Implementing the Recommendations of the High Level Panel
By Gleneara Bates and Matt Williams

At the height of the United Nations' sanctions regime against Saddam Hussein's Iraq, up to 150 Iraqi children a day were dying of malnutrition and disease. In 1995, the U.N. created the "Oil for Food" program to address the humanitarian concerns involved in sanctioning Iraq. Designed to allow Iraq to sell oil on the international market and use the profits to aid Iraqi citizens, the program was touted as an example of "smart sanctions." However, Oil for Food instead became an example of how systemic problems within the United Nations cause corruption and malfeasance. The program helped to line the pockets of U.N. officials, oil company executives, and even Saddam Hussein himself, while the Iraqi people continued to starve under the crushing weight of international sanctions.

The Oil for Food Scandal is not an isolated incident, but instead is symptomatic of deeply rooted systemic deficiencies within the U.N. After the disbanding of Oil for Food, numerous questions can be asked. How could the world's most prominent international governing body allow a scandal of this magnitude to happen? What can ensure that similar scandals and debacles will not occur in the future? Most importantly, what reforms can restore the credibility of the United Nations? Answering these questions demands a survey of the High-Level Panel's recommendations for reform, along with an analysis of the U.N.'s systemic problems. This General Assembly topic challenges delegates to acquire a thorough understanding of the structure of the United Nations in order to think up creative solutions to address the problems that have beset the organization since its inception, and have recently shaken its credibility to the core.

The High-Level Panel is comprised of fifteen members from various countries and backgrounds to ensure that each issue is reviewed in a non-biased manner. Members of the High-Level Panel work specifically to examine the global threat and challenges that countries face today regarding international peace and security. Panel members work to differentiate the various threats that UN member states face individually in order to find balanced solutions globally and domestically. Although there have been many discrepancies in the UN addressed by the recommendations of the High-Level Panel, events such as the Oil for Food scandal have proven the particular need for the High-Level Panel to reevaluate the management structures and practices of the United Nations, especially those that relate to oversight, transparency and accountability. UN agencies are already undergoing extensive reforms, including broader and more rigorous financial disclosure requirements, a stronger policy to protect whistleblowers, and a review of all oversight and audit arrangements. However, there were many other reasons behind creating a panel, such as making the United Nations a better and stronger organization in the future through reforming the secretariat. Many member states agree that the High-Level Panel was a necessary move in order to insure the stability, growth and security of the United Nations.

The panel found that the UN has been much more effective in addressing the major threats to peace and security than it is given credit for, but that nonetheless major changes are needed if it is to be effective, efficient and equitable in providing collective security for all in the 21st Century. However, in order to implement the recommendations of the High-Level Panel a consensus must be reached by not only the panel members but member states as well. The High-Level Panel has created 101 proposals for dealing with the six areas identified as being the greatest security threats in the twenty-first century: continued poverty and environmental

degradation; terrorism; civil war; conflict between States; the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD); and organized crime. Other recommendations also included proposals to strengthen development efforts, public health capacity and the current nuclear non-proliferation regime. Among the most significant changes recommended is the expansion of the Security Council from 15 to 24 members. The panel suggests two options: one involving six new permanent members with no veto, the other based on new four-year, renewable seats that would be regionally distributed. It is argued that expanding the Security Council would make the U.N. more inequitable and would rectify the double standards the plague the organization's operation. Unfortunately, despite 100 other major reform proposals, the 59th General Assembly squandered the opportunity to discuss those issues and instead focused its attention solely upon the reformation and expansion of the Security Council, fruitlessly pressing the issue despite reaching a deadlock early in negotiations. The purpose of this year's General Assembly situation is for delegates to assess restructuring the secretariat and the streamlining and strengthening the United Nations' oversight and accountability measures, not to engage in discussion concerning the aforementioned six security threats or reform and expansion of the Security Council.

Secretariat Reform and Accountability

How did the Oil for Food scandal happen, and more importantly, who allowed it to take place? The answer to the first question is complicated. Oil for Food was a UN program set up to blunt the deleterious impacts of sanctions on Iraq's civilians under the Hussein regime. Iraq was allowed to sell a certain amount of oil each year on the market, and the monies collected were transferred into an account managed by the UN in order to buy foodstuffs and essential medical supplies for Iraqis. It functioned as an escrow account, meaning that Iraq's government could not withdraw money from it, but instead that UN administrators had full control over where oil

revenues in the account were to be distributed. Malfeasance and corruption took place in four different ways: first, certain UN officials who administered the account were bribed by Hussein into directly giving him a portion of the oil money; secondly, Hussein also bribed officials into allocating money from the account to parts of the Iraqi government that he could easily raid and leech from; thirdly, UN officials gave the program's contracts to oil, food, and medical supply companies that they had vested interests in; and finally, some of the account's managers may have simply stolen from it. This pattern of corruption persisted for over five years before it was discovered, and the reason is that the organization of the UN allows different sub-bodies to function with little to no accountability to the Office of the Secretary General (OSG) or higher authorities. The Oil for Food program was created by the Security Council to function in conjunction with nine other UN bodies, but none of them, not even the Security Council itself, was required to oversee the program. Its existence and legal status were sanctioned by a Memorandum of Agreement signed between Iraq and the UN, making the program more accountable to the notoriously corrupt and inhumane Iraqi government than any other entity.

In order to understand how the complexities of the UN's organization might slow down the body and make it corruption-prone, consider the way that the United States federal government works. Officially, there are only three branches of government, but there are a host of different bureaucracies that function under the auspices of the executive branch, such as the CIA, Departments of Defense, Education, Energy, and Agriculture, the FBI, the National Security Agency, and so on. Each agency's head holds a cabinet position and is directly accountable to the president, and even still, agencies have a difficult time cooperating with one another and synchronizing their actions. One can only imagine how much worse this problem of

bureaucratic ineptitude—the subject of so many jokes in American politics—would be if there was no direct accountability to the president himself.

This is precisely the problem with the organization of the United Nations, but rather than having a handful of agencies, it has over 100- and rather than representing just one country's interests, they are supposed to represent the earth's entire population. A glance at a chart of UN organization (available at http://www.un.org/aboutun/chart.html) shows how complex the UN's structure is, and also how little power the Secretary General wields to hold departments accountable. Although the UN Ombudsman's Office and the Ethics Office both report to the OSG, the Oil for Food scandal shows how this oversight is limited and inadequate enough to allow corruption to take place. To rectify the problem, in May the UN Ethics Office agreed to take a central role in the reform process by enacting new guidelines to educate UN officials of their responsibility as public servants as well as to police the organization. Certain cases are forwarded to the UN Office of Internal Oversight (OIS), which acts as an independent watchdog for the UN. Additionally, one particularly critical new UN Ethics Office guideline is that "the value of gifts that UN officials will be required to report will drop from $10,000 to $250" ("UN Ethics Office…"), meaning that even small gifts that may signal a conflict of interest will need to be reported. Other guidelines require more officials to file paperwork disclosing the worth of gifts they have received, and measures have been taken to decrease backlash against whistleblowers.

However, two major issues arise when considering UN reform. The first challenge is to reform the UN in a way that guarantees departmental accountability to higher authorities without fundamentally changing the roles of the OSG and other UN departments. Article 97 of the UN charter defines the Secretary General as the "chief administrative officer" of the UN, and the

OSG is at the head of a group of offices collectively known as the UN Secretariat. A look at the UN organizational chart reveals that the General Assembly operates with almost complete autonomy. In fact, the UN charter directs the OSG (and implicitly, the Secretariat) to carry out tasks for the GA, the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), and the Security Council. The Secretary General's role as an influencer or overseer is limited to speaking to the GA about pressing matters, making recommendations to the Security Council, and acting as a logistical coordinator and facilitator for the UN's activities. Thus, while it would be sensible for UN member states to reform the organization by granting the OSG authority to hold UN bodies accountable, this might involve changing the UN charter and the very role of the Secretary General.

The second major challenge inherent in reforming the UN is balancing the need to streamline the organization's multitude of departments while recognizing that their existence has been legitimately willed by the GA. Any UN body that was created after the drafting of the charter exists because the General Assembly created it. This myriad of bureaucratic offices that function in different capacities towards achieving different outcomes reflects the will of the international community, and making fundamental changes to UN agencies—whether by combining them into new agencies, making them accountable to different offices, or abolishing them altogether—requires bold, ambitious, and controversial decisions on the part of GA delegates. Key points that delegates should keep in mind include whether changing the UN's departmental structure is in their countries' national interests, along with practical concerns regarding whether sweeping reforms will lead to stable and productive outcomes.

Whatever options for reform delegates choose to investigate, there is no question that reform of the UN's internal organization is necessary and timely. The current structure is not

only prone to corruption and malfeasance, but also is most certainly not operating as efficiently as it could. Both of these problems stem from a lack of accountability, but the second issue directly affects citizens in countries throughout the world because inefficiency and bureaucratic ineptitude in the UN may hamper efforts to reduce poverty, rectify social ills, and ensure security and prosperity. Even if the 101 recommendations of the High Level Panel concerning these issues are implemented, positive outcomes cannot be assured when a lack of transparency and oversight allows UN bodies to conduct their affairs inefficiently and ineffectively. Thus, the future of all UN action might hinge on reforming its structure now. Delegates of the General Assembly are charged with three main tasks: determining the need for specific systemic reforms, assessing and discussing different reform options, and finally agreeing on a new path for the organization to take. The myriad of divergent interests reflected in the GA guarantee that this will not be simple or without controversy, but substantial reform is the only tenable option lest scandals such as Oil for Food happen again.

Discussion Questions:

1. How would UN reform impact your country's national interests?

2. What are possible ideas for reforming the UN system to make its offices more accountable to higher authorities?

3. Is the OSG the appropriate body to keep the UN accountable? Should its Office of Internal Oversight be given greater authority to evaluate UN bodies?

4. Does the UN have too many bureaucracies? If so, what should be done to make them more efficient and synchronized?

5. Should the greater part of the UN's agencies remain under the control of the General Assembly, or should they also be responsive to the influence of other UN bodies?
6. Will reform of the UN restore its credibility as an international organization that operates in good faith?

References

UN Office of the Iraqi Programme (Oil for Food)
http://www.un.org/depts/oip/

UN News Story: "Ethics office will go beyond regulations to create moral milieu"
http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=18440&Cr=ethics&Cr1=

Report of the High-Level Panel on Financing for Development   www.un.org/reports/financing

Report of the Secretary-General's High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change
www.un.org/secureworld

High-Level Panel on System-wide Coherence http://www.un.org/events/panel/html/page1.html

Reforming the United Nations
www.un.org/reform/

Press Conference by High-level Panel convened to strengthen UN
www.un.org/News/briefings/docs/2006/060406_Coherence_Panel.doc.htm

Press Conference by High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges, and Change
www.un.org/News/briefings/docs/2004/Panyarachun_Press_Cfc_041202.doc.htm

101 Steps Toward a More Secure World
http://presentdanger.irc-online.org/commentary/2004/0412secure_body.html

The World Summit 2005
http://www.un.org/summit2005/

Kimberly Doris

Regulating and Tracking the Trade in Small Arms

In the 2000 Millennium Declaration, a section was put aside for discussion and cooperation in the ability to discover a better way to deal with problems caused by the trafficking of small arms. Small arms are undersized infantry weapons with the ability to be carried by a single human being, such as pistols, shotguns, rifles, assault rifles, automatic weapons, light machine guns, submachine guns, revolvers, and even hand grenades. Other weapons have been as classified heavy, light, or small depending on the individual circumstances. Although the exact number of small arms is nearly impossible to account for, there are said to be over 600 million illicit small arms spread throughout the world today. In fact, most of the fighting in the twentieth century has been characterized by the use of small arms. The illicit trade of small arms is accountable for the killing of hundreds of thousands of people, and between 60 to 90 percent of deaths in violent conflicts were caused by small arms. In many parts of the globe, circulation of illicit small arms continues to lead to human suffering. Untrained militias in particular are notorious for using small arms to violate human rights. The international arms trade is largely unregulated, making it far too easy for illicit deadly weapons to end up in the wrong hands. These weapons many times will travel from conflict to conflict as well as between fighters only to fuel more armed violence. The incalculable and relentless spread of these weapons is a serious issue that only continues to worsen. The problem exists not only locally, but nationally, regionally and internationally, involving nearly every state around the globe.

The main contributors to the spread of small arms include Europe and the United States. In addition, during the Cold War, countries including China, Germany, Belgium, Brazil, and the

Soviet Union also provided significant numbers of small arms that now lay in the hands of arms dealers traveling from one conflict area to another. The lack of a global reporting system for the trade and acquisition of small arms it leaves an opening for the power of illegal operations. both legal and illegal contracts in the arms industry are often made in secret, making them difficult to track. The marketing of these weapons has also been linked to terrorism, organized crime, and drug trafficking. This creates a security threat for nations world wide as criminal networks obtain and deal both drugs and small arms. It also poses a high threat to states' internal security, creating conditions in which rebellious and unskilled militias obtain such small arms and fight against their own governments.

Distribution of small arms causes a huge threat to the security, stability, and development of various countries and regions today. This topic is best addressed through a multilateral viewpoint and by adopting a system to regulate and track the trade in small arms. The problem has been consistent in many areas of West Africa, where thousands of people have been massacred by the use of small arms in inter-cultural conflict. The lack of collaboration and universal control on the illicit trade in small arms only increases the violence, leaving loopholes of opportunity for such weapons to be placed in the hands of forces that suppress human rights and in response undermine development. In order to suppress the supply and demand of such illegal weapons it is vital that there be international cooperation. Nonetheless, this process must take into account the unique situations, priorities, and extent of concern within each sovereign state.

Resolution 54/54 V of December 15, 1999 entitled "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and collecting them" created a Preparatory Committee for the United Nations conference on the illicit trade in small arms. During the conference, member states

expressed the importance of strengthening international regulations. Member states also asked

for assistance in collecting and demobilizing small arms in post-combat situations and other

affected areas. This urged the Secretary General to continue providing aid to states' efforts

towards curbing the illegal circulation of small arms and to collect arms in the effected states,

which have requested such support. The United Nations continued this conference concerning

the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects on July 9, 2001. The conference

held twenty three informal meetings and then concluded on July 20, 2001. Within these meetings

the states adopted a draft entitled Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat, and Eradicate the

Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects (A/CONF.192/L.5/Rev.1).

This document was divided into measures of action at the national, at the regional, and at the

global level.

The document's main focus at the national level was the obligation of each individual

state to create laws, regulations, and administrative infrastructure for the import, export,

manufacturing, possession, and trade of small arms. It also called for the creation of an

institution to develop and regulate an adequate infrastructure to produce guidelines, reports,

financial records, and records on the manufacture and destruction of small arms. In addition,

states were mandated to provide proper information about the violations and violators of the

installed laws. In an attempt to better track the distribution of small arms, each state is to require

licensed manufactures to provide each weapon with a serial number connecting it to its country

of origin enabling member states to trace and identify each weapon of concern.

At the regional and sub-regional level, states were urged to form an acknowledged place

of contact where issues could be discussed and information could be shared. This was designed

to urge member states to establish unified border and customs control law containing the same

enforcement procedures. At the global level states were mandated to cooperate with the United Nations, its Security Council, and the World Customs Organization in efforts to carry out the designed programme of action. In addition, it was recommended that member states exchange training, experiences, and intelligence in order to suppress the illicit trade of small arms. In 2003 resolution 58/241 of 23 of December was designed and adopted to create a sense of urgency on the importance of accomplishing the goals expressed in through the Programme of Action. States were then asked to report on a biannual basis to the Secretary General and meet to reflect on such reports.

Although the 2001 programme of action provided guidelines to stop illicit trade in small arms, many problems still exist. Developing nations continue to ask for greater international support financially in order to continue progress on the issue of small arms. Countries have lost substantial numbers of law enforcement agents in battles with drug lords and terrorist groups who both buy and sell illicit small arms. It has been expressed by various countries that past approaches had been helpful but were slow and inconsistent. In order to prevent the uncontrolled proliferation of small arms, some countries are striving for consensus in establishing strict export policies and effective export controls and the creation of detailed international norms for the registering of arms transfers. The African continent is one many yearning for the creation of stern and precise international laws dealing with the trade of small arms to non-state actors. Such violence has lead to increased poverty and undermined their development. Without effective laws implemented internationally the problem will only continue to grow.

