General Assembly

Security Council Reform


The Security Council is the crowning committee that gives the UN a difference from its

predecessor, the League of Nations. It is given the capacity to use power in the United Nations

and is primarily responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security.  When

conflict arises, the United Nation's natural inclination and most common recommendation

advises a peaceful means of agreement, but at times it is necessary that the Security Council

steps in and undertakes investigation by appointing special representatives and by advocating for

a diplomatic agreement.  If negotiations break down and the dispute leads the international

community to the brink of war, the council's main objective is to diffuse the impending crisis

through their ability to command sanctions by whatever means they deem most effective.  The

Security Council must promote international law, peace and security in order to effectively

uphold its mandate.  With the dramatic changes in today's geo-political landscape, the United

Nations requires much more guidance by the Security Council than in years past.   A closer link

between the Security Council and the general membership of the United Nations is imperative to

enable the organization to effectively address the issues and crises that adversely impacted

international peace and security.

The issue of Security Council reform has become a major concern among member states

since the end of the Cold War.  One of the main issues at hand regarding reformation of the

Security Council would be the composition of the council itself.  The issue is centered around

expanding the body through the addition of permanent seats or more non-permanent membership

seats.  Countries have agreed on the major deficiencies of the council, but there has been little

agreement on how to effectively and fairly address the issue.  The Security Council is currently comprised of 15 members, 10 rotating members with 2 year terms: Belgium, Indonesia, South Africa, Burkina Faso, Italy, Viet Nam, Costa Rica, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Croatia and Panama as of 2008, and 5 permanent members: China, France, Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States.  In order to change the composition of the body's membership, the U.N. Charter would have to be amended.  The current composition of the Security Council can be altered through the amendment process by calling on a 2/3 vote in the General Assembly that includes the members of the Security Council.  To pass any matter in the Security Council there must be 9 out of the 15 members in the affirmative, with the concurring votes of all five permanent members.  Under the UN Charter all members of the United Nations agree to fulfill the decisions of the Security Council while all other organizations, such as the General Assembly, 2nd Committee or NATO, can only make recommendations.

Many nations feel that the representation in the Security Council is disproportionate and leaves various powers, major and minor alike, without a say in matters of global consequence.  The council was mandated by the U.N. Charter and reflects the global balance of power after World War II, and many nations argue that it no longer applies to the current geopolitical landscape.  The Security Council's rules have also remained provisional since the establishment of the United Nations, yet no substantial measures have been taken to address this matter.  There is significant debate on how to repair this; most member states agree on the need for either more permanent representatives, more delegates on the Security Council in general, or both.  There are many differences between the various blocs on how exactly to apportion these new delegates, and there is also concern among delegations in the minority on the perceived lack of transparency on the part of the Security Council.  There is also constant debate on the body's

institutional strength and framework.  The five permanent members arguably have an institution

advantage in that they control much of the outcome regarding reform by the requirement of their

support for further revision.  It is also argued that its ability to foster internal progress towards

development and bureaucratic change is hampered by the minor support it receives from the

Secretariat in the UN Charter.  Frequent changes in the office of presidency also have rendered

the Security Council less efficient than a body of its magnitude should be.  Proponents of

Security Council reform argue that although many resolutions are passed by the body, very few

are actually enforced, especially in matters involving permanent members.  Another area of

concern involves the institutional advantages held by the council, such as the power to appoint

individuals to key posts within the United Nations as well as other intergovernmental

organizations such as the World Court.  There has been a growing amount of concern as to how

much influence and control permanent members should have in regards to the crafting of

terminology in resolutions and other reports.  Proponents of reform have also charged the body

with interfering with the office of the Secretariat.  The decisions reached by the body, whether

they facilitate action or inaction, have an effect on all member states, especially on the progress

and survival of weak and vulnerable countries.On December 3, 1993 the General Assembly

adopted resolution 4826 which created an open-ended working group that focused on equitable

representation, an increase of membership and other necessary objectives to allow the Security

Council to function more efficiently.  The movement for reform continued to gain strength with

the unfolding of events in Iraq and Rwanda and how the council addressed them.  The

Commission on Global Governance, which worked independently of the UN and included

luminaries such as former U.S. President Jimmy Carter, recommended expanded representation

in the Security Council to further bolster its legitimacy and credibility.  The panel also proposed

the concept of an *economic security council* in order to establish more efficient and democratic oversight of the global economy.  In 2004 these issues were again discussed at the Assembly with emphasis on the size, composition, veto power, accountability, and transparency of the council.  High-level paneling has also been utilized in order to expand ideas on improvement of organizations. Previous UN Secretary Generals have established many high-level panels that correspond and promote new thinking to jump-start reforms and further action in governments.

