areas of women's rights, and sets forward actions to be taken by governments, regional, and international organizations in order to accomplish strategic objectives. Beijing charges the UN and its associated organizations with following up on the Platform for Action, by monitoring and implementing the individual objectives.

Although the UN has done much in the field of integrating human and gender rights for women, many issues remain unresolved. The issue of women's rights itself is considered a part of the mainstream branch of human rights. However there is more agreement among countries about the notion of human rights, rather than that of women's rights. For instance, all but twenty-six States have ratified the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, making it the second most widely ratified human rights treaty. In April 2001, the Commission on Human Rights passed a resolution calling for the further integration of the human rights of women throughout the UN system. Specifically, it asked that there be further cooperation between the CSW, the Division for the Advancement of Women, the Commission on Human Rights, the Special Advisor on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women, and the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. It is hoped that further integration and cooperation will increase the protection of the human rights of women worldwide.

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

- What is your country's position on the integration of gender and human rights?
- What actions has your country taken either on its own or in accordance with other countries and NGOs for the integration of gender and human rights?
- What measures can be taken to assist countries with this issue, while maintaining their sovereignty?

Bibliography:

- "Brundtland Ogata Speculate On 21st Century." *UN Wire*, 6 January 2000.
- "Calls For 'Truly Equal Rights For Women.'" *UN Wire*, 9 June 1999.
- "Conference To Examine Violence Against Women." *UN Wire*, 16 May 2001.



- “Contentious Session Yields Final Document On Women.” *UN Wire*, 12 June 2000.
- “New Report Documents UNFPA Efforts.” *UN Wire*, 16 February 2001.
- “Reducing Gender Gap Cuts Poverty, World Bank Says.” *UN Wire*, 8 March 2001.
- “Thousands Expected At New York Meeting.” *UN Wire*, 17 March 2000.
- “UN Dialogue On Women Indicates Shift In Thinking.” *UN Wire*, 3 October 2000.
- “UN Meeting Concludes With Focus On Gender, HIV/AIDS.” *UN Wire*, 19 March 2001.
- “UN Report Shows Gender Discrepancies Persist; More, 1 June 2000.” *UN Wire*, 1 June 2000.
- “Women Contribute Most, Despite Poverty.” *UN Wire*, 7 July 1999.
- “Women's Rights Vary Widely In Region,” *UN Wire*, 7 December 1999.

UN Documents:

- E/2001/76, 30 May 2001, “Revitalization and strengthening of the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women—Report of the Secretary-General”
- E/2001/27, “Commission on the Status of Women -- Report on the forty-fifth session, 6-16 March and 9-11 May 2001
- E/CN.4/RES/2001/50, from 23 April 2001
- GA/9725, 10 June 2000, “General Assembly Reaffirms Commitment to 1995 Beijing Conference Goals, as ‘Women 2000’ Special Session Concludes at Headquarters”
- GA/9721, 7 June 2000, “Speakers in Special Session Place Emphasis on Right of Women to Enjoy Equality in Decision-making and Power Roles”
- GA/SHC/3584, 9 October 2000, “Obstacles on Road to Women’s Advancement Discussed in Third Committee”

Additional Web Resources:

- www.unhchr.ch/women/index.html
- www.unhchr.ch/html/50th/50kit2.htm
- www.unhchr.ch/html/menu2/womenpub2000.htm
- www.un.org/womenwatch/resources/stats.htm
- www.unifem.undp.org/about.htm
- www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/beijing/platform/human.htm

CONVENTION TO COMBAT DESERTIFICATION

When one encounters the term “desertification,” images of sweeping sands and strong winds may come to mind. But, in reality, desertification has little to do with deserts beyond the fact that that both occur in arid geographies. A desert is a climatic region that receives scarce and erratic precipitation because of its location in

the interior of a continent, distant or isolated from an ocean or its location in a region of almost perpetual high pressure, and therefore lack of moisture uplift that would create clouds. Therefore, one could very easily argue that deserts are completely the work of nature.

Desertification, on the other hand, is the degradation of the land and biota that occurs because of drought and poor land-use practices. These practices or actions may include war, overgrazing, deforestation, imprudent agriculture or poor water use. Desertification, therefore, could be defined as human environmental degradation superimposed upon a natural drought occurrence. As a result, desertification can have a drastic impact on the social fabric of a nation or region. As many economies affected by desertification are agriculturally based, an entire nation can be driven further into poverty. Until remedial measures are taken, the land degradation - poverty cycle can be difficult to escape.