In the July 2006 conference very little was accomplished due to opposing viewpoints and lack of collaboration between states. In particular, the United States stands in disagreement to any regulations that would tamper with the legal trade or legal manufacturing of small arms. It

also stands in opposition to any restrictions regarding civilian ownership, ammunition, explosives or a ban on transfers to non-state organizations. The United States claims that regulations dealing with ammunition would be far too complicated to manage, too costly to support, and irrelevant to any discussion within the Progamme of Action. In addition, under the U.S. constitutional law, citizens have the right to keep and bear arms, so The United States will have absolutely no provisions restricting that right. The United States also holds that there shall be no ban on the trade between non-state actors. Not only does the United States disagree with such bans but expresses concerns that dialogue dealing with restricting the trade of small arms will only take the focus away from accomplishing proper measures within the Programme of Action.

In spite of the inadequacy of measures taken thus far, it is essential that improvements be made to the regulation and tracking the trade in small arms. This problem can not be fixed without candid discussion between states and a genuine willingness to cooperate and make sacrifices. Over the past years there have been many programs created to prevent and stop the illicit trade of small arms, and although there are still disputes on how to overcome remaining problems it is clear that these programs have made great improvements. At the national, sub-regional, regional, and international level, collaboration is vital to the success in regulating and tracking the illicit trade in small arms, and delegates of the first committee are charged with balancing cooperation towards reaching this end and the protection their own state interests.

Discussion Questions:

1. Do the mixed results of the Programme of Action thus far suggest that the United Nations is ineffective at administering international law?

2. Can arms producing nations be held responsible for the violence that their weapons cause?

3. The countries and regions of the world that produce the vast majority of small arms in circulation today are the U.S., Eastern Europe, and China. Because arms trading is such a large part of their economic vitality, is it possible to persuade these countries and regions to curtail the manufacture and sale of small arms?

4. Is there any way to force the hand of arms manufacturers and producers to abide by guidelines of who their weapons can be sold to?

5. Are restrictions on small arms trade harmful to free trade?

Research Links:

http://www.un.org/

http://www.un.org/documents/ga/docs/55/a5550.pdf

http://www.un.org/documents/ga/docs/55/a55216.pdf

http://www.un.org/events/smallarms2006/prepcom/statements.html

http://disarmament2.un.org/cab/oewg/Report

http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2006/dc3029.doc.htm

Issue Brief: IEDs and the Landmine Treaty

By Sara Lamoreax

The use of Improvised Explosive Devices first began in World War II by Belarusian guerillas against the Nazis. IED's are an unconventional form of warfare usually used by terrorists, guerrillas, or commando forces. These devices tend to be made by inexperienced designers with the intent to destroy, incapacitate, harass, or distract. Because these devices are usually shoddily made, there are no specific guidelines for the safe disposal of IEDs. In recent years, IEDs are still employed in conflicts. For example, the Taliban and its supporters have used IEDs against American and nternational Security Assistance Forces as well as Afghan military and civilian vehicles since the invasion of Afganistan in 2001. IEDs have additionally been used in the Israeli-Lebanon conflict, in Chechnya, and in Iraq.

Landmines tend to be used between borders in order to secure disputed borders and to prevent invasion in times of conflict. Many countries maintain that landmines are a necessity in order to protect their soldiers in time of conflict. Landmines, like most technology, help to amplify forces in times of conflict and help to defeat larger enemies. Anti-personnel landmines act as ethically problematic weapons considering the majority of its victims are civilians, especially since even after the end of conflicts, the landmines remain in locations often very vulnerable to human contact. 110 million landmines currently reside in 64 countries, resulting in approximately 800 deaths per month, most of which are innocent civilians, with additional thousands maimed for life every month. Some countries, such as Bosnia and Herzegovina possess landmine densities of 152 landmines per square mile. Landmines currently cost roughly three to ten dollars, yet cost anywhere from three hundred to one thousand dollars to remove, presenting a major international problem.

The Ottawa Treaty, formerly known as the "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on their Destruction", first started towards the steps of adoption in 1992, and was formally adopted in 1997. Since its ratification, all but forty countries have signed the agreement. Non-signatories include countries such as the United States, Russia, Israel, China, India, Iran, Iraq, and Cuba. The Ottawa treaty bans antipersonnel mines and requests that each signatory destroy all antipersonnel mines within a time period of four years. This treaty, however, only covers antipersonnel mines, and Improvised Explosive Devices, antitank mines, mixed mines, and other such devices are not covered under the Ottawa Treaty.

In the past, the United States favored a global ban of antipersonnel mines, and has continued to work towards antipersonnel bans and the defeat of IEDs. Especially since the invasion of Iraq, IEDs have been the primary killer of American troops, and as such, the U.S. has made recent efforts to ask and work towards strategy to defeat IED's as suggested by the U.S. Department of defense. Clearly, the United States, like most countries, feels a need to address the issue of IEDs and landmines. However, because of the United States' desire to ban mines with an exception of on the Northern border of South Korea, many point out the hypocrisy of the situation. The United States reasoning for refusing to sign the Ottawa Treaty exists in the fact that no exception for U.S. strategic placement of mines in Korea would be allowed.

In recent years, new policies reverse many of the positive steps that the United States has made towards the defeat of antipersonnel mines. The use of self-destructing mines is now permitted indefinitely without any geographic restrictions. The use of long-lived antipersonnel mines is now permitted in South Korea until 2010. This policy acts completely contrary to the global movement that has been working tirelessly for over a decade. The unprecedented alliance

of governments, international organizations such as the United Nations and International Committee of the Red Cross, and civil society groups, such as Human Rights Watch and the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL) made history in 1997 when they secured the 1997 treaty prohibiting antipersonnel mines. United States policy undermines the movement's efforts to universalize the Ottawa Treaty by providing justification for other holdout states to use, produce, or export these indiscriminate weapons. United States policy also further prevents the United Nations and other organizations from new and more effective bans that perhaps could include mines in addition to antipersonnel mines, such as antitank mines, improvised explosive devices, and mixed mines. As such a powerful nation-state, the United States has rendered the United Nations nearly powerless in a world where convincing critical states to sign the Treaty is necessary in order to protect the lives of millions.

Another aspect to the global problem of landmines and IED's exists in their strategic use. For example, mines along the North and South Korea border ensure the prevention of major conflict between the two states, which could most certainly result in catastrophic global warfare. However, nearly fifty percent of the mines for Korean use currently reside within the United States, weeks or months away from the area of need if a "massive surprise attack" ensues. This begs the question, considering the 1992 legislative ban by President Clinton on all mine exports or transfers: would these mines even be legally allowed to transfer to Korea if such an attack occurs? This new information calls into question the major rationale put forth by the Pentagon for not banning antipersonnel mines.

Many countries such as Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, and Croatia still have over 100 mines per square mile within their countries, and a number of countries in the world are still dramatically affected by the use of landmines and IEDs. Many such countries and governments

lack the means to effectively remove devices, and rely on international organizations for aid. Also, very little has been done regarding IEDs, as countries also lack the means to control the illicit manufacture, use, and transfer of such devices, resulting in countless deaths. This is a major international problem that the United Nations and member states need to address.

At this critical time, efforts must be made within the United Nations in order to stop the use of antipersonnel mines, to make new goals concerning other types of mines such as IEDs, and to prevent the prevalent undermining of the United Nations' efforts to eradicate landmines. A more common goal to unite countries within the U.N. in order to ensure the peace and safety of the global people must be reevaluated and reinstated to prevent unnecessary deaths and help the United Nations maintain its credibility.

Questions:

- What steps can the United Nations and its member states take towards expanding and encouraging the signing of the Ottawa Treaty?

- How does the inability of the United Nations to curtail the use of landmines so far reflect upon its credibility?

- Should exceptions be made in landmine ban treaties, such as that of the United States' request to allow mines in Korea?

- Is there anything that member states can to do decrease or limit the use of Improvised Explosive Devices?

- What efforts can be made to help prevent the further death of innocent civilians within countries that presently contain mines and IEDS?

- What actions can the United Nations and its member states take in order to ensure the safe removal and disposal of landmines and IEDs around the globe?

Helpful Links:

http://unicef.org/sowc96pk/mainmenu.htm

http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N02/207/88/PDF/N0220788.pdf

http://disarmament.un.org/MineBan.nsf

http://www.icrc.org/web/eng/siteeng0.nsf/iwpList2/Focus:Landmines

http://www.icbl.org/

http://www.newint.org/issue294/facts.html

Exploring the Need for and Logistics of a Standing UN Force

By

Brooke Worcester

"Peace-keeping can rightly be called the invention of the United Nations. It has brought a degree of stability to numerous areas of tension around the world." – *June 1992, Secretary-General Boutros-Ghali*

History of Peacekeeping

Peacekeeping is defined as combined international efforts aimed at helping countries torn by conflict create conditions for sustainable peace. This is achieved by United Nations peacekeepers in the form of military officers, police, and civilian personnel from numerous member states, in order to monitor and assist peace building in fragile situations. UN peacekeeping initially developed during the Cold War era as a means to ease tensions and help resolve conflicts between States. The first peacekeeping operation, the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO) was created in May 1948 to supervise the truce signifying the end to the first Arab-Israeli war. Similar operations in India and Pakistan were soon to follow. In 1956 the first United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF I) was established to supervise the cessation of hostilities, including the withdrawal of the armed forces of France, Israel and the United Kingdom from Egyptian territory and, after the withdrawal, to serve as a buffer between the Egyptian and Israeli forces. UNEF I was successful and served as a model for later UN forces.

The end of the Cold War signified a dramatic shift in UN peacekeeping mainly as a result of two factors: the revitalization of the Security Council, establishing larger and more complex missions, and comprehensive peace agreements between intra-State conflicts. Rather than simply responding to intergovernmental conflicts, the UN could not ignore escalating humanitarian

threats within member states. From 1988 to 1992 twenty two new operations were set up. The nature of these operations also changed, from traditional military peacekeeping tasks to multidimensional operations which involved political and humanitarian work and relief. The UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) was created in 1992 to support this increased demand for complex peacekeeping. Initially the changes sought newfound success, bringing national reconciliation in El Salvador, Mozambique, and Cambodia, though operations in the early 1990's began to experience setbacks. Peacekeeping forces lacked resources, training, and manpower to adequately accomplish set missions. This stretching of UN resources is most notably seen in the unfortunate failures of the 1994 Rwandan genocide crisis and 1995's Bosnia and Herzegovina massacres, along with the current outbreak of violence in Darfur, Sudan.

Current Situation

In today's world, the increased need for peacekeeping forces is crucial to maintaining international peace and security. Currently, UN peacekeeping operates under the United Nations Standby Arrangements System (UNSAS), which consists of arrangements for standby resources negotiated between the UN and individual member States. Under UNSAS, preparation and training are conducted within a country in accordance with UN guidelines. There are various levels of commitment to UNSAS, including at the lowest level providing a list of available capabilities and resources. Member states then submit a formal Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on Standby Arrangements, which specifies response times, conditions for employment, and requirements regarding contributions. The 1998 document "Standby Arrangements in the Service of Peace-Tables of Organization and Equipment" contains structure for the military and civilian police components of peacekeeping mission. To propose a contribution of personnel and resources, member states must first consult with secretariat staff, and follow through with

training and materials in accordance with the DPKO. Once training is achieved, volunteers are then managed into coherent brigade groups along with personnel from other nations. Upon the Security Council's approval of a mission, the brigade unit deploys to the traditional mission area within 30 days, 90 days for a complex mission. Furthermore, administration and military aspects of UNSAS are managed by the Stand-by Arrangements Team (SAT), which was established in 1992's "Agenda for Peace," calling for a fresh look at creating a common security system. Consequently, there are almost 90,000 personnel serving on 18 DPKO led peacekeeping operations on four continents, directly impacting the lives of hundreds of millions of people.

Need for Reform

Though programs such as UNSAS and the DPKO have been successful in maintaining and promoting peace, recent international events have raised the question of a need for reforming the peacekeeping system. The concept of a standing army is not a new phenomenon. In the 1995 Statement "Supplement to an Agenda for Peace," Secretary-General Kofi Annan recommended that the UN consider the idea of a rapid deployment force, consisting of units from a number of member states, trained to the same standard, using the same operating procedures and inter-operable equipment, and taking part in combined exercises at regular intervals. This requirement was further reinforced by the 2000 "Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations," which called for several coherent brigade-size forces, from a group of countries that work together to develop widespread training and equipment standards, similar doctrine, and common arrangements for the operational control of the force. Fully implemented in 1997 with the full support of Kofi Annan, the Multinational United Nations Standby Forces High Readiness Brigade (SHIRBRIG) was composed of seven countries developing operating procedures and logistic training. Now consisting of fifteen member states and seven additional observers,

SHIRBRIG serves as a multinational brigade that can be made available to the UN as a rapidly deployable peacekeeping force.

Advocates also call for an army consisting of troops that would not be accountable to one nation or state, but completely remain under the auspices of the United Nations in order to increase response time to humanitarian crises such as genocide and gross violations of human rights. The UN force would consist of 12,000 to 15,000 civilian, police, judicial, military, and relief professionals composed of individually recruited volunteers from many countries, meaning that this army would have direct allegiance to the UN, avoiding divided loyalties. Because it does not currently have a standing military of its own, some think the United Nations is largely powerless. It can issue resolutions, but when it comes time to enforce them, it relies on member states to voluntarily provide the manpower needed to enforce crucial decisions. Many believe the creation of a standing army is the most efficient way to enforce the mandates and decisions made by the UN at the diplomatic level.

Some believe a standing army will never be feasible. One argument against an organized force is that it would infringe on national sovereignties. Moreover, many feel it will only increase the UN's appetite for precipitous involvement in conflicts. To equip an international body with a standing force would inevitably make the UN more like a world government. This means a standing army may actually be counter-productive, impairing current perceptions of the UN's selfless neutrality, undermining its moral authority and its ability to broker peace agreements. Another problem with a standing UN army involves that of command structure and who has the power to operate such an army. Opponents of the idea argue that a force made of personnel from varying member states might not be able to overcome adversities and differences

in ideology, and are wary of the possibility of individual soldiers taking sides in a particular conflict. The establishment, training, and equipping of forces would be substantially costly, especially if the purchase of air and sea transport were included. Furthermore, how the multinational force would procure its weapons is an area of further contention. At present the UN can draw upon varied peacekeepers for different kinds of missions from whatever member states feel best equipped to deal with a particular situation. If a standing force were established, the level of flexability would deteriorate.

Conclusion

Article 42 of the UN Charter states the Security Council "may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade…or land forces of Members of the United Nations." The jurisdiction of peacekeeping forces rests solely with the Security Council; 1st Committee cannot consider specific applications of forces, and debate must focus on the concept of a standing army, not regions where action may be necessary. Overall, UN peacekeeping is a collective responsibility. No one country can undertake it alone. Regardless if the international body chooses to reform peacekeeping forces, the UN will ultimately be judged by its peacekeeping scorecard more than anything else.

Questions to Consider:

1. Should the International Body formulate a standing force?
2. How should the United Nations finance peacekeeping forces?
3. If a standing army were implemented, how would it be recruited? Where might it be based? How should it be trained? What military capabilities should it have (land/sea/air)?

4. Should Non-Governmental Organizations be factored in the establishment of peacekeeping troops?

5. What are some negative effects of a standing army? How can they be resolved?

Fourth Committee: Exploring Alternatives to Sanctions
By Jackie Eibey
Mesa Community College

Under Article 41 of the UN Charter, the Security Council may call upon Member States to apply measures not involving the use of armed force in order to maintain or restore international peace and security. One such measure is that which is commonly referred to as sanctions. The Security Council has invoked Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter to impose sanctions in sixteen cases: Afghanistan, Angola, Cote d'Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia and Eritrea, Haiti, Iraq, Liberia, Libya, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, Southern Rhodesia, Sudan and the former Yugoslavia. The administration of multilateral sanctions, especially those overseen by the United Nations, is the only type of economic warfare approved by the United Nations Charter. According to Article 41 of the United Nations Charter, sanctions can include the "complete or partial disruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations." Unilaterally administrated sanctions, such as the United States-Cuban Embargo, not only go to show a few fundamental problems with the practice of economic warfare, but they also serve to undermine the overall effect and impact of multilateral movements and pressure mechanisms. When a single state chooses to place sanctions on another single state actor, it goes to pre-empt and undermine the power of the United Nations as the foremost international regulatory body. The United Nations has expressly condemned unilateral sanctions in numerous resolutions, including those presented in General Assembly Press Releases GA/10288 and GA/10083, as well as the Libyan sponsored Resolution A/57/L.4, which calls on the United Nations to refuse to recognize unilateral coercive measures.

