

## CHAPTER IV.

# THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

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

### BACKGROUND RESEARCH

#### THE FIRST COMMITTEE (DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

### Bibliography:

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

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

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

"Landmine Advocacy Fact Sheet." ICBL, 1999. [www.icbl.org](http://www.icbl.org)

"Landmine Monitor Report 2001." ICBL, 2001. [www.icbl.org/lm/2001/findings](http://www.icbl.org/lm/2001/findings)

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

### UN Documents:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### Additional Web Resources:

[disarmament.un.org/TreatyStatus.nsf](http://disarmament.un.org/TreatyStatus.nsf)

[www.un.org/Depts/dda/resources.htm](http://www.un.org/Depts/dda/resources.htm)

[www.icbl.org/](http://www.icbl.org/)

[www.unog.ch/UNIDIR](http://www.unog.ch/UNIDIR)

[www.un.org/Depts/DPKO/maputo/2029.htm](http://www.un.org/Depts/DPKO/maputo/2029.htm)

[www.un.org/Depts/DPKO/maputo/maput7.htm](http://www.un.org/Depts/DPKO/maputo/maput7.htm)

[www.un.org/Depts/DPKO/maputo/2030.htm](http://www.un.org/Depts/DPKO/maputo/2030.htm)

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **Bibliography:**

- Bolton, John. Speech to the BWC RevCon, 19 Nov 2001. [www.state.gov/t/us/rm/janJuly/6231.htm](http://www.state.gov/t/us/rm/janJuly/6231.htm)
- Brugger, Seth. "Executive Summary of the Chairman's Text," *Arms Control Today On-Line*, May 2001. [www.armscontrol.org/act/2001\\_05/brugger.asp](http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2001_05/brugger.asp).
- "Chronology of State Use and Biological and Chemical Weapons Control." Center for Non-Proliferation Studies, 24 Oct 2001. [cns.miis.edu/research/cbw/pastuse.htm](http://cns.miis.edu/research/cbw/pastuse.htm)
- The Harvard and Sussex Program on CBW Armament and Arms Limitation. [fas-www.harvard.edu/~hsp/](http://fas-www.harvard.edu/~hsp/)
- "Limiting the Acquisition and Use of Biological Weapons by Strengthening the BWC." The Center for Nonproliferation Studies at the Monterey Institute of International Studies, 2002. [www.nti.org/f\\_wmd411/f2j.html](http://www.nti.org/f_wmd411/f2j.html)
- "Science's Call To Arms: The Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons Convention (BWC)." The Chemical and Biological Arms Control Institute. [www.cbaci.org/](http://www.cbaci.org/)
- Special Weapons Primer on Biological Weapons. Federation of American Scientists, 11 Nov 1998. [www.fas.org/nuke/intro/bw/intro.htm](http://www.fas.org/nuke/intro/bw/intro.htm)

### *UN Documents:*

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



*Additional Web Resources:*

[www.armscontrol.org/subject/bw/](http://www.armscontrol.org/subject/bw/)

---

## THE SECOND COMMITTEE (ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL)

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

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

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

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

Nevertheless, not all of the failures of the past Programmes

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

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

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

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

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

Programme for Action?

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

### Bibliography:

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

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

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

"What Are the Least Developed Countries." [www.unctad.org/Idcs/accueil.asp](http://www.unctad.org/Idcs/accueil.asp)

#### UN Documents:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

DEV/BRU/24 (20 May 2001)

GA/9892 (12 Jul 2001)

#### Additional Web Resources:

[www.jubileeplus.org](http://www.jubileeplus.org)

[www.unctad.org/conference](http://www.unctad.org/conference)

[www.worldbank.org/poverty/strategies/index.htm](http://www.worldbank.org/poverty/strategies/index.htm)

[www.unctad.org/en/pub/ps1ldc02.en.htm](http://www.unctad.org/en/pub/ps1ldc02.en.htm)

[if.wto.org/LDCS.htm](http://if.wto.org/LDCS.htm)

[www.unesco.org/ldc/strategy.htm](http://www.unesco.org/ldc/strategy.htm)

[www.unesco.org/ldc/](http://www.unesco.org/ldc/)

[www.itu.int/ITU-D/ldc/projects.html](http://www.itu.int/ITU-D/ldc/projects.html)

[www.wipo.int/ldcs/en/](http://www.wipo.int/ldcs/en/)

[www.uncdf.org/index.html](http://www.uncdf.org/index.html)

[www.wto.org/english/tratop\\_e/dda\\_e/dda\\_e.htm](http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dda_e/dda_e.htm)

### STRENGTHENING INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC COOPERATION FOR DEVELOPMENT THROUGH PARTNERSHIP

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### Bibliography:

"General Assembly Opens High-Level Dialogue on Cooperation for Development." UN News service, 21 Sep 2001. [www.globalpolicy.org/socecon/un/2001/0921ga.htm](http://www.globalpolicy.org/socecon/un/2001/0921ga.htm)

"Global Development Finance 1998: Analysis and Summary Tables." The World Bank. Washington D.C.: World Bank, 1998.