The condition of desertification has plagued semi-arid geographies throughout the twentieth century. In the 1930s, a stunning example of desertification occurred in the United States - the “Dust Bowl” conditions of the Great Plains. Although the term had yet to be coined, the extensive prairie and woodland clearing and grazing during a time of drought caused a desertification incident.

The world became more aware of the problem of desertification in the late 1960s. The Sahel area of North Africa, the subhumid/subarid region on the southern edge of the Sahara Desert, suffered a six-year drought. While traditional nomadic migration and agricultural activity patterns had environmental degradation in check before 1950, medical, political and economic improvements, coupled with above average rainfall, caused a sharp population increase in the 1960s. Political border changes induced a migratory population to become sedentary and changed their land-use from some grazing to irrigated agriculture and grazing. Because of the increase in land clearing for agriculture, increased demand for firewood and increase in cattle herd sizes, the Sahel was hit particularly hard by this drought.

In the 1970s, the United Nations attempted to address this massive problem. Roughly \$9 billion was dedicated to the situation in Africa. It was later found that only \$1 billion was actually used on fieldwork. This fact would make future negotiations more difficult for African nations seeking assistance in addressing desertification.

In the 1990s, the Convention to Combat Desertification was created as a result of Agenda 21. There was much debate on a definition of desertification and determining its position as a world problem. It was the African countries that lobbied to put desertification on the agenda of the conference. Not until France and the United States convinced the European Community to do



so was there global support for the measure. The Convention is now widely supported, as over 110 nations have signed the document.

Desertification is not merely an African issue. Desertification affects the Middle East, India, western China, southern Australia, Chile, Peru, Brazil, United States, Mexico and other places. More than fifty-one million square kilometers are affected by desertification - this affects one billion people. Over 250 million people already live in areas in which land has been degraded. The Great Plains of the US did recover from desertification; other regions can, too. But, as it took a concentrated effort for the Plains to recover, it may take an equal or greater effort in other areas, as well.

The Convention to Combat Desertification is implemented through action programmes. Action programmes are comprehensive in that they address the causes of desertification and seek to reverse it. In addition to national plans, there are regional and sub-regional plans which complement national plans when transboundary resources, like lakes and rivers, are involved. Additionally, in a "radical departure" from earlier development goals, local governments, communities and NGOs are an integral part of the program of action's development and implementation.

The Convention also includes some financing mechanisms. These include cooperation between donor and recipient nations, but affected countries do most fund raising. International agencies supply funding as well. The future successes under this convention will, however, rely on innovative sources of funding. Yet, the commitments to funding are often the challenge to implementing treaties dedicated to sustainable development issues, and the Convention to Combat Desertification is no exception.

The Convention is a means to address a serious sustainable development challenge. Desertification is an environmental issue with far-reaching human impact. Food security, water quality, migration and political stability are intimately tied to land degradation issues. This again proves that humans are inextricably linked to the environment. It is therefore imperative to properly address social issues as well as to look to nature.

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

- How can countries be best encouraged to develop comprehensive land management plans and to address remediation?
- Can regional coordination be enhanced in the worst-affected areas?
- How can countries be encouraged to develop and implement action programs for desertification?
- What funding sources does your country favor to cover the cost of these programs?

Bibliography:

- "Asian Countries Face Serious Problems - UN." *UN Wire*, 8 November 2000.
- "Conference Concludes with Commitments." *UN Wire*, 2 January 2001.
- "Countries Assess Results Of Programs Worldwide." *UN Wire*, 19 March 2001.
- "Developing Countries Plan Joint Projects." *UN Wire*, 10 March 2000.
- "Global Meeting Produces Big Plans, Small Budget." *UN Wire*, 29 November 1999.
- "Leaders Lament Low Funding For Conventions," *UN Wire*, 16 March 2001.
- McKnight, T. *Physical Geography: A Landscape Appreciation*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1990.
- Porter, G. and Brown, J.W. *Global Environmental Politics*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, Inc., 1996.
- United Nations Association of the United States of America. *A Global Agenda: Issues Before the 53rd General Assembly*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 1999.