One of the major problems associated with the use of economic sanctions is that the levying of sanctions, especially on lesser developed countries (LDCs), is counterproductive to economic autonomy, growth, and globalization. Debt incurred through loans and economic debts is crushing most countries' ability to develop as they spend huge amounts of their resources serving debt rather than solving the needs of their populations – in fact, the money spent on debt and economic troubles due to sanctions and other forms of economic pressure are proven to halt a country's autonomy to pursue its own economic plans, including the prioritization of socials needs. Economic sanctions decrease the flow of trade from within and out of a certain country. When trade decreases, so does the amount of readily available wealth and the GNP/GDP of a nation, which in turn decreases the ability of the people to exercise their rights within a stable system. Liberal theories of economics emphasize the ability of individuals, communities, states, societies, and nations to buy and sell freely – unfortunately, due to the constantly shifting balance of economic power in the post-World War II global community, economic theory is far removed from the day-to-day practice of buying, selling, and exchange. One of the greatest motivating factors for this disparity is the long-held international bargaining chip of economic sanctions. Furthermore, the Economic and Social Council Report on the Adverse Consequences of Economic Sanctions on the Enjoyment of Human Rights (E/CN.4/Sub.2/2000/33) of June 21, 2000 goes into greater detail, stating that sanctioning a state leaves it more vulnerable to tyranny and less able to develop basic political freedoms.

A case study showing the negative impacts of sanctions is the African nation of Burundi. To quote one study: "Across the various sectors reviewed [poverty, health, agriculture, water, sanitation, education, democracy], the pattern is consistent: serious problems predating sanctions were exacerbated by the imposition of sanctions, which themselves had numerous effects on

civilian populations … The imposition of economic sanctions worsens an already grim situation, raising serious moral and ethical questions." Comprehensive economic sanctions against Burundi were called for in July 1996 at the Second Arusha Regional Summit on Burundi (Arusha II), and were gradually imposed during August 1996 by the Governments of Tanzania, Kenya, Uganda, Ethiopia, Zaire (now the Democratic Republic of the Congo), Rwanda and Namibia. Through the sanctions, conceived of as a response to the military coup of 25 July 1996, those States sought the restoration of the National Assembly, the re-legalization of political parties, and immediate and unconditional negotiations with all parties to the conflict in Burundi. The States concerned set up the Regional Sanctions Coordinating Committee (RSCC) to regulate and monitor the sanctions. The sanctions were imposed without the formal endorsement of the Security Council, although on 30 August 1996, in its resolution 1072 (1996), the Council expressed "strong support for the efforts of regional leaders". The Special Rapporteur of the Commission on Human Rights on the situation of human rights in Burundi also gave his support to the sanctions, stating that economic sanctions should not be lifted until the authorities had pursued efforts for a ceasefire between the parties, and human rights violations had been investigated.

During the time the sanctions against Burundi were in place, serious shortages of fuel, spare parts, medicines and fertilizers were experienced, with corresponding dramatic price increases and inflation. Commerce and industry were paralyzed by the lack of raw materials and spare parts, unemployment skyrocketed and incomes plummeted. Agriculture also suffered because of the shortage of seeds and fertilizers. Development assistance, approximately $250 million annually, was cut off and foreign currency reserves were exhausted. Burundi's health infrastructure was heavily hit, and the inability to obtain even emergency medical supplies led to

severe shortages of medicines and vaccines. Sanitation and water programs were scaled down or eliminated. Humanitarian aid agencies were left helpless in the face of escalating need and increasingly difficult working conditions - the World Food Program (WFP) alone was distributing emergency food assistance to an average of 218,000 people each month in 1998. The health infrastructure is in shambles, as are the industrial and agricultural sectors. Desperately needed foreign assistance to fund reconstruction is still nowhere to be found. The sanctions, and particularly the humanitarian impact of the sanctions, predictably led to political problems as well. The sanctions provided the regime with a useful propaganda tool. In an effort to garner domestic support, the Burundi regime accused neighboring countries of harboring secret agendas against the Burundi people. Sanctions also were used to deflect attention away from the regime's own inadequacies and from well-documented human rights concerns. The military regime apparently even benefited from sanctions as it monopolized smuggling operations.

Furthermore, economic sanctions can decrease the amount of economic opportunity and stability of the international community. The implementation of sanctions disrupts the flow of trade throughout the world, not just locally, and contributes detrimentally to all involved. There is a global economic impact, even with localized sanctions. The economic havoc wreaked upon a sanctioned nation will lead to borrowing, and cross-debt will occur in regionalized areas. For example, following the end of the First World War, many nations felt it necessary to hobble the German war machine, in order to better prevent future conflict. To accomplish this, the newly formed League of Nations, under Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points Plan, placed heavy economic sanctions on Germany, creating artificial inflation, causing, by the end of the administration, the complete destruction of the value of the German mark, as well somewhat

irreparable debt and damage to the German economy; damage that would eventually give cause and fire to the newly-formed Nazi party.

In such instances, not only is economic opportunity lost on both sides, but progress towards reaching political goals is also stagnated. Like military action, sanctions are a coercive exercise of power that not only often fail to persuade states to change their behavior, but are also likely to have deleterious repercussions. This unstable use of coercion can delegitimize the goals of the sanctioning body, and will even cut off the targeted nations' willingness to open to new ideas, ideologies, and changes. For example, the current situation between the Islamic Republic of Iran, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), and the Security Council proves very well that the threat of sanctions is very rarely effective, especially in tenuous diplomatic situations. The United Nations continued threats to effect sanctions have only drawn Iran's ire, leading to an escalation of tension between the Islamic Republic and the members of the United Nations Security Council.

There are many alternatives to blanket multilateral sanctions: targeted sanctions, in which a certain trade portion or economic sector of a country is targeted; travel bans, in which the United Nations refuses to allow tourism or travel into a certain country, thus targeting the pocketbooks of the political elite and thereby removing revenue; disengagement of peacekeepers; elimination of UN-based aid; involvement of the International Criminal Court and the International Court of Justice; and dissolutions of diplomatic relations and membership in UN subsidiary bodies. These alternatives and others might allow for the United Nations to achieve its goal of maintaining international peace and security without bringing about the negative effects of economic sanctions. The parables of Burundi, Germany, Cuba, and Iran are amount to a morality play outlining the utility of economic sanctions – which, when considered,

is not worth the risk to the global community or the delicate balance of the international

economy.

Questions to Consider:
1. Have multilateral sanctions worked in isolated historical cases?
2. What other alternatives to sanctions exist, and how can they be used effectively?
3. Does the United Nations have the resources to shift to a different type of economic warfare?
4. How will finding alternatives to sanctions effect UN relations with nations that frequently advocate multilateral and unilateral sanctioning, such as the United States?
5. Will finding alternatives to sanctions help decrease the tension surrounding the current problems with Iran?

Further Reading

The Adverse Consequences of Economic Sanctions on the Enjoyment of Human Rights
  Economic and Social Council Report E/CN.4/Sub.2/2000/33
  http://www.globalpolicy.org/security/sanction/unreports/bossuyt.htm#case-b

Pariah States and Sanctions in the Middle East: Iraq, Libya, and Sudan
  Tim Niblock

Power: The Means to Success in World Politics
  Joeseph Nye

Shrewd Sanctions: Statecraft and State Sponsors of Terrorism
  Meghan L. O'Sullivan

"Asphyxiation or Oxygen?: The Sanctions Dilemma"
  Franklin L. Lanvin
  Foreign Policy Magazine, Issue 104, Fall 1996

"Rehabilitating Serbia"
  Marten van Heuven
  Foreign Policy Magazine, Issue 96, Fall 1994

"Trading Tyranny for Freedom: How Open Markets Till the Soil for Democracy"
  Daniel T. Griswold
  Cato Institute for Trade Policy Studies

"What Sanctions Epidemic?"
  Jesse Helms
  Foreign Affairs Magazine, Volume 78, Issue 1, January/February 1999

"Unsatisfactory Sanctions"

The Economist, Volume 353, Issue 8144, November 6, 1999

"Addicted to Sanctions"
     Thomas Omestad
     US News and World Report, Volume 124, Issue 23, June 15, 1998

"The Five Wars of Globalization"
     Moises Naim
     Foreign Policy Magazine, Issue 134, January/February 2003

"Containing Iraq: Sanctions Worked"
     George A. Lopez
     David Cortright
     Foreign Affairs Magazine, Volume 83, Issue 4, July/August 2004

"Why the West Failed"
     Lawrence Freedman
     Foreign Policy Magazine, Issue 97, Winter 1995

"Legal Aspects of UN Economic Sanctions"
     Gian Luca Burci
     http://lcil.law.cam.ac.uk/Burci.doc

Kofi Annan's Assessment of "Smart Sanctions"
     http://www.casi.org.uk/discuss/2001/msg00751.html

Reassessing the Role of the UN Peacekeepers in Civil War

by
Christina Marie Rocks

History of UN Peacekeeping Action in Civil War:

Over the decades, peacekeeping operations have varied in size and form and have taken on similarly varied mandates. In its charter, the United Nations delegates the power and responsibility to maintain international security through peacekeeping. Since both peacekeeping and peace enforcement require the use of military personnel, and are sometimes mandated with the use of its military powers, it is easy to confuse peacekeeping with peace enforcement. The United Nations defines "peacekeeping" as "a way to help countries torn by conflict create conditions for sustainable peace." Peacekeeping forces of the UN have the mission of monitoring and observing peace processes that emerge in post-conflict situations. They also assist ex-combatants in implementing the peace agreements they have signed. To avoid confusing sovereignty entanglement, the United Nations puts forth great effort to not engage in peace enforcement. Peace enforcement requires more occupation of forces and troops. In peace-keeping, the UN can enter into a situation to help resolve it in a natural way, whereas peace enforcement does not necessarily resolve an issue, but attempts to end the physical violence brought about by a crisis. This often only causes the conflict to go underground and erupt under much more pressure, creating dire circumstances that might not have been so severe without the "peace enforcement." Peacekeeping is not explicitly addressed in the UN Charter despite it being a key activity defining the UN today. It was initially adopted during the Cold War as a substitute for collective security and in response to the stalemate between permanent members of the Security Council. Additionally, peacekeeping is not a forceful maintenance of peace, but rather an attempt to minimize violence and avoid military action.

There is a certain ambiguity involved in international peacekeeping. One provision is that peacekeeping is only conducted with the consent of the involved parties, and though the UN requires consent from both parties before intervention, who constitutes as a legitimate party can be a difficult thing to decide--especially in cases of civil war. Civil wars have many causes in both permissive and immediate terms. In cases of civil war, gaining required consent can prove to be difficult when one group is more in control of the government, or historically has more international legitimacy. International peacekeeping's legal ambiguity was cleared up by the International Court of Justice, establishing the validity of peacekeeping action. Its ruling is based partly on the legislative intent of the Chapter Six provisions under the UN Charter, which provides for the peaceful settlement of disputes, but its provisions are not foolproof.

Historically, the United Nations has acted as a mediating party in civil wars, overseeing treaties and agreements to make sure that they are carried out appropriately. Such was the case in 1962 in Yemen, when the UN monitored withdrawal of Egypt and Saudi Arabia, who were both fueling the Yemen Civil War. Another example is when in 1963, the UN sent a 6,000 man force to keep the newly independent nation of Cyprus at peace during its civil war. Although the United Nations' presence as a peacekeeping entity is often very effective, there have been times when UN presence has not been enough to stop violence, such as when the UN attempted to smooth Namibia's move to independence in 1989.

Current Situation

The United Nations currently has peacekeeping missions in Burundi, Haiti, Cote d'Ivoire, East Timor, and other locations in the Middle East. In these areas, peacekeeping troops have

been deployed for the specific purpose of stabilizing and observing to keep peace. The most pressing points of this issue today lie in questions of sovereignty and in finding money within the United Nations budget for their civil war peacekeeping operations. Sovereignty, the question of who has political power and of where it originates from, is often a question when the UN has to step in as an international body that supervises other autonomous administrations. The efficiency of the United Nations peacekeeping is also being called into question at a time when the world is utilizing the organization more than at any other time in history. This calls into question whether the UN should work with regional organizations (such as the Western European Union or NATO). It is important to consider these alternatives to the UN working alone on this issue, and also to consider that each nation has a very specific culture and history that the UN must be aware of and careful not to disrupt when entering a country for the purpose of peacekeeping.

Questions to Consider:

1. *In the cases of Civil Wars, who is most responsible for taking action; governments, inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations, financial institutions, arms manufacturers, social and educational institutions?*
2. *Should there be any qualifying characteristics to determine whether a party has enough legitimacy to for the UN to require consent from it before intervening?*
3. *Should peacekeeping in civil wars be seen as a separate entity in the United Nations, with missions being delegated to a specialized committee?*
4. *Does the UN's lack of ability to send peacekeepers into a sovereign country without its consent undermine its authority and international legitimacy?*
5. *Does the involvement of UN peacekeepers have the potential to worsen conflicts in civil war scenarios by creating the appearance that the organization supports one side more than another?*

Helpful Websites:

- http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/other/HRLRes/2002/6/index.html#Heading46

- http://www.historylearningsite.co.uk/timeline_of_united_nations_actio.htm

- http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/dpko/index.asp

Preventing State-Sponsorship of Terrorism
By
Justin Miller

"Terrorism: The unlawful use or threatened use of force or violence by a person or an organized group against people or property with the intention of intimidating or coercing societies or governments, often for ideological or political reasons."
The American Heritage Dictionary

Introduction

There are many different definitions of "terrorism," but there is no definition officially recognized by the United Nations. As the old saying goes, "one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter." The obligation of Fourth Committee is not to define "terrorism," but rather to take the existing definitions and create a framework for cooperation around them.

State-sponsored terrorism occurs when governments give weapons, equipment, safe harbor, training grounds, or financial support to terrorists. State-sponsorship of terrorism takes many forms. Some regimes actively recruit terrorists for certain actions, while others passively ignore the operation of terrorist networks within their borders. These regimes give aid to terrorist organizations as a means of committing covert, war-like actions against enemies. Many terror-sponsoring regimes are themselves frequently labeled as extremist, often sponsoring terrorist groups that espouse similarly militant political or religious ideologies.

Speculation of State's Sponsoring Terrorist Organizations

Iran and Hezbollah: Iran has made no secret of its special relationship with Lebanon's Hezbollah. Many experts suggest that this relationship extends beyond Iran's providing the group with advanced weaponry, arguing that the Iranian government has controlled Lebanon for the past few years. It is claimed that Hezbollah's militia is also supported by Syria.

Sri Lanka and TamilEela Makkal Viduthalai Pulikal: The party claims no affiliations to any of the political parties nor the Sri Lankan government although the Sri Lankan monitoring mission SLMM and the LTTE claims that cadres belonging to the so called Karuna Group are extensively used by the Sri Lankan government to kill LTTE supporters and Tamil civilians throughout the country.

Cuba/ Syria: These countries are believed not to have actively participated in terrorist activities themselves in the past ten years or so, but instead have opened their countries as safe-havens for terrorist organizations to plan attacks and hide out.

Scotland and Scottish National Liberation Army: The group may have been involved in a potential attack on the London water system and is accused of having sent hundreds of letter bombs to English targets, mainly to English Members of Parliament representing Scottish constituencies. The group's main goal is to establish a fully independent, autonomous Scottish republic separate from the United Kingdom.

UN Involvement

"Fighting terrorism is like being a goalkeeper. You can make a hundred brilliant saves but the only shot that people remember is the one that gets past you."
- *Paul Wilkinson*

Terrorism has been of concern to the international community since 1937 when the League of Nations elaborated the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism. Subsequently, the United Nations and regional inter-governmental organizations have dealt with terrorism from a legal and political perspective. Since 1963, the international community has elaborated universal legal instruments related to the prevention and suppression of international terrorism.

Terrorism constitutes a threat to international peace and security, and it is contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations. UNODC's Global Programme against Terrorism is an integral part of the United Nations' collective action against terrorism. The Programme, working closely with the Counter-Terrorism Committee of the Security Council, provides technical assistance to Member States and promotes international cooperation against terrorism.

In the wake of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks in the United States, the United Nations Security Council unanimously adopted resolution 1373, which, among its provisions, obliges all States to criminalize assistance for terrorist activities, deny financial support and safe haven to terrorists and share information about groups planning terrorist attacks.

The 15-member Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC) was established at the same time to monitor implementation of the resolution. While the ultimate aim of the Committee is to increase the ability of States to fight terrorism, it is not a sanctions body nor does it maintain a list of terrorist organizations or individuals.

Seeking to revitalize the Committee's work, in 2004 the Security Council adopted resolution 1535, creating the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED) to provide the CTC with expert advice on all areas covered by resolution 1373. CTED was established also with the aim of facilitating technical assistance to countries, as well as promoting closer cooperation and coordination both within the UN system of organizations and among regional and intergovernmental bodies.

During the September 2005 World Summit at the United Nations, the Security Council – meeting at the level of Heads of States or Governments for just the third time in its history – adopted resolution 1624 concerning incitement to commit acts of terrorism. The resolution also stressed the obligations of countries to comply with international human rights laws.