"Proposals by Zedillo panel to fight poverty would alter international financial skyline." Press Release, 28 Jun 2001. [www.un.org/reports/financing/press\\_release.htm](http://www.un.org/reports/financing/press_release.htm)

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

### UN Documents:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### Additional Web Resource:

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



## THE THIRD COMMITTEE (SOCIAL, HUMANITARIAN AND CULTURAL)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

### Bibliography:

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

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

### UN Documents:

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

### Additional Web Resources:

- [www.un.org/special-rep/children-armed-conflict/index.html](http://www.un.org/special-rep/children-armed-conflict/index.html)
- [www.un.org/millennium/sg/report/index.html](http://www.un.org/millennium/sg/report/index.html)
- [www.un.org/special-rep/children-armed-conflict/fUnDocs.htm](http://www.un.org/special-rep/children-armed-conflict/fUnDocs.htm)





## INTERNATIONAL DRUG CONTROL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Bibliography:

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*Additional Web Resources:*  
[www.undcp.org/index.html](http://www.undcp.org/index.html)  
[www.undcp.org/drug\\_demand\\_reduction.html](http://www.undcp.org/drug_demand_reduction.html)  
[www.undcp.org/alternative\\_development.html](http://www.undcp.org/alternative_development.html)  
[www.undcp.org/crop\\_monitoring.html](http://www.undcp.org/crop_monitoring.html)  
[www.undcp.org/law\\_enforcement.html](http://www.undcp.org/law_enforcement.html)  
[www.undcp.org/treaty\\_and\\_legal\\_affairs.html](http://www.undcp.org/treaty_and_legal_affairs.html)  
[www.undcp.org/event\\_2001-06-26\\_1.html](http://www.undcp.org/event_2001-06-26_1.html)  
[www.emcdda.org/links/europe.shtml](http://www.emcdda.org/links/europe.shtml)  
[www.undcp.org/cnd\\_session\\_45.html](http://www.undcp.org/cnd_session_45.html) -- The 45th Session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs (11-15 Mar 2002)

---

## THE SIXTH COMMITTEE (LEGAL)

### MEASURES TO ELIMINATE INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### Bibliography:

- "Annan Seeks More Limits On Weapons Of Mass Destruction." *UN Wire*, 1 October 2001.
- "Countries Consider Links Between Drugs, Terrorism." *UN Wire*, 16 October 2001.
- "Global Battle Should Not Mean Violating Freedoms, Experts Say." *UN Wire*, 29 November 2001.
- "Muslim and EU States End Forum, Urge Tolerance." *UN Wire*, 12 February 2002.
- "OSCE Calls For 'Comprehensive' Fight At Kyrgyzstan Meeting." *UN Wire*, 12 December 2001.
- "Poverty, Middle East Conflict Key Factors, African Leaders Told." *UN Wire*, 17 October 2001.
- "Progress Reported On Implementing UN Resolutions." *UN Wire*, 27 June 2002.
- "Stress Human Rights to Avoid Terrorism-Robinson." *UN Wire*, 9 October 2001.
- "Symposium Aims To Channel UN Efforts To Fight Scourge." *UN Wire*, 3 June 2002.
- "Terrorism, Poverty Dominate High-Level Meeting." *UN Wire*, 18 November 2001.
- "UN Focuses On Terrorism On World Day." *UN Wire*, 2 May 2002.
- "UN Panel Urges Cooperation Against Terrorism; More." *UN Wire*, 25 April 2002.
- "UN To Launch Information Campaign In Arab World." *UN Wire*, 31 July 2002.
- "UN, International Conferences Debate Prevention Measures." *UN Wire*, 28 October 2001.
- Wurst, Jim. "Counterterrorism Committee Extended As It Enters Phase Three." *UN Wire*, 15 April 2002.
- Wurst, Jim. "Lubbers Warns Against Making 'Scapegoats' In Anti-Terror War." *UN Wire*, 7 February 2002.
- Wurst, Jim. "Negotiations On Anti-Terrorism Treaties Yield No Progress." *UN Wire*, 3 February 2002.

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

### UN Documents:

- A/56/190: SG's Report on Human Rights and Terrorism
- A/56/160: SG's Report on Measures to Eliminate International Terrorism
- A/Res/56/1: Condemnation of terrorist attacks in the United States of America
- A/Res/55/158: Measures to eliminate international terrorism
- A/Res/54/439
- A/Res/54/164: Human rights and terrorism
- A/Res/54/110: Measures to eliminate international terrorism
- A/Res/54/109: International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism
- A/Res/53/108: Measures to eliminate international terrorism
- A/Res/52/165: Measures to eliminate international terrorism
- L/2993 (2 Jan 2002): Press Release from the Ad Hoc Committee on Terrorism
- A/Res/51/210
- A/Res/49/60
- S/PRST/2000/38
- S/Res/1269 (1999)
- S/Res/1373 (2001)

### Additional Web Resources:

- [www.un.org/law/terrorism/index.html](http://www.un.org/law/terrorism/index.html)
- [www.un.org/terrorism](http://www.un.org/terrorism)
- [www.un.org/terrorism/sc.htm](http://www.un.org/terrorism/sc.htm)
- [www.un.org/terrorism/ga.htm](http://www.un.org/terrorism/ga.htm)
- [www.un.org/dda/terrorism.htm](http://www.un.org/dda/terrorism.htm)
- [www.ict.org.il](http://www.ict.org.il)
- [state.gov/www/global/terrorism](http://state.gov/www/global/terrorism)
- [www.globalterrorism101.com](http://www.globalterrorism101.com)

### INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION AGAINST THE REPRODUCTIVE CLONING OF HUMAN BEINGS

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### Bibliography:

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



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

*UN Documents:*

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

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

*Additional Web Resource:*

The Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and on Human Rights: [www.unesco.org/ibc/en/genome/](http://www.unesco.org/ibc/en/genome/)