UN Documents:

- ENV/DEV/558, 28 December 2000, "New Resources, Enhanced Commitments to Combat Desertification Called for in Bonn, as Parties to Desertification Convention Conclude Fourth Session"
- GA/SM/175, 15 June 2000, "Assembly President Calls on States That Have Not Yet Done So to Become Parties to Anti-desertification Convention"
- GA/SM/125

Additional Web Resources:

- www.unep.org
www.undp.org
www.unesco.org
www.unccd.int
www.unccd.int/main.php

ASSISTANCE TO THIRD STATES AFFECTED BY THE APPLICATION OF SANCTIONS

International economic sanctions, usually imposed by the Security Council, are now one of the primary tools in the UN's efforts to maintain international peace and security. There is, however, significant concern that the application of these sanctions may not have the desired effect in causing States to change their behavior. More importantly, the negative impacts of sanctions imposed in the 1990s are now clear. These include the potential for grave humanitarian consequences to the target population, which is often more affected than the country's leadership. For the purposes of this topic, another important effect is the negative impact of



sanctions on third States. When sanctions are imposed on a country, they often cut off trade and external contacts with other nations. This may just be trade in armaments, but often includes all trade outside of basic humanitarian considerations. Sanctions against oil exports from Iraq are a good example of this phenomenon. Cutting off trade not only affects the target nation, but also has detrimental consequences to non-target nations, called "third States," who are the regular trading partners of the target nations.

A wide variety of UN bodies have addressed this issue in the past several years, including ECOSOC, the Security Council (SC), the General Assembly (GA), and an ad hoc group the GA created in 1999, the "ad hoc expert group meeting on developing a methodology for assessing the consequences incurred by third States as a result of preventive or enforcement measures and on exploring innovative and practical measures of international assistance to the affected third States." (SG Report: A/53/312)

The key underlying questions involve burden sharing and an equitable distribution of the costs of sanctions. The UN is actively trying to ascertain how to make sanctions work more effectively against the target State, while not unfairly discriminating against one or more third States who happen to have relations with the target. This is both in the interests of equity, but more importantly it is recognized that States are less likely to support sanctions against a target if they are also negatively affected by those sanctions.

Issues under discussion on this topic include: (1) measures for improving the abilities of the SC and its sanctions committees; (2) a review of the capacity and mechanisms of the Secretariat for implementation of sanctions; (3) the need for additional financial resources to assist third States; and (4) the need for a comprehensive methodology to evaluate the economic situation in non-target States. Another issue is that problems can still continue after sanctions are lifted, since the effects are not immediately eliminated or even mitigated.

Specific suggestions to relieve this problem come from a number of directions. One suggestion looks at the need to alleviate the humanitarian consequences of sanctions on the target's populace. The World Food Programme (WFP), which traditionally provides significant assistance to target populations, suggests that exemptions can be made to give third States priority as the primary suppliers of humanitarian supplies for the target's populace. Another suggestion is that the SC should more actively consult affected third States when discussing the initial application or continuation of sanctions.

Many suggestions also involve financial compensation for third States. This may be in the form of International

Financial Institutions' opening credit lines to assist third States. Other possibilities are that donor countries can be encouraged to give trade preference to third States, or to support investment in those States. The most discussed financial solution is the possibility of creating a fund within the UN to support third States, based on how negatively their economies are affected by sanctions against a target State.

At this point in time, the UN is actively searching for answers to an acknowledged problem, but has been unable to come to agreement on what form those answers should take.

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

- What solutions does your government support to assist third States affected by sanctions?
- How will funding be generated to pay for these efforts? Who should pay for these efforts?
- How can the international community quantify the actual effects of sanctions on third States?

Bibliography:

UN Documents:

- A/55/295, Secretary-General's Report
A/54/383, Secretary-General's Report
A/53/312, Secretary-General's Report
A/51/172, Secretary-General's Report
A/Res/55/157, 12 December 2000
A/Res/54/107, 9 December 1999
E/2001/90, 18 June 2001, Assistance to third States affected by the application of sanctions, Note by the Secretary-General
E/2000/45, 3 May 2000, Assistance to third States affected by the application of sanctions, Note by the Secretariat
E/Res/2000/32, 28 July 2000
E/Res/1999/59, 30 July 1999
ECOSOC/5931, 28 July 2000, Economic and Social Council, Winding up 2000 Substantive Session, Decides to Establish Information, Communication, Technology Task Force
GA/9782, 27 September 2000, Continuing Consideration of Report of Secretary-General, Assembly Speakers Maintain Focus on Peace Operations, Sanctions, Humanitarian Intervention
GA/9788, 17 October 2000, General Assembly Takes up Report of Security Council
GA/9766, 14 September 2000, Assembly, Continuing General Debate, Discusses Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict, Role of Private Sector in World Affairs
GA/9170, 21 November 1996, Press Release