The United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy was adopted by Member States on 8 September 2006. The strategy – in the form of a Resolution and an annexed Plan of Action – is a unique global instrument that will enhance national, regional and international efforts to counter terrorism. This is the first time that all Member States have agreed to a common strategic approach to fight terrorism, not only sending a clear message that terrorism is unacceptable in all its forms and manifestations but also resolving to take practical steps individually and collectively to prevent and combat it. Those practical steps include a wide array of measures ranging from strengthening state capacity to counter terrorist threats to better coordinating United Nations system's counter-terrorism activities. The adoption of the strategy fulfils the commitment made by world leaders at the 2005 September Summit and builds on many of the elements proposed by the Secretary-General in his 2 May 2006 report, entitled "Uniting against Terrorism: Recommendations for a Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy."

Suggestions

It seems as though there are many demands on the United Nations to try and put a stop to state-sponsorship of terrorism, but there is no clear cut ways of how to do so. One idea is to have an Interpol-type of database that allows Member States to share information as to how best to face the threats of terrorist organizations that may be occupying a certain area. There are many organizations such as Al Qaeda, Hezbollah, and The Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) who reside in multiple countries at one time, and many of those countries do not want them there. If the Member States work together, then their chances of defeating their occupiers can greatly increase.

Questions

1. If terrorism is state-sponsored, than should it be considered "terrorism," or is it merely that state's policy?
2. Should there be any action taken against Member States who actively support and/or harbor terrorist organizations?
3. What are some flaws in the UN's current policies on State-Sponsorship of Terrorism, and how can these policies be strengthened?

Sources

The American Heritage Dictionary
www.enotes.com
www.un.org/sc/ctc/
www.unodc.org/unodc/en/terrorism.html
www.socialstudies.com/c/terrorism1.html
www.un.org/terrorism/strategy/

RECONCEPTUALIZING SOVEREIGNTY
By Joshua Mittvick

Beginning with the inception of the Treaty of Westphalia, the model of state sovereignty

was introduced as a means to the creation of nation-states and national self determination. This

model was based on the principles of equality between nation-states, internationally binding

treaties, and non-intervention in states' internal affairs by other states. These concepts were

critical for the formation of both international relations and diplomacy as they presently exist.

With the end of WWII, the framework for the United Nations was the UN Charter which was

formed on the principle of "sovereign equality" in Article 2, Section 1, combining the concept of

state sovereignty and the equality of states.

While the idealism of this concept within the Charter is evident, the reality of "sovereign

equality" is not fully recognized. The veto power of the five permanent members of the Security

Council alone is confirmation that equality within the organization is not based solely on

sovereignty. Coupled with that is the fact that basic attributes of size, resources, population, and

economic and military power all constitute distinct inequalities among states. This reflects the

level of influence that great power states have in the UN over their developing state counter-

parts, and can be highlighted as one of the major reasons why member states have a hard time

finding consensus on issues of great importance, as well as their implementation.

Inherent within any model containing perceived flaws creates a cause and effect

relationship towards its future as a fully functional system. Presently, many have argued that the

very credibility of the UN is at stake if these perceived flaws are not more acknowledged and

dealt with. Therefore it is imperative that these perceptions be addressed as they may hold the

answer as to how a stronger foundation can be created in order to create a system of sovereign

equality, as stated in the Charter. Thus, if changes are to be made, they will focus on amending the Charter itself, a process which can only be initiated in one GA meeting.

It should be acknowledged that the reason the UN was created was to try and prevent war. States, under the present model, are solely responsible for protecting themselves from attack and thus create armies to deter attack. It is argued by most that this is primarily due to the fact that the international system is based in anarchy. It is also the reason International Governmental Organizations are created since, under the present model, states need a forum where dialogue can take place in order to try and establish greater security. Some Charter amendments would concentrate on creating different contingencies through which sovereignty is recognized and legitimized in order to create a better sense of equality and security, instead of states being considered sovereign under the Westphalian model. So what would these contingencies be and for what situations would they be created?

Some have argued that the UN is a stepping stone towards a type of global governing system. Under this argument, states would be viewed as sovereign based on the contingency of having a democratic government. This would provide an incentive for states to become democratic as it allows them to be an integral part of the international community—including them to truly be acknowledged as sovereign based on their choice of being democratic. It may also ensure greater security as democratic states historically do not start wars with each other. However, could this create more problems in terms of segregating states on the basis of their governmental ideologies? What ramifications would this have on sovereignty for states that refuse to adopt democracy?

Presently there are also debates occurring within the international community about "failed states" and "rogue states" and how they should be addressed. Both may be subject to

problems such as ethnic cleansing, genocide, or weapons proliferation and thus be subjected to the external influence of great power states that debate their fate in order to reestablish stability. This can be problematic, as great power states that pursue their domestic agendas may use the claim of sovereignty to deny resolutions of any value. For instance, if a country is committing illegal acts within its own borders, but is a key trading partner with a great power, the great power may object to resolutions that would condemn those actions because ostensibly they might infringe on the country's sovereignty—while the real issue at hand is maintaining trade and economic viability.

A second element lies in what are considered to be microstates—smaller states that do not possess the same level of economic, military, or political power of those possessed by great power states. These states, while also viewed as having an equal voice of representation within the UN, may be viewed as limited in terms of their abilities to persuade their larger counterparts to pass meaningful resolutions that underscore their nations' interest in order to complement the UN system's intentions of doing so. In essence, this can put stress on the credibility of the UN as an effective body that upholds progressive and meaningful cooperation through sovereign equality among all states.

This debate is an important one to engage in due to the abilities great power states have relative to that of microstates concerning the imbalance of influence under the present model. There have been recent historical examples that suggest that, for some states, sovereignty is considered a high priority and should never be infringed upon. Yet, these same states engage in activities that have diluted the territorial integrity of states under claims of security. While the international community may frown upon this type of behavior, little can be done under the

present model to curb this due to the actual imbalance that exists between microstates and great power ones.

States can also use the claim of sovereignty in order to try and protect potential economic interests or safeguard domestic abuses. This can have catastrophic implications for states that are attempting to relieve themselves of a failed state status or have continuous domestic problems such as ethnic cleansing or genocide. Once again, this creates an aggravation in terms of the credibility of the UN and begs to question whether or not it upholds the goals that it has sought to achieve since its inception. As Secretary General, Kofi Annan stated in 1999, "Governments must not be allowed to use sovereignty as a shield to systematically deny their people of human rights and undertake gross systematic abuses of human rights."

As a result, some argue that sovereignty should be upheld under a codes of conduct system. This system would uphold a sovereign status for states that practice peaceful domestic policies as well as proper interactions with other states. Those states that resemble what modern era accord has labeled a failed state would automatically lose their sovereignty and thus be subject to the will of the international community—primarily states within the region that neighbor that failed state. Under this contingency, the UN Security Council permanent members would not be able to protect these failed states under the claim of sovereignty in order to further their own possible economic gains. Instead, UNSC permanent members would act together with neighboring states of the region and conclude what action should be taken under a strict timetable in order to reestablish sovereignty for those failed states.

Despite the fact that the code of conduct model provides a good foundation through which sovereignty could be viewed, it too is not without unanswered questions and uncertainties. One would be whether or not great power states would consider it within their interest to shift the

systemic definitions of sovereignty in order to balance power among all UN states? Another

would be whether or not great power states would act in accordance with something that would

be outside of their direct national interest? If states act on behalf of their own agendas, how

would great power states benefit from helping failed states regain sovereignty again?

There are also those that argue that the present model does not contain a great deal of

systemic flaws and that it should remain intact as it exists right now. Those that present this

view suggest that all states should simply remain active members of the UN. This means that all

states are participants within all of the committees to which they are assigned regardless of their

domestic policies. Amending the Charter would not take place as this would resemble

something similar to the High Level Panel's recommendations to tweak the Security Council in

order to have it run more efficiently. However, would changing the Security Council actually

create sovereign equality for all states or would this just reflect a different version of the present

model? If the latter is true, would it imply that amending the Charter is the only true step

towards creating real sovereign equality among states? The delegates of the General Assembly

are charged with answering these pressing questions, and determining whether sovereignty is a

natural right of states or a status to be earned and maintained.

Discussion Questions:
1. What incentives can be provided for great power states that could encourage them to adopt the
political will to shift redefine sovereignty in ways that lead to greater equality for all UN member
states?
2. Some have dubbed the UN ineffective in security matters due to the theory that it rests on a
structural environment that is anarchical. Is it in the collective interest of states to begin creating
steps for a global governing system in which all states lose portions of their sovereignty in an
attempt to gain more security? If yes, is it feasible that states would trust each other enough to
collectively give up portions of their sovereignty, or would it end up creating a "prisoner's
dilemma" scenario?

3. What are the implications of democratic sovereignty for states that are non-democratic or act
outside of international norms and conventions?

4. Do the UN and the international community have the right to impose their values upon individual member states by redefining sovereignty?
5. Would redefining sovereignty only enhance unilateralism and military alliance-building among states that would then have less power and influence granted to them than under the present UN model, and therefore push these member states away from international governmental organizations such as the UN to pursue their interests?
6. Can rogue states and failed states be contained or "fixed" under the Westphalian model, or is redefining sovereignty a necessity?
7. If democracy is the condition upon which sovereignty is granted to states, what qualifications and characteristics must a state's government possess to be considered democratic?

Works Cited:
http://www.law.ufl.edu/faculty/publications/pdf/sov.pdf

Hammer, Craig and Nagan, Winston: The Changing Character of Sovereignty in International Law and International Relations
http://www.law.ufl.edu/faculty/publications/pdf/sov.pdf

Popovski, Vesselin; Sovereignty as Duty to Protect Human Rights
http://www.un.org/Pubs/chronicle/2004/issue4/0404p16.html

http://www.un.org/aboutun/charter/chapter1.htm

Feinstein, Lee: UN Divided; Council on Foreign Relations, Winter 2005 - 2006
http://www.cfr.org/publication/9434/

Daalder, Ivo H. and Lindsay, James M.; An Alliance of Democracies, The Washington Post, May 23, 2004
http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A46728-2004May21.html

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Prisoner's_dilemma

Gayle Bentley

Assessing the Nonproliferation regime

Nonproliferation continues to remain at the forefront of civilization's worries, rendering the nonproliferation regime increasingly pertinent. Since the regime's mandate originates from the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and includes the bureaucracy provided by the IAEA, UN Security Council, NPT Review Conferences, UN General Assembly First committee, and various regional organizations and agreements, it has become a substantial deterrent to the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The regime has major influence and power over the trade, development and disarmament of nuclear materials and weapons; however, its reach does not extend fully enough to prevent all states' undesired actions.

Sovereignty provides the nonproliferation regime with obstacles that sometimes lead to dangerous situations, and the involvement of the Security Council remains vital. Without the Security Council's power to impose sanctions and otherwise punish states in noncompliance, the regime would not have any teeth to deter proliferation. However, the Security Council can only target nations that are signatories to the NPT. This means that India, Pakistan, and Israel are out of reach of the NPT's punitive measures. Without these states' membership to the NPT, the regime loses much of its power because its strength centers around comprehensive rules that are meant to apply to all nations. Even with just a few truant states, the NPT and the regime face a huge challenge in encouraging other states to comply, due to their inability to compete with the new nuclear states.

Noncompliance and nonparticipating states represent only a portion of the struggles endured by the nonproliferation regime. The director general of the IAEA, Dr. Mohamed

ElBaradei, has identified new threats to nonproliferation including an increase in the spread and distribution of nuclear technologies and expertise. The many states that currently use nuclear materials for power and peaceful means may also know how to quickly turn this material into a nuclear weapon. Other developments include states and extremist groups that recently have more desire and more incentive to acquire nuclear weapons which results in black market nuclear networks. In order for the regime to combat these new threats, reform must be made to preempt any illicit attempt to either produce or procure nuclear weapons. (ElBaradei 2006, "Nuclear Non-Proliferation: Responding to a Changing Landscape").

The IAEA itself is experiencing a struggle of its own because of its limited budget. With an annual budget of only 120 million US dollars, the IAEA has great difficulties keeping up with technological developments and has an even more difficult time finding learned professionals and safeguards inspectors, who are vital to the verification nonproliferation. Despite the vast budgetary limitations, the IAEA has integrated satellite imagery, 3-D visualization tools, and modern nuclear forensic techniques to help identify noncompliance with the NPT. Although these technologies have been implemented, the IAEA must constantly compete with the innovative producers and smugglers of nuclear materials.

The IAEA does not have complete jurisdiction over member states due to issues of sovereignty. Maintaining and gaining legal authority to impose regulations of nuclear materials is very difficult and is currently only achieved through mutual trust. This provides yet another hurdle for the regime because although it has the potential for ensuring nonproliferation, legality issues constantly stand in the way.

There are many problems facing the nuclear disarmament community but solutions are yet to be found. In the past great successes have been achieved in improving the existing NPT

and supporting treaties. One of the most effective of these past reforms has been the "additional protocol" which vastly increases the reach of the IAEA because it allows the organization more access to information and sites under question. This allows the IAEA to determine both the existence *and* the absence of undeclared nuclear material and activities. This addition to the IAEA's reach has been tremendously helpful in asserting what kind of nuclear activity occurs in any given state. Although strides have been achieved by the additional protocol, states that have not agreed to the additional protocol, which includes the comprehensive safeguards agreement, are not subject to this more extensive and effective oversight. A topic of concern for reform would be to extend the additional protocol even further so that it becomes comprehensive. IAEA director Dr. ElBaradei has encouraged states to adhere to the extra safeguards agreements and the additional protocol so that it can be utilized universally to deter the proliferation. Besides the additional protocol, the Security Council has exercised its influence by passing resolution 1540 in 2004 which was supported by the GA's adoption of the *International Convention on the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism*. These statutes both strongly encourage states to make the domestic possession of radioactive materials illegal in order to discourage proliferation within their borders.

Although these actions have shown increased efforts to deter proliferation, the regime still faces the problem of lacking legal authority to actually enforce any of these treaties or resolutions. The sovereignty of nations still serves as a hurdle to the regime because some states may oppose certain measures which may infringe on their own national security. The world faces a dilemma concerning nonproliferation because if nonproliferation is not universal, it cannot be effective, but in order for it to become universal, some states may feel that their sovereignty has

been breeched. Overall, the reforms made in the recent past serve as a good stepping stone for further reforms to improve the effectiveness of the nonproliferation regime.

With regards to suggested reforms to the regime, there is an abundance of options but each has difficulties. One easy improvement to the encouragement of nonproliferation would be to simply ensure that states using radioactive material for peaceful means only use only low enriched uranium fuel. As it stands, the majority of states use fuel that is enriched higher than 90%, which is what is required to make nuclear weapons. According to the IAEA, this high enriched fuel could be converted from a peaceful means of creating nuclear energy into a nuclear weapon in only months. In order to prevent proliferation, the regime would support a change to the current system so that states not permitted to make nuclear weapons do not have access to the necessary materials, including highly enriched uranium. Further loopholes exist in the regime besides the grade of nuclear fuel. Under the IAEA, non-nuclear weapons states only have to declare international exports exceeding one kilogram. In order for the regime to close these loopholes, it has been suggested that all states be required to declare all levels of nuclear material transferred internationally.

In addition to lowering the amount of nuclear material required to be reported, members of the regime and the IAEA would suggest greater control over exports and put nuclear trade more fully under multinational control. The regime exists because multinational efforts provide checks and balances, deterring states from acting dangerously or irresponsibly because their actions are constantly being monitored by other states. Without comprehensive multinational control over nuclear resources, ElBaradei suggests that nonproliferation may not progress. To put such materials under multinational control, the IAEA has recommended that the Agency serve as the "guarantor of two fuel cycle related services: the supply of fissile material for fuel, and the

reprocessing of spent fuel" (ElBaradei, "Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons").

Giving responsibility to the IAEA would also help gain better oversight over potentially illegal exports.

Among the plethora of potential improvements to the nonproliferation regime, the most controversial and potentially most important would be endowing the IAEA and other facets of the regime with more legal power. In dealing with violations of the NPT, the regime, and the IAEA specifically, has very little power to address the violation in any way that would deter future abuses. Also at this point, the regime cannot force states to maintain transparency in their nuclear operations because of sovereignty issues. As the High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges, and Change has already determined, the IAEA should be the supervisor over the supply of nuclear fuel and the disposal of used fuel. Besides this specific suggestion, the regime would experience a great boost in the full knowledge of nuclear activity in all states. However, with increased power, the IAEA and the regime also risks losing support for nonproliferation.

Although the nonproliferation regime would support the above mentioned reforms, states hold disparate viewpoints and and advocate alternative propositions about how to combat or increase proliferation. With an issue so pertinent to the world as a whole, each state must carefully consider acceptable approaches to reform while also paying mind to delicate concerns of sovereignty. The regime cannot be effective without international support and recognized authority. There is a delicate balance between involvement of the regime in domestic affairs and the necessity of comprehensive support for the regime's approach to nonproliferation.

Discussion Questions
1. Will lowering the enrichment level of nuclear materials actually deter the proliferation of nuclear weapons? Which states would consent to this and what problems would have to be considered concerning individual states' domestic security?

2. What is the best way to reform the regime and/or the NPT in order to gain non-signing states' support or to ensure compliance?
3. Would providing better technologies to the regime deter proliferation or would states feel like their privacy is breeched? If these technologies are provided, where will the funding originate? Are improved technologies necessary or would they infringe on states' sovereignty?
4. What sorts of trade boundaries and inspections should the regime require of states wishing to transport nuclear material?
5. How should the regime react to the newly strengthened extremists groups that are not necessarily affiliated any state or region and what sorts of actions should (if necessary) be taken against these groups? How would the regime approach this situation?
6. How can nuclear materials be more comprehensively placed under the regime?
7. Will nonproliferation efforts made by the regime end up discouraging peaceful use of nuclear materials? How thoroughly should these efforts be monitored, will certain states be able to engage in peaceful operations over others?

References

Bunn, George. "The World's Non-Proliferation Regime in Time"
http://www.iaea.org/Publications/Magazines/Bulletin/Bull462/nonproliferation_regime_2.html

ElBaradei, Mohamed (Olli Heinonen). "Nuclear Non-Proliferation: Responding to a Changing Landscape." Japan Atomic Energy Agency. 18 May 2006. Tokyo, Japan.
http://www.iaea.org/NewsCenter/Statements/2006/ebsp2006n007.html

ElBaradei, Mohamed. "Nuclear Power: An Evolving Scenario" 2 March 2004. European Parliament Conference: "Energy Choices for Europe" Brussels, Belgium.
http://www.iaea.org/NewsCenter/Statements/2004/ebsp2004n001.html

ElBaradei, Mohamed. "Strengthening the Nuclear Non-Proliferatin Regime: An International Priority." 2002. http://www.iaea.org/NewsCenter/Statements/2002/ebsp2002n009.shtml

ElBaradei, Mohamed. "Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons" 2005.
http://www.iaea.org/NewsCenter/Statements/2005/ebsp2005n006.html.

 "Evolution of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Regime 1945-1970."
http://www.ppnn.soton.ac.uk/bb1/Bb1Chap1.pdfGoldschmidt, Pierre. "Strengthening the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Regime: The Need for Broad Information and Access Rights." Carnegie International Non-Proliferation Conference 22 June 2004. Washington, DC.
http://www.iaea.org/NewsCenter/Statements/DDGs/goldschmidt22062004.html

"The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Regime"
http://www.iaea.org/Publications/Booklets/Safeguards/pia3802.htmlElBaradei, Mohamed. Interview. "Changing the Non-Proliferation Regime." 2003.
http://www.iaea.org/NewsCenter/Transcripts/2003/act112003.html

Ensuring the Safety and Security of Nuclear Energy
By Kathryn Dearman

In an age where nuclear power is a cost effective and efficient way to provide power to states around the globe, a world wide effort to secure these valuable assets is a necessity. The benefits of such great power also bring great risks. One of the most notable instances where the international community recognized the impact of a nuclear disaster was the meltdown at Chernobyl nearly twenty years ago. A combination of a faulty reactor design, the lack of a properly designed containment building, poorly trained operators, and a non-existent safety culture resulted in the explosion. While an incident of such magnitude has been avoided in the years following Chernobyl, the threat of another incident is very real. This is why new technologies and safety precautions have been produced and continue to advance.

Because some nuclear reactors have been operational since 1954, new safety measures and maintenance are necessary to allow older reactors to continue running in a stable matter. Just like any other building or machine, updates to the technology and maintenance are needed. The question then becomes, who will be held responsible to assure to the international community that such safety precautions and maintenance are adhered to? The guidelines and precautions have been discussed at great lengths, but accountability must be maintained. At the state, regional, and international levels, action must be taken-- but the extent to which each is involved and where the jurisdiction of each lies is up for debate.

The threat of nuclear weapons being created under the guise of a peaceful nuclear power plant have been recently realized in the North Korean nuclear testing and have added to doubts about Iran's ostensible goal of developing peaceful nuclear power. Another issue to consider is the technology that is accessible to provide peaceful power plants and how the safeguarding how these power plants should take place.. Ideas include technology being readily available on things

like fuel cycles of reactors but safeguarding the sensitive technologies that would allow states to turn a peaceful power into a deadly one. The outcome of nuclear safety is contingent upon whether the international community can deem a state ready for such information, or if individual states can responsibly deal with a nuclear power plant in a safe and non-threatening manner.

Safety of Nuclear Energy

Nearly 20 years later, the international community is still studying the effects of the Chernobyl disaster.. Since this accident, the nuclear community has sought safety guidelines and programs to ensure these types of incidents do not happen in the future. While an incredibly useful source of energy, nuclear power can have devastating effects if proper safety precautions are not taken. In the last 20 years, significant improvements have been made towards ensuring the safety of nuclear energy, but with new technology and aging processes, new safety requirements will always be necessary.

Before the Chernobyl accident even occurred, the international community sought the development of safety standards.. In 1986, two critical conventions were held: the Convention on Early Notification of a Nuclear Accident and the Convention on Assistance in the Case of a Nuclear Accident or Radiological Emergency. These two conventions set the framework for the future of nuclear safety.

Convention on Early Notification of a Nuclear Accident

A nuclear accident can have trans-boundary impacts, and knowing about an accident as early as possible minimizes these impacts. The Convention on Early Notification of a Nuclear

Accident ensures that the potentially affected countries and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) are made aware of the accident. The affected countries and the IAEA are made aware of the nature of the accident, its magnitude, and are given any other information that may be critical towards preventing significant consequences of the accident from occurring.

Convention on Assistance in the Case of a Nuclear Accident or Radiological Emergency

Not all nuclear facilities have the capability of handling an emergency. When an accident does occur, the Convention on Assistance in the Case of a Nuclear Accident or Radiological Emergency ensures that the IAEA and capable States assist with any accident. The assurance of cooperation between nations ensures that nuclear emergencies cause as little damage to life, property and the environment as possible.

Convention of Nuclear Safety

In 1994, the IAEA increased their safety precautions with the Convention of Nuclear Safety. The convention entered into force in 1996 and by 2005 all nations with nuclear power plants had become parties to the convention. While the previous two conventions ensured that an emergency would be properly taken care of, the Convention on Nuclear Safety provided a standard for which facilities would be able to use daily. This convention called for any nuclear facilities that would not be able to upgrade to the appropriate safety standards to be shut down completely. It also suggested that nations establish their own safety regulations and regulatory framework. Not only were facilities that already existed taken into account, but those whose installation was yet to come would have new design and construction requirements.

Safety Aspects of Long Term Operation of Water Moderated Reactors (SALTO) and Safety Knowledge-base for Ageing and Long Term Operation of Nuclear Power Plants (SKALTO)

In 2003, the IAEA established the extra budgetary program on SALTO. The long term operation of reactors has increasingly been a concern to many Member States. A Steering Committee is separated into four working groups, each of which collects information on long term operation, reviews this information, identifies challenges and issues, and finally develops a report. This ensures that the proper safety standards will be set to ensure safety standards on maintenance of long term operation of reactors. The final meeting will be in September 2006. Starting in 2007, the Engineering Safety for Long Term Operation of Nuclear Power Plants will continue this effort.

Sharing of information on the long term operation of nuclear power plants is critical towards ensuring proper safety standards are set. SKALTO works with SALTO to create the comprehensive knowledge base on the long term operation and ageing management activities, providing published documents related to these areas. It is important that the international community cooperate in order to find an internationally agreed upon comprehensive guidance for safety for the long term operation of nuclear power plants.

Measures to Strengthen International Co-operation in Nuclear, Radiation and Transport Safety and Waste Management (GC(47)/RES/7and GC(48)/RES/10)

In September 2003, the IAEA General Conference re-examined nuclear safety through resolution GC(47)/RES/7. The resolution calls for the continued research in safety standards, including those conducted by the Commission on Safety Standards. The resolution continues the safety standards in radiation safety, radioactive waste management safety, decommissioning

activities safety, and transport safety. It also calls for training and education in all of these areas. It also encouraged the Code of Conduct on the Safety and Security of Radioactive Sources set forth by resolution GC(47)/9.

In 2004, the IAEA General Conference revisited the same issue. In this resolution, Member States were encouraged to aid financially towards international nuclear safety and asked to seek improvements in their own safety standards. The resolution took into consideration reviews from committees based on their reaction to the resolution in the 47th session and expanded the same resolution to include those. Along with financial support, Member States were encouraged to provide any technical support they had available.

Security of Nuclear Energy

The security of nuclear energy focuses around two things: states getting too much information and gaining the capabilities to build nuclear weapons, and nuclear material falling into the hands of terrorists. In the last few years both of these topics have been at the top of the international agenda. Iran and North Korea have both been questioned on whether or not their nuclear pursuits are for peaceful use only or if they have an advanced nuclear program that is close to or has nuclear weapons. Since the terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001 the threat of terrorism, including nuclear terrorism has been a key issue for most nations resulting in heightened security measures to ensure that nuclear material does not fall into the hands of terrorists.

Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT)

In 1970, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons was adopted. Under

this treaty came the agreement that states would not research or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons. However, it does allow for states to pursue the peaceful use of nuclear technology. Recently there have been many questions about the effectiveness of the NPT in achieving its goal. There is not much space between a peaceful nuclear program and one that is seeking nuclear weapons. This NPT regime has had many pitfalls over the years as a result of this, even with those that are party to the treaty. This has lead to a lot of debate over what technology should be accessible to those that do not already have nuclear weapons.

Dr. Mohamed ElBaradei, Director General of the IAEA, has suggested that in order to have the regime strengthened that there should be a better control of access to nuclear fuel cycle technology. This would call for there to be an assurance of supply of technology and fuel for all peaceful nuclear programs. It would also call for a moratorium on new uranium enrichment and plutonium reprocessing facilities. Also, there would be a framework for both the back end and front end of the fuel cycle. This would control the information that states without weapons technology have access to certain parts of the fuel cycle process.

At the G8 Summit in July 2006, the leaders of the Group of 8 proposed a new plan for nuclear energy technology called "Generation IV." This would include innovative nuclear power systems that would not allow the possibility for arms production with the nuclear material. These systems would also increase the possibility of using nuclear energy as a more prominent resource.

Safeguards

The IAEA uses safeguards in order to verify a state's declaration on their nuclear material

and activities. Different agreements and protocols determine the level of implementation in which the IAEA can operate. The safeguard system has undergone numerous investigations and improvements. Previously the system had only verified the correctness of a state's declarations and failed to fully verify the completeness of the declaration. This poses a problem because a state can then get away with a program that could potentially start working towards nuclear weapons technology.

The Safeguards Statement of 2005 shows the many problems within safeguards. For three years, the IAEA has been implementing the safeguards agreement and has conducted many investigations into the completeness of Iran's declarations. As of 2005, they were not able to conclude whether or not Iran's declaration was correct and complete. Since 2002, the IAEA has not been able to perform any verification for the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK). The status of their nuclear material and activities is unknown.

Nuclear Terrorism

The defense against nuclear terrorism occurs on several levels. The first aim is prevention. This includes measures to protect nuclear and other radioactive materials against theft or other forms of loss of control, illegal possession, smuggling, and unauthorized use, as well as measures to protect nuclear installations and transport against sabotage and other malicious acts that can result in radiation exposure to the general public or the environment.

One of the ways the IAEA goes about ensuring prevention is through the International Nuclear Security Advisory Service. INSServ can be requested by a state to have them identify necessary

security improvements. The International Physical Protection Advisory Service behaves in much the same manner, but offers improvements on the effectiveness of the physical protection of nuclear materials and facilities. The International State Systems for Material Accountancy and Control Advisory Service aids in providing suggestions for improvements in their programs to ensure reliable accounting for and control of their nuclear material.

Response to malicious acts and threats of is another step towards defense against nuclear terrorism. This includes training and workshops on emergency response and radiological responses. A pilot course on combating nuclear terrorism has been on going in Romania on a regional level. The coordination and management of information is also critical. In order for the international community to respond to potential nuclear terrorism, coordination between key international organizations is critical. Many of these efforts have been made through the Nuclear Security Fund, an extra budgetary fund.

Detection of illicit trafficking in nuclear and other radioactive materials is also necessary. This includes providing training and education to border control. Detection equipment is limited and can be provided by the Nuclear Security Equipment Laboratory (NSEL). Providing equipment and technical cooperation both aid the states that lack the necessary resources for detecting illicit trafficking.

Security Council Action towards Nuclear Terrorism

In continuance of the Security Council's efforts to combat terrorism, in 2004, the Security

Council issued Resolution 1540. Under this resolution, the Security Council decided that states will refrain from providing support to non-state actors attempt to acquire or possess nuclear weapons. They also decided that states should establish appropriate controls over nuclear related materials and have measures to account for and secure these items. Border control would also need to be effective in detect and prevent illicit trafficking, along with national export controls.

IAEA Action towards Nuclear Terrorism

In 2005, the IAEA General Conference adopted GC(49)/RES/17: Nuclear Security- Measures to Protect Against Nuclear Terrorism. This was a continuance of their annual efforts that were increased with the 9/11 attacks to counter nuclear terrorism. This resolution provided the annual progress report and included a Nuclear Security Plan for 2006-2009. In the progress report, it was reported that the agency was able to increase the awareness of the importance of a regulatory framework for nuclear security and had over 100 evaluation missions conducted in the past 3 years. International cooperation and coordination also increased significantly.

The Nuclear Security Plan for 2006-2009 included several key objectives. The objectives are: to understand nuclear security needs and identify areas of cooperation, fully protect sensitive nuclear security information, coordinate support programs, and have effective mechanisms of interaction with other international organizations. The resolution also called for prevention objectives including adherence of commitments by states to the CPPNM and for more effective nuclear security involving protection, control, and accountancy of all nuclear and other radioactive material. Better detection and response were also objectives under the plan.

General Assembly Action towards Nuclear Terrorism

Since the 9/11 terrorist attacks, the general assembly has issued several resolution on countering terrorism, including nuclear terrorism. In the recent session (60th) the GA issued two resolutions concerning nuclear terrorism. Resolution A/RES/60/78: Measures to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction, the GA invited states to take measures to increasing national measures towards preventing nuclear terrorism and informing the Secretary General of such actions. They also encouraged the cooperation between Member States towards reaching this common goal. The GA also requested that the Secretary General compile a report on the efforts of other international organizations towards combating nuclear terrorism.

The GA also adopted A/RES/60/73: Preventing the risk of radiological terrorism. Under this resolution, the GA called for Member States to support regional and international efforts to combat radiological terrorism. Most importantly, the GA invited Member States to endorse the IAEA's Nuclear Security Plan for 2006-2009.

Discussion Now

While many of the issues regarding maintenance of nuclear power plants, safeguarding peaceful nuclear power technologies from turning into deadly nuclear weapons and nuclear facilities being a target of terrorist attacks, discussions of accountability and to what extent state regional and international actors have jurisdiction are still under constant debate. These issues are critical

because while states can give repeated assurances of safety, measures need to be put into to place that can accurately gauge the validity of these assurances.

The debate around countries wishing to begin a peaceful nuclear power plant is also key to the IAEA's discussion. Evaluating what states are responsible candidates for this technology is critical. Are there some nations that can not be trusted with such information and what actor has the authority to make such a claim?

Attacks on a nuclear power plant is an issue that must be discussed. When planes, cars and individuals can be used to commit an act of terror, the security of such plants is an issue, but the means by which these facilities protect themselves is an issue. The international community and regions must be involved on the ground at the facilities where actions to prevent such attacks must occur. Accountability on all levels of safety management of nuclear power is also necessary.. These critical issues and a number of other aspects of nuclear safety are the topic of discussion for delegates in the IAEA, who are challenged with addressing nuclear safety while maintaining their own sovereign interests.

Questions

What regional efforts have been made for safety and security guidelines?

Other than the NPT safeguards, in what way can a state's declarations be verified?

How can the international community ensure that state's with ill intentions for nuclear technology do not receive too much information?

What kind of support and how much support should nations with nuclear technology give to state's that have a relatively new nuclear program?

What is the barrier separating the line from peaceful use technology and nuclear weapons

technology? How can it be safeguarded?