GA/L/3146, 12 October 2000, Speakers Call for Means to Ameliorate Affect of Sanctions on Third Parties in Sixth Committee

GA/L/3110, 15 October 1999, US Warns Legal Committee of Weakened Effectiveness of Security Council If 'Unwise' Measures Adopted to Mitigate Sanctions" Unwanted Impacts

GA/L/3040, 13 October 1997, Support Expressed in Fourth Committee for Expert Group to Study Measures to Help Third States Affected by Sanctions

GA/L/3002, 26 September 1996, Impact of Economic Sanctions on Third States must Be Assessed Through Agreed Methodology, Sixth Committee Told

SC/6845, 17 April 2000, Speakers Call for Clearer Definition, Tighter Targeting of Un Sanctions as Council Draws on "Lessons Learned" to Refine Sanctions Regimes

REPORT OF FAO

In addition to the four main topics on ECOSOC's agenda, the Council will also receive a report on the final day from the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). As an agency which works closely with other UN bodies, FAO provides periodic reports to ECOSOC on its work throughout the year. While these reports are generally accepted pro forma, ECOSOC may also choose to take some action on the recommendations contained in a report. Please note that FAO may also choose to provide a draft resolution on steps that ECOSOC can choose to take, but this will be at FAO's option.

It is recommended that all Representatives assigned to ECOSOC also review the background section on FAO (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

NAURU V. AUSTRALIA (1989): DISPUTE ON THE REHABILITATION OF AN ISLAND NATION AFTER COLONIAL MINING

The Republic of Nauru (hereinafter “Nauru”) sought adjudication by the International Court of Justice (ICJ) in 1989 with the intention of settling a dispute with the Commonwealth of Australia (hereinafter “Australia”) regarding the “rehabilitation of certain phosphate lands worked out before Nauruan independence.” Since both States agreed to the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court without any relevant reservation, the rendered judgment by the justices in this case is understood to be final and binding upon both of the parties to the dispute.

Nauru, a modest island in proximity to Australia’s northeastern coast, was annexed by Germany in 1888 as the “Imperial German Protectorate of the Marshall Islands” and established as such by the Anglo-German Convention of 6 April 1886. By 1900, extensive phosphate deposits were discovered on Nauru and on nearby Ocean Island, which occasioned the German Jaluit Gesellschaft company to commence ninety-four years of mining operations on Nauru in 1905. Additionally, by consent of the Imperial Chancellor Germany formed a partnership with the United Kingdom on 12 December 1905 to enable strict exploitation of the phosphate deposits on both Nauru and Ocean Island.

Australia, which had occupied Nauru after the First World War, expressed a desire after the war to annex Nauru from German possessions in the Pacific Rim in order to gain control over the phosphate deposits. At the Versailles Convention of victor States (principal victor States after World War I were the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and Italy), however, it was agreed that Nauru, along with other German colonies, would be placed under the Mandate system pursuant to Article 22 of the League of Nations’ Covenant. As stipulated under the Covenant, the Mandatory undertook to “promote to the utmost the material and moral well-being and the social progress of the inhabitants of the territory subject to the present Mandate.” The mandate for Nauru was established 17 December 1920 and

“conferred” to the United Kingdom as for its administration by the League.

Subsequently, the British, in response to Australia’s desire to obtain partial control over Nauruan phosphate deposits, signed an agreement with the governments of Australia and New Zealand on 2 July 1919 with the express intention of allowing the mining of the phosphate deposits on Nauru. A Board of Commissioners was created, consisting of three members (one appointed by each Government) in whom title to the phosphate deposits would be vested. These States were thus granted priority access to Nauruan phosphate deposits, at a price which was to be set no higher than was necessary to cover the costs of mining and administration. Nauru argues, however, that this tripartite agreement was in violation of the confirmed 1920 Mandate for Nauru from League’s Council. Nauru claims that this was specifically in direct violation of Article 2 of the established Mandate, wherein the thirteenth provision “binds itself [each government party of the Agreement] not to do or to permit any act or thing contrary to or inconsistent with the terms and purpose of this Agreement,” thus establishing a priority over all other purposes.

The Agreement was ratified by the legislative branches of each state (Australia, New Zealand and the United Kingdom, but this was subject to the provisions of Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations. Moreover, approved amendments to the 1919 Agreement in 1923 stipulated that governing power with respect to the territory of Nauru was vested in the Government (comprising the three powers) with powers of legislation and disallowance vested exclusively in that Government. Contrary to this, the Australian parliament had been the major drafter of all legislation for Nauru from 1919 to 1968 without formal consent from the United Kingdom or from New Zealand; thereby effectively rendering Australia as the governing state of the island.

Furthermore, after Japanese occupation of Nauru during the Second World War, Australian forces retook the island in 1945, bringing Nauru under the trusteeship system established by the UN Charter. The Trusteeship Agreement under the Charter did not vary much in



comparison to the League's Mandate system, since all three governments party to the 1923 Agreement on Nauru continued their administrative authority over the island as the joint Authority of the Territory, while the actual, day-to-day administration was vested in the Government of Australia. However, according to Nauru's Application to the ICJ, for Australia to fully administer the region, all three governments party to the Trusteeship Agreement had to recognize Australia as the actual administrator of Nauru. This was not agreed upon until 26 November 1965, when all three governments party to the Agreement proclaimed Australia's actual governing authority. Thus, the trusteeship system formalized Australia's recognition as the sole administrator and authority over the island in 1965 until Nauruan independence on 31 January 1968. This did not, however, extend Australia's authority to the phosphate industry (including the operations, ownership and control of that industry); phosphate royalties; or the ownership and control of phosphate-bearing land, as stipulated by Article 1(2)(a) of the Agreement; the latter superseding the Agreements of 1919 and 1923.

Given Australia's historical concern since World War I, when the Nauruan people sought greater control over the phosphate industry they agreed to give precedence to the partner governments. This took the form of Nauru Island Phosphate Industry Agreement (14 November 1967) dealing with the arrangements for the future operations of the industry. This agreement required that phosphates be supplied exclusively to the partner governments and assumed Nauru of liabilities with respect to the phosphate industry.

The current dispute arises from Nauru's claim that, from 1919 until 1 July 1967, the benefit by the Nauruans from phosphate was much lower than it should have been because all three governments, but principally Australia, procured the real benefit of phosphate mining. This was done in such a way that Australia's agricultural sector profited from its massive excavation operations, rendering approximately one-third of the island completely useless for habitation, agriculture, or any other purpose unless and until rehabilitation was carried out. Thus, Nauru claims that Australia, as independent administrator of the island under the Trusteeship Agreement, accelerated the potential exhaustion of the phosphate in order to ensure that it was mined out before the British Phosphate Commissioners concession expired in 2000. This was done without any mention of legislative nor contractual provisions for the rehabilitation of those lands. Nauru further argues that the government of Australia has failed to make adequate and reasonable provision for the long-term needs of the Nauruan people, and in particular has not restored the island of Nauru to a reasonable level for habitation by the Nauruan people as a sovereign nation. This contradicts the principles of the Trusteeship Agreement which requires the Administering

Authority to ensure that, if any conflict arises between the needs of the inhabitants and the expansion requirements of the phosphate industry, the needs of the inhabitants must take precedence. This is contrary to the BPC's view, supported by the Administering Authority, that there was no obligation to pay phosphate royalties to the Nauruan people nor to replant trees, or otherwise to restore the land to a cultivable state.

Although Nauru fully accepted responsibility in respect of land mined subsequently to 1 July 1967, it claims that prior to that date it had not received the net proceeds; thus, Nauru contends that the three Governments should bear responsibility for the rehabilitation of land mined prior to 1 July 1967. This is in order to seek what was, in the opinion of the Nauruan people, a just settlement of their claims, contrary to the Australian contention of a just settlement provided by the comprehensive Phosphate Agreement concluded prior to Nauruan Independence that cleared the Partner Governments of any responsibility for the rehabilitation of Nauru.