Sources

http://www-ns.iaea.org/conventions/emergency.htm

http://www.iaea.org/Publicatoins/Documents/INfcircs/Others/inf449.shtml

http://www-ns.iaea.org/projects/salto/default.htm

http://www-ns.iaea.org/home/nis.htm

http://www.iaea.org/About/Policy/GC/GC49/Resolutions/index.html

http://www.iaea.org/NewsCenter/Statements/2005/ebsp2005n006.html

http://www.iaea.org/NewsCenter/Statements/2005/ebsp2005n007.html

http://www.iaea.org/OurWork/SV/Safeguards/safeg_system.pdf#search=%22safeguards%20system%20of%20the%20IAEA%22

http://www.iaea.org/OurWork/SV/Safeguards/es2005.html

http://priceofoil.org/wp-content/uploads/2006/05/2nd%20draft%20of%20G8%20Summit%20Communique%20on%20Energy%20Security-1.pdf#search=%22global%20energy%20security%20G8%20Summit%22

http://www-ns.iaea.org/security/response.htm

http://www-ns.iaea.org/security/coordination.htm

http://www-ns.iaea.org/security/default.htm

http://www-ns.iaea.org/security/detection.htm

http://disarmament2.un.org/Committee1540/Res1540(E).pdf

http://www.un.org/Depts/dhl/resguide/r60.htm

Reassessing the Non-Proliferation Treaty
By Megan Curran

Adopted in June of 1968, the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) is the United Nations' greatest milestone in furthering nuclear disarmament. The NPT goals include bringing to an end the manufacturing of nuclear weapons, preventing the trade of nuclear weapons or weapons technology, safeguarding all nuclear materials in states with peaceful nuclear activities, and negotiating towards a "general and complete disarmament" (Article VI, NPT).

The NPT is set up under the jurisdiction of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), which sets up the necessary standards for all nuclear material. It is the IAEA's duty to protect the right of any nations to develop nuclear programs for peaceful purposes as the NPT designates, but at the same time the IAEA must ensure signatories do not develop nuclear weapons with an exception granted to the Nuclear Weapons States (NWS). [1]

Reassessing the NPT is quickly becoming an urgent and demanding issue. Although the NPT is a much needed international disarmament agreement there are several loopholes in the treaty. With a changing world, the United Nations needs to re-examine the effectiveness of the NPT and evaluate the various challenges that have been posed in the last half a century. Strained relations between member states in the Middle East, nuclear weapons testing in India and Pakistan, as well as the withdrawal of DPRK from the NPT have significantly changed the diplomatic landscape from what it was in 1968.

The NPT is regarded as a major step towards global disarmament and yet over the years it has begun to show signs of weakness. Article VI of the NPT obliges the parties of the treaty to pursue "negotiations…on a Treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control." Despite 25 years of negotiation from 1970 to 1995 (the year the NPT was due to expire) there was no treaty which had met the NPT's guidelines. In fact, nuclear

weapons states showed a complete failure in furthering disarmament. In 1970 there were 39,700 nuclear weapons in the five NWS. In 1995, there were 43,200. This complete lack of results is unsettling and speaks to the urgency of the issue at hand. [2]

To date there have been several bilateral and even multilateral agreements between nations concerning the disarmament of Nuclear Weapons States. The most well-known of these agreements would be the Moscow Treaty, also known as the Treaty on Strategic Offensive Reductions (SORT) which was signed in 2002 by both the United States and Russia. The Moscow Treaty called upon both nations to reduce their nuclear arsenal to 1700-2200 warheads by 2012. However, the Moscow Treaty, along with most of the disarmament agreements, is not registered with the United Nations and verification measures are made by separate NGO's instead of the IAEA.[3]

The United States and Russia are the only nuclear weapon states that have subjected their nuclear weapons program to inspection and verification under the Natural Resources Defense Council. The United States has 5,735 active warheads and Russia has 5,830. The other five states proven to have nuclear weapons (India, Pakistan, France, United Kingdom, and China) all claim to have less than 350 warheads. The continuing existence of nuclear weapons in these seven nations indicates that a contemporary disarmament treaty is greatly needed. [4]

Article IV of the NPT affirms the right of nations to create nuclear reactors and nuclear technology for energy purposes. Several nations are taking advantage of this situation in order to reduce oil demands and become more independent while also decreasing the amount of carbon dioxide emitted into the atmosphere. Japan plans to produce 40% of its own energy by 2010.[5] Nuclear energy supplies 16% of the world's energy currently.[6] It has become synonymous with cleaner air over the past half century, increasing its appeal to countries worldwide.[5]

An expanding nuclear energy market also gives nations the ability and resources to create weapons within a few years if the decision is made to do so. The option of turning a nuclear energy program into a nuclear defense program is extremely alluring to nations that perceive a threat beyond their borders. This very real threat poses a hazard to the IAEA. With the introduction of pre-emptive defense and active passivism the IAEA faces an obstacle when it comes to inspecting nuclear reactors worldwide and upholding international standards of safety.[5]

Iran (a signatory), DPRK (a former signatory), and Israel (a non-signatory) are each suspected sites of nuclear weapons programs. Iran was fairly cooperative with the IAEA until February 4, 2006, when the IAEA referred the Iranian issue to the Security Council. Iran then announced that it would end voluntary cooperation with the IAEA other than the basic NPT requirements. DPRK has long claimed to have nuclear weapons, and has recently verified this assertion with an official test of its technology. Israel has neither officially denied nor confirmed if it has nuclear weapons, but the IAEA believes that a facility in Dimona, Israel holds nuclear weapons. The Natural Resources Defense Council estimates Israel at having between 300-400 weapons.[7]

Another difficulty is the blatant bias the NPT shows towards the officially recognized nuclear powers. Those with nuclear weapons are free from the restraints of the IAEA and the NPT while non-nuclear nations have their means of energy production regulated. India refused to sign the NPT because of the restrictions it placed on non-nuclear states while granting the possession of nuclear weapons to select nations, and eventually decided to resume nuclear testing and weapons development in 1998. In order for the NPT to become a global treaty, changes need to be made in order to account for the NPT's lack of equality.[8]

One of the most frequent abusers of the NPT is the United States. The United States is party to the treaty and is one of the five powers granted the right of nuclear weapons. As aforementioned it is the duty of parties of the treaty to work towards eventual and complete disarmament. On the contrary, the United States has started to maintain its "Strategic Nuclear Force."[9] The Presidential Decision Directive of November, 1997 and the Nuclear Posture Review of December, 2001 both declare the importance of their nuclear arsenals as a defense mechanism. The Nuclear Posture Review actually recommends the creation of a new form of nuclear weapon, known as the "bunker buster."[10]

Other than the United States' national defense strategies, its international diplomatic relations have a questionable motivation as well. The United States has been known to condemn NPT signatories in the past. In 2003 the US went so far as to invade Iraq with the pretense of disarmament. The US's aggressive international policy for pursuing disarmament is undermined by its constant lack of pressure on nations such as India and Israel. The United States' continually refuses to place pressure on Israel to sign the NPT or become more open about its possible nuclear weapons technology. India (a nation with known nuclear weapons) and the US have been working together to help each other's economy, while at the same time the US is threatening Iran with economic sanctions if uranium enrichment is suspended. There is clearly a double standard affecting US foreign policy. The United States' ambiguity on nuclear programs only serves to undermine any criticism of Iran. The United Nations cannot present a unified front if key nations have a double standard on important issues like nuclear development. [11]

The India-US nuclear deal of February 2006 further demonstrates the US disregard for advancing global disarmament. The nuclear deal allows for the IAEA to come into India and inspect its nuclear reactors. This small stepping stone to India's disarmament is offset by the fact

that India would be eligible to trade nuclear technology with the US. This technology would include materials and equipment used to enrich uranium and reprocess plutonium, which can potentially be used to create nuclear bombs. This trade agreement is a clear violation of Article I of the NPT.[12]

NATO agreements pose yet another threat to the NPT. NATO policies allow for US nuclear weapons to be sent out to six non-nuclear weapons states that are party to the NPT. These nations (Belgium, Greece, Italy, Turkey, Germany, and the Netherlands) are also trained to use the nuclear weapons. Explaining their questionable policy to the world, the US claims they maintain control of the nuclear weapons during peacetime. The agreements allow for the nuclear weapons to be dispersed to the allied nations in times of war. The NAM (nonaligned movement) in April of 1998 protested this policy and called for "the Nuclear-weapon States parties to the NPT…to refrain from…nuclear sharing for military purposes under any kind of security arrangements." The US frequent lack of concern for international regulations is a vast problem that needs to be addressed.[13]

Secretary-General Kofi Annan declared that the most reasonable step to beginning international nuclear disarmament is convincing nations to willingly relinquish the development of fuel-cycle facilities. This can be accomplished through the creation of incentives for voluntary nations. A reaffirmation of the moratorium on nuclear testing is another essential part toward furthering disarmament. If member states can agree to ambitious goals now then progress in the future will be all the more smooth.[14]

Director General of the IAEA Mohamed ElBaradei stated in May of 2005 that the NPT regime has several flaws, listing among them the limitations placed on the IAEA in countries, specifically countries that have signed onto the Additional Protocol and the dependence on

nuclear deterrence in several nations. ElBaradei warned that the NPT needs to "evolve" in order to remain an effective means to prevent the spread of weapons technology. He went on to say that an emphasis on a zero tolerance policy for new nations developing weapons needs to be reaffirmed while also reassuring the right of nations to use nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. Acknowledging that the Additional Protocol is an effective tool in providing access to information and nuclear facilities is an integral part of combating the spread of nuclear weapons.[20]

ElBaradei also named four areas that can be improved upon in order to more adequately verify a nation's nuclear programs. These areas include modern technology, access to information, ample resources, and legal authority. Substantial export controls, sufficient protection of nuclear material as well as dealing with non-compliance are the most important issues facing the NPT. The Director General also confirmed that expanding the IAEA's power to regulate nuclear facilities does not mean stopping the spread of nuclear technology used for peaceful means. ElBaradei has continuously made suggestions to improve the NPT as well as the IAEA in the past, but nations are often not able to create an effective resolution to support his proposals.[15]

Article IV of the NPT should be the center of discussions. Article IV, as mentioned earlier, focuses on the need for a global disarmament policy. If the goals in this article are achieved most international nuclear concerns would dissipate. An international ban of nuclear weapons would place all nations on a safe playing field. Nations such as India and Pakistan have both agreed to a nuclear free world and the involvement of all nations is essential in creating a secure and optimistic future.[16]

Sectary General Kofi Annan said in May 2005, "…there are cracks in each of the treaty's pillars - nonproliferation, disarmament and peaceful uses of nuclear technology - and each of these cracks requires urgent repair." He also warned nations that the review conference of the NPT would stall "if some delegates focused on some threats instead of addressing them all." In order to uphold the dignity of the United Nations and the IAEA it is absolutely necessary to have a productive and focused conference addressing re-evaluating the NPT which applies realistic standards on the international community.[19]

Questions:
  1. *Are nations such as the US and Iran upholding their commitment to the NPT?*
  2. *What are possible incentives to nations complying with the NPT? Punishments for those that do not?*
  3. *What real incentives do Nuclear Weapons States actually have to disarm? Can these incentives ever outweigh these nations' security concerns?*
  4. *Does the IAEA have enough power and flexibility to complete the inspections necessary to maintain nuclear programs?*
  5. *How can the line between the nuclear haves and have-nots be modified or removed?*
  6. *Do Nuclear Weapons States have the inherent right to maintain technology that was in their possession prior to the NPT?*

[1] http://www.iaea.org
[2] http://www.cdi.org/dm/2000/issue3/NPT.html
[3] http://www.state.gov/t/ac/trt/18016.htm#1
[4] http://www.thebulletin.org/nuclear_weapons_data/
[5] http://washingtontimes.com/world/20050808-121636-3027r.htm
[6] http://www.llnl.gov/str/JulAug04/Smith.html
[7] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_countries_with_nuclear_weapons
[8] http://www.indianembassy.org/policy/CTBT/embassy_non_proliferation.htm
[9] http://www.dod.mil/execsec/adr95/nucfoes5.html
[10] http://www.globalsecurity.org/wmd/library/policy/dod/npr.htm
[11] http://www.cfr.org/publication/10685/india_iran_and_the_case_for_double_standards.html
[12] http://www.cfr.org/publication/9663/usindia_nuclear_deal.html
[13] http://www.basicint.org/pubs/Notes/1998criticismnato.htm
[14] http://www.acronym.org.uk/docs/0505/doc12.htm
[15] http://www10.antenna.nl/wise/index.html?http://www10.antenna.nl/wise/beyondbomb/1-3.html
[16] http://www.fas.org/nuke/control/npt/text/npt2.htm

China vs Taiwan vs Vietnam Malaysia vs Philippines: The dispute over Spratly islands

The Spratly Islands are a group of about 100 low islands and coral reefs in the central South China Sea, intersecting busy shipping lanes. The People's Republic of China (PRC), the Republic of China (Taiwan), and Vietnam each claim sovereignty over the entire group of islands, while Brunei, Malaysia, and the Philippines each claim various parts. In February 1995, the PRC occupied Mischief Reef, creating a political crisis in Southeast Asia, especially with the Philippines. In early 1999, these disputes escalated as the Philippines claimed that the PRC was building military installations on the reef. The first indication that the Spratly Islands were more than merely a hazard to shipping was in 1968 when oil was discovered in the region. The PRC's Geology and Mineral Resources Ministry has estimated that the Spratly area holds oil and natural gas reserves of 17.7 billion tons (1.60×10^{10} kg), as compared to the 13 billion tons (1.17×10^{10} kg) held by Kuwait, placing it as the fourth largest reserve bed in the world. Naturally, these large reserves assisted in intensifying the situation and propelled the territorial claims of the neighboring countries. On 11 March 1976, the first major Philippine oil discovery occurred off the coast of Palawan, within the Spratly Islands territory, and these oil fields now account for fifteen percent of all petroleum consumed in the Philippines. The claimants to sovereignty have not awarded offshore concessions in the islands for fear of provoking an immediate clash. Foreign companies have not made any commitments to explore the area until the territorial dispute is settled or the claimants come to terms on joint development. In 1984, Brunei established an exclusive fishing zone encompassing Louisa Reef in the southern Spratly Islands, but has not publicly claimed the island. Then, in 1988, the PRC and Vietnam again clashed at sea over possession of Johnson Reef in the Spratlys. Further escalation occurred in early 1995 when the Philippines discovered a primitive PRC military structure on Mischief Reef, one hundred and thirty nautical miles off the coast of Palawan. This prompted the Philippines government to issue a formal protest over the PRC occupation of the reef. Several of the nations involved have soldiers stationed in the Spratlys and control various installations on different islands and reefs.

The Republic of China (Taiwan) occupies one of the largest islands, Taiping. Various islands, valued primarily for the petroleum and gas potential of the surrounding waters and to a lesser degree for their fishing grounds, are occupied by their claimants. Although the disputes have calmed to some degree, they still remain one of the most plausible scenarios for a major war in East Asia involving the PRC or a smaller war between other claimants.

France vs Madagascar. The issue of territories of Bassas da India, Europa Island Glorioso Islands, and Juan de Nova Island.

The Iles Eparses, or scattered islands, are a group of five French entities - Bassas da India, Europa Island, Glorioso Islands, Juan de Nova Island, and Tromelin Island - which on 1 April 1960 came under the authority of the Minister in charge of overseas possessions. On 19 September 1960 by decree, the islands were transferred to the charge of the Prefet of Reunion.The islands, under French sovereignty, have been classified as nature reserves, and they support meteorological stations. The station on Tromelin island in particular provides warning of cyclones threatening Madagascar, Réunion or Mauritius. Each of the islands has an airstrip of more than 1,000 metres. The Iles Eparses had previously been under the administration of the prefect of Réunion since the independence of Madagascar in 1960. France maintains a military garrison of around 14 troops on each of the islands in the Mozambique Channel, which are claimed by Madagascar.

Canada vs Denmark. The question of Hans Island.

Hans Island (Greenlandic/Inuktitut: **Tartupaluk**, Danish: **Hans Ø**, French: **Île Hans**) is a small uninhabited barren knoll measuring 1.3 km² (0.5 mi²), located at approximately 80°49′41″N, 66°38′46″W in the centre of the Kennedy Channel of Nares Strait—the strait that separates Ellesmere Island from northern Greenland and connects Baffin Bay with the Lincoln Sea. Hans Island is the smallest of three islands located in Kennedy Channel; the others are Franklin Island and Crozier Island.