In thinking about this case, justices should consider reviewing the tripartite ordinance that set out the terms for mining leases to be concluded with the Nauruan landowners. These terms avoided any reference to compensation or rehabilitation. Germany, prior to the First World War, had set a precedent by creating provisions for compensation to the Nauruan landowners for the reduced value of their lands as a result of mining; thus putting into question Australia's administration in relation to the UN trusteeship system and international customary law as a whole. This occurred when Australia failed to comply with applicable international standards in respect to the preparation for and transfer of control and administration of territory by a predecessor. In addition to the evidence displaying the decay of Nauruan soil due to extensive mining by Australian authorities, justices should determine the possible breaches committed by Australia of the UN Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Bill of Rights. The relief sought by Nauru implies a declaration by the Court that Australia has incurred an international legal responsibility and restitution or other appropriate reparation to Nauru for the damage and prejudice suffered should be forthcoming. The claim refers to Australia's alleged failure to comply with international standards recognized as applicable in the implementation of the principle of self-determination in the UN Charter, and its alleged abuse of its rights over the Territory of Nauru and with respect to the Nauruan people, and, by reason of its improper and arbitrary conduct as Administering Authority in Nauru, allegedly engaging in acts of maladministration wrongful under international law.

Bibliography:

- "Application of the Republic of Nauru." General List, No. 80. 1989. www.icj-cij.org
- Brown, Seyom. *Human Rights in World Politics*. Addison Wesley Longman, Inc., 2000.
- Magdoff, Fred. "Liebig, Marx, and the depletion of soil fertility: relevance for today's agriculture." *Monthly Review*, 1 July 1998.
- McDaniel, Carl N. and Gowdy, John M. *Paradise for Sale A Parable of Nature*. University of California Press, 2000.

Additional Web Resources:

- www.countrywatch.com - search for "Nauru," with particular emphasis on the Economy
- www.un.org, "United Nations Treaty Series"

HUNGARY v. SLOVAKIA (1994): DISPUTE OVER THE FINISHING OF TREATY OBLIGATIONS

The Hungarian People's Republic (Hungary) and the Czechoslovak People's Republic (Czechoslovakia) entered into the Treaty of 16 September 1977 concerning the construction and operation of the Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros System of Locks and Dams (1977 Treaty). Under the Treaty, the system of locks was to be situated between Bratislava, Slovakia (then, Czechoslovakia), and Budapest, Hungary, with a total distance of 200 kilometers. The intention of this system was to obtain a high utilization of the area's water resources. In accordance with the agreement, a Joint Contractual Plan was created to provide the construction, financing, technical specifics, and management of the works on a joint basis in which both parties would participate in an equal measure.

In 1983, Hungary requested that both parties slow down the work being done on the project and to postpone commencing the operation of power plants associated with the project. The timetable was altered once more when both parties agreed to accelerate the progress of the project by a Protocol on 6 February 1989. Then, on 13 May 1989, the Hungarian Government bowed to intense internal pressure from environmental activists and decided to suspend the works at one site pending the completion of various studies, which were estimated to finish by 31 July 1989. The Hungarian portion of the project was again postponed until 31 October 1989, and then abandoned on 27 October 1989.

As a result of the postponements of the project by Hungary, the parties entered into negotiations to resolve the problems with the 1977 Treaty. As a precaution, Czechoslovakia also investigated alternative options to the project. One option created was labeled Variant C. Variant C was a method of maximizing the use of the

Danube River in the event that the Treaty was not going to be fulfilled by both parties. Because of the continued postponements of the Treaty, the Czechoslovakian government then enacted Variant C in November 1991. On 25 May 1992 the government of Hungary effectively canceled the 1977 Treaty by sending a Note Verbale to the Czechoslovakian government, the government in turn began further work in Variant C later that year.

The Republic of Slovakia became a state in January of 1993 and in 1994 the Republic of Slovakia filed suit in the International Court of Justice against the Republic of Hungary. Both parties agreed upon the jurisdiction of the Court, thus there was no question of jurisdiction for this case. In 1995, an agreement was signed which implemented a temporary water management regime for the Danube River between the parties. Under this agreement the parties involved set a date to expire pending the first judgment of the court in 1997. The International Court of Justice released its decision; because of this the water management agreement was officially void. The judgment stated that the parties involved were both in violation of the 1977 Treaty. Hungary was in violation of international law because it had not canceled the Treaty when it had canceled work on its section of the project, and did not invoke the entitled negotiations with Slovakia as provided for in the 1977 Treaty. Slovakia was found to be in violation of international law insofar that it began the operation of its section of the project unilaterally in 1992 when, as stated above, it also should have entered into negotiations with Hungary. Also in the Court's judgment the parties must begin negotiations to decide the modalities of the judgment.

In 1998 the parties entered into negotiations to resolve the dispute, as ordered by the Court. Then in September, Hungary postponed the negotiations pending elections in Slovakia. In response to this delay, Slovakia petitioned the International Court of Justice to resolve the dispute. In the time that has passed since the postponement and petition, negotiations have been sporadic and unsuccessful, with minor agreements being made, but with no consensus as to the final state of the Treaty.

Questions to consider while deliberating this matter include:

- Did Hungary have the right to postpone and then cancel the Treaty?
- Was Slovakia a successor under the Vienna Convention on Successive States, and did that make it party to the 1977 Treaty?
- Did Slovakia have the right to begin its own project, Variant C?
- Do any of the parties to the 1977 Treaty have rights to compensation?



Bibliography:

- “Hungary gives up power for water.” *Budapest Sun*, 9 December 1999. www.budapestsun.com
- Szamosi, Géda. “Experts say dam unstable.” *Budapest Sun*, 18 February 1999. www.budapestsun.com
- Balázs, Eszter. “Slovak-Hungarian talks renewed.” *Budapest Sun*, 19 November 1998. www.budapestsun.com
- Bürger, Márton. “Slovakian dam fight may ease.” *Budapest Sun*, 8 October 1998. www.budapestsun.com
- Bürger, Márton. “Danube dispute returns to Hague.” *Budapest Sun*, 10 September 1998. www.budapestsun.com
- “Breakthrough in Hungaria-Slovak Dam Talks.” *Slovakia Daily Surveyor*. 17 May 1999. www.slovensko.com

UN Documents:

- Budapest Treaty of 16 September 1977
- Convention of 18 August 1948 Concerning the Regime of Navigation of the Danube
- The Law of State Responsibility
- Vienna Convention of 1969 on Law of Treaties
- Vienna Convention on Successive States

Additional Web Resources:

- www.icj-cij.org, International Court of Justice
- www.ramsar.org/key_elc_draft_e.htm
- memory.loc.gov/frd/cs/hutoc.html
- www.slovakia.org/history-gabcikovo.htm
- www.slovensko.com

NICARAGUA V. HONDURAS (1999): DISPUTE OVER THE MARITIME BOUNDARIES OF TWO NATIONS

This conflict began in November 1999 when the Honduran Congress ratified the 1986 Caribbean Sea Maritime Limits Treaty, which grants Colombia sovereignty over a section of the Caribbean. The Nicaraguan government believes that the treaty, also known as the Ramirez-Lopez treaty, unjustly encroaches on 130,000 square kilometers of its maritime border. Honduran ambassadors in Managua said that the treaty was being ratified, after four years of discussions, because Honduras believed that Nicaragua and Jamaica were planning a claim on the disputed territory, which includes the islands of San Andres, Providence and Serranilla Key.

The tensions rose in December 1999 with rumors of military troop movements near the Honduran/Nicaraguan border, which both parties denied. In response, Honduras and Nicaragua signed an agreement in March 2000 limiting the patrol of the contested Caribbean waters and military presence along their border until the dispute could be heard by the International Court of Justice. Nevertheless, since the

signing of the treaty, there have been naval incidents in the disputed area. In February 2000, Nicaraguan military officials accused two Honduran naval vessels of entering Nicaraguan waters and opening fire at a Nicaraguan patrol boat. The Honduran response was that a Nicaraguan patrol boat was about to detain a Honduran fishing vessel in Honduran waters. Similarly, in December of the same year, the Honduran Navy seized the Nicaraguan vessel “Mister Kerry,” which it alleges was in Honduran national waters.

The situation has achieved international attention as a serious threat to the region’s stability and economic unity. The issue stems from the land boundary as created by the Arbitral Award from His Majesty the King of Spain on 23 December 1906. Both nations brought the issue of their land boundary before the ICJ in 1960 where the Award was found “valid and binding.” Additional international assistance was garnered from the Interamerican Peace Commission of the Organization of American States (OAS), which aided in determining the final details associated with the Arbitral Award. The shortcoming of this agreement was that it left the issue of maritime delimitation considerably vague.

After the increase in tensions, the OAS again stepped in to support a peaceful resolution to the conflict. Nicaragua and Honduras requested their assistance in brokering the March 2000 agreement. This agreement sought to establish a military exclusion zone in the disputed area of the Caribbean Sea as a means to ensure the security of fishermen and communities in the border area. The United Nations response to the increase in tensions in the region, as described by Secretary-General Kofi Annan, was that “the United Nations would step in” if other regional attempts at preventing further violence failed.