The ownership of the island is disputed as it is claimed by both Canada and Denmark. The two states failed to settle the issue when borders were drawn between Canada and Greenland in 1973. The border is established in the delimitation treaty about the Continental Shelf between Greenland and Canada, ratified by the United Nations on December 17, 1973, and in force since March 13, 1974. At that time, it was the longest shelf boundary treaty ever negotiated and may have been the first ever continental shelf boundary developed by a computer program. The treaty list 127 points (latitude and longitude) from Davis Strait to the end of Robeson Channel, where Nares Strait runs into Lincoln Sea, to draw geodesic lines between, to form the border. The treaty does not, however, draw a line from point 122 (80° 49' 2 - 66° 29' 0) to point 123 (80° 49' 8 - 66° 26' 3), a distance of 875 metres. Hans Island is situated in the centre of this area. The dispute over Hans Island may turn into a test case on sovereignty claims along the entire Northwest Passage and Arctic Sea. While Hans Island has little to no actual value, as a landmass, the waters associated with the island may have value to both countries. Because of its location in the centre of Kennedy Channel, it could play a key role in determining control of the passage through Nares Strait.

Advisory opinion. The status of Taiwan.

The controversy regarding the **political status of Taiwan** hinges on whether Taiwan, including the Pescadores (Penghu), should remain the effective territory of the Republic of China (ROC), become unified with the territories now governed by the People's Republic of China (PRC), or become the Republic of Taiwan. The controversy over the **political status of the Republic of China** hinges on whether its existence as a state is legitimate and recognised. Since the ROC lost its United Nations seat in 1971 (replaced by the People's Republic of China (PRC)), most sovereign states have switched their diplomatic recognition to the PRC, recognizing or acknowledging the PRC to be the sole legitimate representative of all China, notably the United States in 1979. As of 2006, the ROC maintains official diplomatic relations with 24 sovereign states, although de facto relations are maintained with nearly all others. Agencies such as the

Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office and American Institute in Taiwan operate as de facto embassies with ambiguous diplomatic status. The ROC government has in the past considered itself to be the sole legitimate government over China, as well as its former territories. Different groups have different concepts of what the current formal political situation of Taiwan is. The political solution that is accepted by many of the current groups is the following perspective of the status quo: that is, to unofficially treat Taiwan as a state and at a minimum, to officially declare no support for the government of this state making a formal declaration of independence. What a formal declaration of independence would consist of is not clear and can be confusing given the fact that the People's Republic of China has never controlled Taiwan since its founding and the fact that the Republic of China, whose government controls Taiwan, considers itself a de jure sovereign state. The status quo is accepted in large part because it does not define the legal status or future status of Taiwan, leaving each group to interpret the situation in a way that is politically acceptable to its members. At the same time, a policy of status quo has been criticized as being dangerous precisely because different sides have different interpretations of what the status quo is, leading to the possibility of war through brinkmanship or miscalculation.

MUNFW 2007 Climate Change Background Guide
Laura Maddox- Western Oregon University

One term continues to dominate every environmental discussion and debate across the globe: climate change. According to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change—the most trusted and relied-upon source of climate change scientific research by the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCC)—"climate" is used to describe the average, long-term weather specific to varying locations on the earth. Climate can be affected by any number of natural variables, such as distance from a body of water, latitude, elevation, and presence or absence of other geographical factors. The Third Assessment Report of the IPCC also describes the "climate system" as an integrated whole, influence from the atmosphere, oceans, ice and snow cover, and land surface components.[1] This committee, The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) acts in concordance with guidelines established by the UNFCC,[2] and thus adheres to the IPCC's consideration of all of these elements when discussing climate change and subsequently related issues. This session has been convened in order to address climate changes which continue to raise alarm among the scientific community and is now beginning to spread into more public arenas.

These changes range from record high temperatures, rising seas, drought, wildfire, hurricane activity, and earthquakes to increasing migration patterns and rapid changes in species growth. Shockingly, all of these scientifically recorded changes have resulted from just an estimated 0.5-1.0 F global average degree rise over the last 100 years.[3] The IPCC reported solid evidence in their Second Assessment Report in 1996 that human activities are largely influencing climate changes.[4] The natural greenhouse effect is primarily created by the presence of greenhouse gases (GHG's) in the earth's atmosphere. GHG's capture and retain heat energy that is reflected off the earth from the sun—a function which, like a greenhouse, creates prime

conditions for flourishing life on earth. But an unnatural overabundance of these gases, (such as

carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide,) raises temperatures and wreaks havoc on natural

systems which rely on predictable climate cycles. [5] In September 2006, scientists reported that

the past twelve month period was the hottest ever recorded in the U.S.[6] They have also reported

that, across the globe, nighttime lows are rising twice as fast as daytime highs. In fact, if carbon

dioxide emission levels simply remain constant at where they stand currently, global

temperatures are estimated to rise approximately 3.5 degrees F.[7]

Another concern which naturally follows rising temperatures is the effect that they are

having on the earth's oceans. Recent images of the Arctic ice core shows that it is melting at an

alarming rate—around 9% per decade.[8] This, coupled with melting glaciers, is predicted to raise

sea level 1.5 feet by 2100.[9] Recent monitoring of glacier activity in Greenland, (the second

largest ice mass in the world,) reported over 30 earthquakes measuring 4.6-5.1 on the Richter

scale. If this accumulation of ice were to break apart, even in relatively small amounts compared

to the mass as a whole, it could result in a 20 foot rise in seas worldwide.[10] Warmer ocean

temperatures also seem to be contributing to more hurricane activity and strength. The U.S.

National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR) has recently reported that the frequency of

Category 4 and 5 hurricanes has nearly doubled since 1970.[11] A resounding theme in

atmospheric research facilities points at one fact—storms may not necessarily be increasing in

number, but they are definitely increasing in strength. The same goes for other natural disasters,

such as earthquakes and tidal waves. Just these few effects of climate change made it clear that

something had to be done to try and reduce GHG emission levels.

In December of 1997, the UNFCC created the Kyoto Protocol, aptly named for the

Japanese city in which discussion and policymaking took place to develop the treaty. To date,

164 of the 189 member countries of the UNFCC are party to this treaty.[12] The goal of this treaty

is to reduce GHG emissions by 5.2 percent from 1990 levels by the year 2012.[13] Specific targets

vary from country to country. All actions and goals put forth in the Kyoto Protocol are aimed at

reducing emissions in an effort to slow current temperature changes which are affecting the

climate so heavily. Emission reduction progress reports are already starting to come in and

action plans are under way. Therefore, as this treaty has already been established and accepted

by the United Nations body, it is now the goal of this committee to look beyond the scope of

global warming and emission reduction discussion and move on to the more pressing issue at

hand; how to *adapt* to inevitable climate changes.

The UNEP and UNFCC have made it very clear that "adaptation" is now to be a central theme in

all climate change discussions. The Conference of the Parties (COP) is the "prime authority"

under the UNFCC, and is made up of all UN member nations. To reiterate, the COP has laid out

in Article 4.1(b) that all member parties are required take action to *mitigate* climate changes.[14]

Thus, deliberation of the Conventions now focus on the daunting task of global *adaptation* to

climate change. Some progress has been made thus far by the COP, which is guided by the

Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) on "matters of climate, the

environment, technology, and method."[15] Convention Article 1.4 states that parties must now

"formulate, implement, publish and regularly update national and, where appropriate, regional

programmes containing measures to [...] facilitate adequate adaptation to climate change," and

"cooperate in preparing for adaptation to the impacts of climate change." Convention Article 4.4

adds that developed country parties shall "assist the developing country Parties that are

particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change in meeting costs of adaptation to

those adverse effects."[16] The African Regional Workshop on Adaptation was held by the

UNFCC September 21-23, 2006, and focused primarily on African concerns related to impending climate change. Reports from this conference are very useful and applicable to the climate change discussion, as Africa is seen by many to be one of the regions in the world whose people will be most likely to suffer and whose economy will be least likely to be able to adapt to resulting changes in climate variability. The most unfortunate fact remains that Africa has also contributed the *least* to GHG emissions. Latin America held a similar workshop in April 2006 to discuss many of these same concerns. Most of the discussion groups focused on climate change adaptation and a reduction in vulnerability to these changes. The four sessions of the African Regional workshop set out a solid structure for discussion of climate change, which make for excellent suggestions as to the order of how this committee could approach the topic at hand as well. In appropriate order, the workshop addressed: "impact and vulnerability assessments; adaptation planning and implementation; regional collaboration; and outcomes and ways forward."[17] It must be stressed that cooperation and consensus must be at the forefront of all policymaking and action decided upon by this committee as well. The desire for these objectives to be met is embodied in the IPCC organization—developed for these very purposes.

The IPCC was created by the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and UNEP in 1988, when the problem of potential global climate change was beginning to surface. All members of the UN and the WMO are welcome to participate and contribute scientific, technical, and socio-economical information relevant to the research, discussion, and potential solutions to the problem of climate change. First and foremost, the IPCC is an *assessment* group of intergovernmental bodies. Three "Working Groups" have been established under the auspices of the IPCC: Working Group I assesses the scientific aspects of the climate system and climate change; Working Group II assesses the vulnerability of socio-economic and natural systems to

climate change, negative and positive consequences of climate change, and options for adapting to it; and Working Group III assesses options for limiting greenhouse gas emissions and otherwise mitigating climate change.[18] This body, along with the Ecosystem Conservation Group (ECG) and the Scientific and Technical Advisory Group (STAP,) exist to provide joint programming and an advisory role to satisfy the UNEP's objective of collaboration in climate change policymaking.

Adaptation tactics will clearly be different for nations varying on the development scale, and must also be applicable to the diverse environments represented by every nation present in this committee. However, as previously mentioned, there are many universal problems which must be considered and addressed by all parties. In particular, as stressed by the African Regional Workshop, sustainable development and water resources will be highly affected by climate change, and thus greatly affects the health of the people.[19] Also needing much attention and reform is the area of funding for adaptation research and tactics. Africa and the Least Developed Countries (LDC's,) in particular, suffer the effects of limited funding for data collection and interpretation. This concern was first addressed by the COP 1 in 1995, but according to the International Emissions Trading Association, was not seriously discussed until the Marrakesh Accords were adopted in 2001.[20] Convention Article 4.4 states that developed country parties

shall "assist the developing country Parties that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change in meeting costs of adaptation to those adverse effects." It is particularly important for this committee to determine ways in which this objective can be met.

To conclude, it is the purpose of this committee session to identify the major impacts of climate change across the globe, who and what is going to be affected, and, most importantly, what needs to be done to adapt and reduce vulnerability to these changes.

For discussion:

- How do you think your country could feasibly take steps to adapt to climate change, and is it possible for your country to aid other countries in adaptation and vulnerability reduction?

- What are the biggest universal obstacles to climate change adaptation?

- In what areas do you think consensus can be reached in discussion of solutions to the problem of climate change?

- Where do your country's interests lie in this discussion?

Sources:

[1] IPCC Third Assessment Report "The Climate System; An Overview"
http://www.grida.no/climate/ipcc_tar/wg1/pdf/TAR-01.PDF

[2] United Nations Environment Programme- "Climate Change"
http://www.unep.org/themes/climatechange/

[3] Center for Educational Technologies- "Global Climate Change"
http://www.cet.edu/ete/modules/climate/GCremote3.html

[4] IPCC Third Assessment Report "The Climate System; An Overview"
http://www.grida.no/climate/ipcc_tar/wg1/pdf/TAR-01.PDF

[5] Stix, Gary. "A Climate Repair Manual." Scientific American Sept. 2006.
http://www.sciam.com/article.cfm?chanID=sa006&colID=1&articleID=000EABE4-BDFF-14E5-BDFF83414B7F0000

[6] "Al Gore Gives Policy Address at NYU on Solving the Climate Crisis."
http://www.nyu.edu/community/gore.html

[7] Center for Educational Technologies- "Global Climate Change"
http://www.cet.edu/ete/modules/climate/GCremote3.html

[8] Duncan, Emma. "The heat is on." The Economist 7 Sept. 2006
http://www.economist.com/surveys/displayStory.cfm?story_id=7852924

[9] World Resources Institute- "Commentary: Global Warming's Human Fingerprint."
http://climate.wri.org/topic_keyissues_text.cfm?cid=1231

[10] "Al Gore Gives Policy Address at NYU on Solving the Climate Crisis."
http://www.nyu.edu/community/gore.html

[11] The National Center for Atmospheric Research & the UCAR Office of Programs- "Explaining Hurricane Behavior, Impacts, and Possible Links to Global Warming."
http://www.ucar.edu/news/releases/2006/hurricanetips.shtml

[12] International Institute for Sustainable Development- Environmental Affairs and Tourism, Republic of South Africa- "UNFCC African Regional Workshop on Adaptation."
http://www.iisd.ca/YMB/ADAPTATIONACCRA/

[13] BBC News- "Kyoto Protocol comes into force."
http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/4267245.stm

[14] UNFCC- "Mitigation of Climate Change."
http://unfccc.int/methods_and_science/mitigation/items/3681.php

[15] UNFCC- "Bodies of the Framework Convention, Actors in the Negotiation Process, and the UNFCC Secretariat."
http://unfccc.int/essential_background/feeling_the_heat/items/2915.php

[16] UNFCC- "Adaptation."
http://unfccc.int/adaptation/items/2973.php

[17] "Background paper for the African Workshop on Adaptation Implementation of Decision 1/CP.10 of the UNFCC Convention."
http://unfccc.int/files/adaptation/adverse_effects_and_response_measures_art_48/application/pdf/background_paper_africa_workshop_on_adaptation_.pdf

[18] IPCC- "Mandate and Membership of the IPCC."
http://www.ipcc.ch/about/about.htm

[19] UN International Strategy for Disaster Reduction- "African Regional Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction."
http://www.unisdrafrica.org/PDF/African%20Regional%20Strategy%20for%20DRR.pdf#search=%22AFRICAN%20REGIONAL%20STRATEGY%20FOR%20DISASTER%20RISK%20REDUCTION%22

[20] International Emissions Trading Association- "COP7- The Marrakech Accords."
http://www.ieta.org/ieta/www/pages/index.php?IdSiteTree=1119

Environmental Degradation and Indigenous People
by Genna Melton

Indigenous peoples account for most of the world's cultural diversity. Their distinct ways of life vary considerably from one location to the next. Of the estimated 6,000 cultures in the world, between 4,000 and 5,000 are indigenous. Approximately three-quarters of the world's 6,000 languages are spoken by indigenous peoples. Confusion over the definition of *Indigenous People* has been debated for several decades, and different states and communities have their own definition for the term. In some countries, the very existence of Indigenous People is denied altogether. The most widely used definition are those used by the United Nation's Working Group on Indigenous Populations and the International Labour Organization's (ILO) Convention Concerning Indigenous and Tribal peoples in independent countries. Specifically, the ILO Convention applies the term to:

- Tribal people in independent countries whose social, cultural and economic conditions distinguish them from other sections of the national community, and whose status is regulated wholly or partially by their own customs or traditions or by special laws or regulations.

- Peoples in independent countries who are regarded as indigenous on account of their descent from the populations which inhabited the country, or geographical region to which the country belongs, at the time of conquest or colonization or the establishment of present state boundaries and who, irrespective of their legal status, retain some or all of their own social, economic, cultural and political institutions.

The UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights has been concerned about growing violations of rights to health, food and culture, particularly as a result of development-related activities. These often lead to the forced displacement of Indigenous peoples from their

lands, denying them their sources of nutrition and breaking their symbolic relationship with the land. At the extreme, systematic repression and deprivation threaten their survival. Ironically, exploitation of their land is often due to demand for the very resources they have carefully managed and protected for centuries, including medicinal plants, timber and natural minerals.

In 1994, the United Nations declared an International Decade of the World's Indigenous Peoples, with the objective of "strengthening international cooperation for the solution of problems faced by Indigenous people in such areas as human rights, the environment, development, education and health." According to the United Nations Human Rights Commission, the decade saw little achievement. Partly in recognition of this, the United Nations proclaimed a second International Decade of the World's Indigenous People, beginning in January of 2005.

Many indigenous communities are overwhelmingly affected by communicable diseases and nutritional deficiencies. In addition, loss of lands and environmental degradation underlie much of the deterioration of indigenous peoples' livelihoods and food security. At the same time, indigenous communities often depend on ecosystems that are rapidly deteriorating through no fault of their own. In some instances, Indigenous peoples are exposed to environmental pollutants that have been prohibited in other parts of the world, exemplified by the ongoing use of DDT, Aldrin and Dieldrin in the western highlands of Guatemala.

These problems come in the wake of social disintegration caused by modernization and the destruction of traditional authority structures and autonomous decision-making. At best, the health situation of indigenous peoples mirrors that of the world's poorest, but is made worse by their social and cultural marginalization. There is no way of overestimating the urgency and gravity of the situation. Environmental degradation for indigenous peoples means a reduction of

the capacity of the environment to meet social and ecological objectives, and needs. Potential effects are varied and may contribute to an increase in vulnerability and the frequency and intensity of natural hazards. Some examples are land degradation, deforestation, desertification, wildfires, loss of biodiversity, land, water and air pollution, climate change, sea level rise and ozone depletion.