As a backdrop to all the international attention to the issue, the Nicaraguan government made application on 8 December 1999 to have the ICJ finally resolve the issue of the Nicaragua/Honduran maritime border. They applied under Article 36, Paragraph 1 and Article 40 of the Statutes, and Article 38 of the Rules of the Court. Jurisdiction exists, according to Nicaragua, because both Nicaragua and Honduras are signatories to the American Treaty of Pacific Settlement of 1948, also known as the “Bogotá Pact,” and because of general norms of International law that were recognized by the 1982 Law of The Sea Convention. Believing that the Arbitral Award of 1906 defined only the land boundary between Nicaragua and Honduras, Nicaragua maintains that there is no established Caribbean maritime. Honduras claims that the delimitation line runs straight easterly from the mouth of the Coco River, the point defined by the Arbitral Award on the parallel fourteen degrees, fifty-nine minutes and eight seconds. Due to the ambiguity, Nicaragua has brought the case before the Court to



finally “determine the course of the single maritime boundary between areas of territorial sea, continental shelf and exclusive economic zone.”

Questions to consider while deliberating this matter include:

- Does Nicaragua have a viable claim on the area of concern? (Note: Colombia claims that Nicaragua lost its right to the Archipelago of San Andreas under a 1928 treaty.)
- Does the land boundary created by the Arbitral Award extend into the maritime border?
- What jurisdiction is created in the Bogotá Pact?
- How does the Law of the Sea Convention affect the international legal perspective on the situation?
- What influence does the possibility of the area’s being “historical waters” have on the case?

Bibliography:

- “Application For Permission To Intervene, Case Concerning The Land, Island And Maritime Frontier Dispute (El Salvador/Honduras).” 13 September 1990. www.icj-cij.org/icjwww/idecisions/ishsummary/ishsummary900913.htm
- “Application, Maritime Delimitation Between Nicaragua and Honduras in the Caribbean Sea (Nicaragua v. Honduras).” 8 December 1999. www.icj-cij.org/icjwww/idocket/inh/inhtoc.htm
- Bounds, Andrew. “Honduras, Nicaragua seek way back from the brink.” *Financial Times* (London), 4 April 2001. [Lexis Nexis]
- “Case Concerning Land, Island And Maritime Frontier Dispute (El Salvador/Honduras: Nicaragua Intervening).” 11 September 1992. www.icj-cij.org/icjwww/idecisions/ishsummary/ishsummary920911.htm
- Conaway, Janelle. “Envoy Eases Neighbors’ Tension.” *Americas* 52:2, March/April 2000. 54. [Ebscohost]
- De la Garza, Paul. “Nicaragua And Honduras Raise Steam Over Disputed Sea.” *The Toronto Star*, 15 December 1999. [Lexis Nexis]
- Giles Warren. “WTO drawn into Nicaragua border dispute: World trade body to decide whether tariffs against Colombia and Honduras can be allowed on security grounds.” *Financial Times* (London), 8 April 2000. [Lexis Nexis]
- “Honduras And Nicaragua Sign Peace Agreement.” *EFE News Services*, 8 March 2000. [Global Newsbanks]
- Keyuan, Zou. “Maritime Boundary Delimitation in the Gulf of Tonkin.” *Ocean Development & International Law* 30:3, July-September 1999. 235. [Ebscohost]
- “Managua Files Protest Over Boat Seizure In Caribbean.” *EFE News Services*, 26 September 2000. [Global Newsbanks]
- “Nicaragua Fired First Shot In Weekend Skirmish, Honduras Says.” *EFE News Services*, 21 February 2000. [Global Newsbanks]
- “Order, Case Concerning Maritime Delimitation Between Nicaragua And Honduras In The Caribbean Sea (Nicaragua V. Honduras).” 21 March 2000. www.icj-cij.org/icjwww/idocket/inh/iNH_orders/iNH_iorder_20000321.htm
- “Press Communiqué, The Court fixes time-limits for the filing of written pleadings.” 23 March 2000. www.icj-cij.org/icjwww/ipresscom/IPress2000/ipresscom2000-10_inh_20000323.htm
- Press Conference By Foreign Minister Of Honduras, 7 December 1999.
- Wilson, James. “OAS called in to mend Caribbean dispute.” *Financial Times* (London) 7 December 1999. [Lexis Nexis]