For example, Australia is a rich country with a high human development index. However, the health of its Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples (460,140 people accounting for 2.4% of Australia's population) is significantly poorer than that of other Australians. Indigenous men are expected to live to the age of 56, some 21 years less than the national average. In 2001, the incidence of tuberculosis for Indigenous people was 10 times that of the non-Indigenous Australians. Deaths from cardiovascular disease among Indigenous people aged 25-54 are up to 15 times higher than the other Australians.

Another example is Bolivia, a very poor country with a low human development index as well. Unlike Australia, half the population is Indigenous. However, 20% of Indigenous children die before they are one year old. Of those who survive the first 12 months, 14% die before reaching school age. Uganda is another case. In the near future, the Batwa pygmy tribe of Uganda may die out all together. Only half of the Batwa children born in Kisro, Uganda, will reach their first birthday.

Political, cultural, economic and environmental violence is a devastating reality for many indigenous communities who face serious difficulties such as the constant threat of territorial invasion and murder, the plundering of their resources, forced assimilation, cultural and legal discrimination, and a lack of recognition of their own self-determination. In order to understand

and live side by side with nature, it is important to recognize that humans are a part of nature and must find ways to work with the environment, rather than against it.

Role of the United Nations

The United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP) is the UN's focal point for environmental action and coordination among governments, UN agencies and NGO's. Following the 1992 Earth Summit, UNEP assumed responsibility for ensuring that states recognize and foster the traditional methods and knowledge of indigenous peoples, and for ensuring that indigenous peoples share in the economic and commercial benefits that accrue from the use of those traditional methods and knowledge. UNEP also works with indigenous and local communities to implement and evaluate projects that are identified and funded in support of the Convention on Biology Diversity. UNEP has been involved with the conservation of biology diversity since 1972, when the issue was first identified as a priority at the UN conference on Human Environment, in Stockholm Sweden.

The United Nations Conference on Environment and development held in Brazil in 1992 represented a turning point in the promotion of indigenous peoples' rights relating to the environment. The establishment of international legal standards to protect indigenous peoples' rights to their traditional knowledge and practices in the area of environment management and conservation were adopted by different legal sectors. The Conference, or Earth Summit as it is called, recognized that indigenous peoples are not only affected by the environment on a much larger scale then that of non-indigenous peoples, but also recognize the critical role they themselves hold when dealing with environment issues. Another important result of the Earth Summit was the adoption of the Convention on Biological Diversity. The Convention recognizes the close dependence of many indigenous communities on biological resources and

the desirability of sharing the benefits that come from using traditional knowledge, innovations, and practices to conserve biological diversity, including special diversity.

Since this Earth Summit conference, interest surrounding the rights of indigenous and non-indigenous peoples has increased, as well as awareness that traditional lands and natural resources are essential to the economic and cultural survival of indigenous peoples. Some countries such as Canada, Australia, Finland, Brazil, and the Philippines have adopted legal measures that acknowledge indigenous land and rights or have established legal procedures for indigenous participation in land-related issues. A growing number of governments have amended their national constitutions to recognize the ancestral rights of indigenous peoples to occupy, own and manage their traditional lands and territories. Many countries have established Environment Ministries and developed national Environmental Policy Statements and Strategies. Even though some governments now consult with indigenous peoples on land rights and the environment, many states still have not introduced laws or policies that provide for indigenous land claims or promote participation of indigenous peoples.

At the Johannesburg summit in 2002, goals were set and the achievement of sustainable development, in its environmental, social, and economic dimensions was their aim. Johannesburg was put into motion with a number of objectives in mind. Improving health and well-being by requiring new levels of cooperation between health and various development sectors was one important objective. This work is to be carried out along two dimensions, institutional and technical, both of which are closely interlinked and complementary. It is to be done through collaboration with a range of clusters and departments at headquarters and regional offices as well as partners such as NGO's, the private sector, collaborating centers, research and academic institutions, and other UN agencies.

The world's biological, cultural and linguistic diversity are at great risk. While the nature and extent of the threat to the Earth's biological richness is much debated, there is no doubt about what is happening to humanity's cultural and linguistic diversity. Change must occur in order to preserve the fate of our environment's future. Sustainable development has become one of the most important aims of the environmental community, and the fate of indigenous peoples is tied to achieving it . This means that in order to protect the earth and its environment from destruction of its resources, nations must adopt development practices that can be both economically viable in the present and humane and environmentally friendly in the long-term.

Questions:
1.) How would the UN prioritize the allowance of aid permitted to those in need?

2.) The world's most developed nations create the greatest portion of pollution, which often affects indigenous peoples disproportionately. To what extent is the developed world responsible for indigenous peoples' health and living conditions?

3.) What new actions should be implemented in order to enrich the well-being of indigenous peopled and the environment in which they live?

4.) Can the United Nations encourage or mandate a country to work to improve the status of its indigenous populations without impinging on its sovereignty?

References

http://www.ciesin.org/docs/010-000a/Year_Worlds_Indig.html

http://arjournals.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev.anthro.35.081705.123235?cookieSet=1&journalCode=anthro

http://www.tew.org/background/earth.charter.html

http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=1125408

http://www.tonatierra.org/mandate.html

http://www.forestpeoples.org/templates/project/law_and_human_rights_base.shtml

http://www.acdis.uiuc.edu/Research/S&Ps/1994-95-Wi/S&P_IX/long-term_causes.html

http://www.ccej.org/about.php4

http://www.umich.edu/~iinet/journal/vol3no3/kirsch.html

http://www.calvert.com/pdf/white_paper_barsh.pdf

http://www.anglicancommunion.org/ethics_technology/johannesburg_2002.cfm

Macklem, Patrick and Ed Morgan. 2000. "Indigenous Rights in the Inter-American System: The Amicus Brief of the Assembly of First Nations in Awas Tingni v. Republic of Nicaragua."

Human Rights Quarterly. Vol. 22: pp. 569-602. Latin America

Anaya, S. James. 1998. "Maya Aboriginal Land and Resource Rights and the Conflict Over Logging in Southern Belize." Yale Human Rights and Development
Law Journal. 1:1

Anaya, S. James and S. Todd Crider. 1996. "Indigenous Peoples, The Environment and Commercial Forestry in Developing Countries: The Case of Awas Tingni, Nicaragua." Human Rights Quarterly. 18:345-367.

Bebbington, Anthony J. et al. 1993. "Fragile Lands, Fragile Organizations: Indian Organizations and the Politics of Sustainability in Ecuador." Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers. 18:176-196.

Brysk, Alison. 2000. From Tribal Village to Global Village: Indian Rights and International Relations in Latin America. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

<div align="center">**Energy Security**</div>

<div align="center">By: Patrick Eiser</div>

Introduction:

The time is long overdue for a major review of global energy security. This is a crucial issue which directly influences the social and economic development of all countries. Economic growth has often been achieved with insufficient consideration of important environmental and social realities. This shortsighted approach has led to conditions which now threaten future development and human progress. This burning issue for some means guaranteeing safe, sufficient and long-term supplies of traditional fossil fuels like oil, gas and coal. For others, it means freeing the planet from fossil fuels in favor of alternative forms of energy like wind, solar, biomass, ethanol and hydrogen.

For some of the world's countries, energy security entails relying heavily on producing energy at home and relying less on foreign aid. Other states prefer buying stakes in foreign oil fields – in Sudan, Nigeria, Angola, Saudi Arabia, and Kuwait and so on. This heavy reliance on international supplies could pose a serious risk should a geopolitical crisis broke out. There is yet a third meaning of energy security to the world's leaders, placing restrictions on foreign investment in domestic gas and oil fields. Today's global energy system is more vulnerable than ever before. Long supply chains separate producers from consumers and increase risk. Highly nationalistic views also have been a major contributor to the current situation.

Real energy security requires setting aside the pipe dream of energy independence and embracing interdependence. Plain and simple, energy security is delivering clean, sustainable, and safe energy to everywhere in the world.

Fossil Fuels:

Despite worldwide calls for a carbon-free world, it is impossible to ignore the fact that fossil fuels will continue to play a major role in the production of energy for the foreseeable future. Nearly two-thirds of the world's electricity and almost all of our transportation fuels, are provided by coal, oil and natural gas. The angst and fear that drives gas and oil prices higher and higher and continues to damage economies is a direct result of disrupted and unsteady supply lines. The effect is felt from industry giants down to the everyday consumers in visits to the gas pump and steadily increasing electricity bills.

This situation can be the beginning and/or the end for economies struggling to survive. "Every time oil hits over $50 a barrel many importing nations on continents like Africa are forced to meet the extra cost through spending precious overseas development aid. This is money intended for hospitals and medicines, and for schools, agriculture and sustainable development programs" (Steiner, UNEP Speeches).

Ensuring that we can continue to rely on clean, affordable energy from our traditional fuel resources should be a primary focus for government heads. Fossil fuels supply 85% of the world's energy, and projects such as pollution-free coal plants and more productive oil and gas fields are still in the works and far off from being a reality. Regardless, some estimates predict that fossil fuel reserves for the entire world will only last seventeen more years.

In its most basic form, energy security is simply getting reliable and safe energy where it is needed. Approximately 90 per cent of people in Kenya, where UNEP is headquartered, have no access to grid electricity. Internationally, over one and a half billion people in the developing world are in the same quandary. Until a more readily accessible and economically feasible source is discovered, the process of burning fossil fuels and releasing harmful compounds and

green house gases into the atmosphere will continue to be the world's number one source of energy.

Connection to Climate Security:

According to Munich-RE, one of the world's biggest re-insurers, weather-related natural disasters cost more than $200 billion in 2005, increasing six-fold since 1950. The damage to rich and poor economies alike will only continue to increase with the continued inaction, pushing the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals toward even more of an outside shot.

The issue of climate change, and more generally climate security, in connection with the issue of energy security is more and more being confronted as a two-headed monster. This method of dealing with the issues presents an extraordinary opportunity to forge political and long-term economic obligations with both environmental and social ones.

Recent Developments:

It is well-established that this issue is at the forefront of the global agenda. The UNEP is leading the way with its "Sustainable Energy Programme," a program designated to help countries create sustainable energy systems where the production, delivery and use of energy support human development in all its social, economic and environmental dimensions. Many other organizations work with the UNEP on these important issues. The International Energy Agency, whose primary focus is ensuring reliable, affordable and clean energy for all, has co-hosted an event on "Energy for Sustainable Development" so that these critical topics are not being ignored. Planet-wide organizations such as the Global Network on Energy for Sustainable Development and their work towards reaching the MDGs, as well as their focus on renewable energy technologies, continue to facilitate a network of knowledge to address these issues.

Its not just IGOs and NGOs confronting this dilemma. During the summer of 2006, the Group of 8 (G8) met at the St. Petersburg Summit, where energy security was the top priority on the agenda, and UNEP's Executive Director Achim Steiner delivered a key speech on the topic. Energy security was also the main topic of discussion during the recent 19th Special Session of the General Assembly. These summit meetings and roundtable discussions have not been fruitless: resolution 59/314 reaffirms the GA's commitment to developing clean, safe and efficient energy, and the GA has also recently adopted Resolution 60/205, another reaffirmation from the world's body on the safe advancement on science and technology and its aid towards the developing world. On a side note, the UN Security Council, in its 61st session, recently unanimously adopted resolution S/RES/1718 regarding the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and its recent nuclear weapons tests. Energy needs are apparent in every state, but so is the threat posed by certain types of energy sources and their potential misuse. Other organizations such as the UN's Energy and Transport Branch and Division of Sustainable Development, as well as several other economic commissions, provide advisory services to governments, in conjunction with technical support regarding energy projects at the field level.

The following is a comprehensive look at what it will take. Conditions must improve for the five-sixths of the world that lack the developed world's material advantages. Both the one billion people living in extreme poverty, and the people living in the developed world must work to promote environmentally friendly, safe and secure, material progress. Economic development can only be continued in a way that will not damage the natural systems that sustain all life.

Cleaner Use and Emission Reduction:

The relationship between sustainable health and the consumption of energy fuels cannot be ignored. Often the practice of burning fossil fuels such as wood and coal is inefficient and

has a direct correlation to the release of a wide range of air-borne pollution. Particle levels can range between a high 300 to a massive 3,000 micrograms per cubic meter .The European Union's guideline, to provide a frame of reference, is 40 micrograms per cubic meter. It is no small wonder that indoor air pollution may be responsible for up to 2.4 million premature deaths annually. On the other hand, outdoor air pollution from industries and vehicles may trigger some 800,000 premature deaths a year, with over 60 per cent of these in Asia. This spells not just misery for millions but has potentially huge economic costs. The World Bank estimates that, given current trends, China may, by 2020, be paying close to $400 billion a year to treat diseases linked to coal burning.

Many countries, like the United States, are now pressing forward with research to develop cleaner – even zero emission – coal-fired power stations. Advanced fuels like hydrogen and fuel cells also may not be that far from commercialization. Meanwhile, greater access to cleaner burning fuels like kerosene and liquid petroleum gas in the short term will reduce the health burden in developing countries homes while taking some of the pressure off important ecosystems like forests.

Reusable Energy and Energy Efficiency

Energy efficiency and renewable energy sources are the foundation upon which a fossil fuel-free future can be built. A renewable energy source is defined as "those energy sources which are not destroyed when their energy is harnessed." By that definition, natural phenomena such as sunlight, wind, waves, water flow, geothermal heat, among others, are being coupled with advances in technology to combine for a viable counter to the threat of energy crisis and climate change.

The direct link of the development of these technologies to the dwindling numbers of accessible fossil fuels cannot be denied. Also, the environmental and political risk associated with the use of nuclear energy continues to drive scientists to find an alternative source of energy. Future energy development faces a host of immense challenges due to the ever present threat of increasing world population, an increased demand for less pollution, demands for increases in the standard of living and of course the movement away from fossil fuels.

Sustainable Development:

Sustainable development is defined as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. To better understand this one need not look farther than the issues at the heart of sustainable development, the prevention of global pandemics, climate change, natural disasters, poor soil conditions and deforestation.

To give a face to the problem, over 1 billion people planet wide live on less than one dollar a day, and the documented life expectancy in nine African nations is under forty years. On the other hand, the rich countries of the world continue to bombard the atmosphere with carbon dioxide and other such greenhouse gases, thus compromising the well-being of future generations and pushing the globe towards an uncertain future.

The consequences of ignoring this pressing issue can already be seen in the form of rising sea levels, extreme droughts, erosion and loss of forests, increases in slum populations, species extinctions, and collapsing fisheries. The dire situation of water scarcity also continues to play a major role in internal violence and regional conflict.

As evidenced by the declarations set forth in the Millennium Development Goals, the leaders of the world agree that the resources and the willpower exist to combat these problems.

Along with the major goal of eradicating extreme poverty and hunger, the goal of ensuring environmental sustainability is as pressing a need as ever before.

The need for change coupled with the desire for it undoubtedly poses the question: Can we pursue development in the definition of the World Commission on Environment and Development "that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs?" What is posed as a simple question is realistically a combined set of complicated issues. A broader approach is required and a host of issues need to be completed as a set to achieve the ultimate goal of sustainable development while meeting the energy security needs of all states.

Questions:
1. How can and should energy systems be protected and improved to promote safe energy for all?
2. Who can best provide the systems and services to secure the world's energy supplies?
3. Should developing nations be required to preserve certain natural resources, or should developed nations be required to lower their consumption rates to provide greater energy security while promoting sustainable development?
4. What, if any, action should governments take to ensure a competitive energy market delivers diverse energy sources and security of supply?

Sources:
1. *Environmental Security.* UNEP Speeches July 2006. Achim Steiner. http://www.unep.org/Documents.Multilingual/Default.asp?DocumentID=488&ArticleID=5324&l=en
2. *Climate Change Evaporates from G8 Agenda.* Robin Pomeroy, July 5, 2006. http://www.boston.com/news/world/europe/articles/2006/07/05
3. *Energy and Environment.* The Atlantic Council of the United States. http://www.acus.org/progrmas-energy_.asp
4. *What Energy Security Really Means.* Sebastian Mallaby, July 3, 2006. Washintonpost.com. http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/07/02/AR2006070200675
5. The NATO Forum on Energy Security Technology
6. Official Website of the G8 presidency of the Russian Federation in St. Petersburg. http://www.en.g8russia.ru

7. *Ensuring Energy Security*. Daniel Yergin, March/April 2006. Foreign Affairs, Council on Foreign Relations. http://www.foreignaffairs.org/20060301faessay85206/daniel-yergin/ensuring-energy-security.html