The key issues of Security Council Reform deal with improving the working methods of the council and enlarging the number of permanent and non-permanent seats .  Expansion of the council is supported in both the permanent and non-permanent categories, but the issue of selecting permanent seats has ultimately fostered the rise of the *Group of Four*.   It is argued by many states that the Group of Four, consisting of Japan, Brazil, India, and Germany, deserve consideration for permanent seats on the Security Council in view of their substantial contributions towards international commerce and trade, as well as their major successes and improvements to science and society.  In July 2005 three resolutions were proposed that failed for lack of support.  The first, the *Group of Four* (Brazil, Germany, India and Japan), desired an increase of membership from 15 to 25 seats with six new permanent seats without the veto power for 15 years and four new non-permanent seats.  Another proposal, from the Italy/Pakistan-led group, rejected an increase of permanent expansion but preferred to see the number of members increased to 25.  Other organizations such as the African Union have negotiated for two permanent seats for Africa on the Security Council, including full prerogatives such as the veto right as well as five non-permanent seats, but with no success.  The possibility for a sixth permanent seat on the council for the African Union has not been ruled out for further consideration, but opponents of Security Council reform cite the difficulty within the A.U. on

empowering one voice to represent the substantial differences and interests of each state on the continent.  Many reformists share the views of the A.U. as well as the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), and have called for expansion in both categories of the council's membership.  The process for selecting candidates for both permanent and non-permanent seats should be legal and transparent, not in the fashion of its post-World War II configuration.  Many have expressed other sentiments and proposals, including that seats should not be allocated to states, but to regional groups, and it should be left up to those groups to allocate seats to specific countries.  Expansion should take into consideration equitable geographic distribution, and it is also believed that African, Asian, Eastern European and Arab States deserve consideration as well.

Those nations seeking representation on the Security Council have expressed a willingness to forfeit the veto power allocated to permanent members of the council for up to fifteen years, if granted representation in the body.  Those aspiring for a voice in the Security Council recognize that representation alone is a significant step towards progress regarding the issue.  There is significant debate on the use of the veto; proponents of reform have recognized the importance of the veto in upholding the balance of power in the U.N. and providing a democratic *check* to the process, but stress the need for limitations to be placed on its use.  The right of veto bestowed upon the permanent members has undercut the body's democratic thrust from time to time in resolving matters of international consequence.  A minority of states argue that the veto power should be eliminated or should be limited to matters that fall under the purview of Chapter VII.

The Secretary-General's office has also put forth a plan to address the concerns and objections of the international community in regards to Security Council reform.  As a response to emerging powers, especially Brazil, Japan, India, and Germany, a new form of council

membership was put forward.  Known as the "Model B" or "Blue Model," this proposal calls for

council terms that are longer than the current, 2-year system in place.  Another recommendation

that has emerged from the Secretary-General's threat panels is the "Green Model," which calls

for an additional ten seats while keeping the two-year terms in place.  The "Green Model" also

allows member states to stand for re-election every two years, but does not effectively address

the issue of tenure.  Another major obstacle to Security Council Reform through expansion is the

reality of its current size.  At fifteen member states, it has been criticized for being *too big*.  The

increase in elected seats from six to ten has only hampered the timeliness and efficiency of the

council, and has led to its metamorphosis from a quick and decisive executive body to one that is

far less effective in recent years.  The current state of ECOSOC has been cited as a working

example of how expansion can be detrimental over time in the U.N.  The most plausible

solutions to Security Council reform can be adjustments to some of the most promising proposals

that have been put fourth over the years.  Perhaps a combination of the elements of these

proposals can find sufficient support.

The Security Council is increasingly faced with new challenges and threats that will test

the mettle and effectiveness of the body in matters of global security. The international fight

against terrorism and weapons of mass destruction, the consequences of wars in Afghanistan and

Iraq, and civil unrest in the Middle East and parts of Africa had clearly underscored the complex

nature of the council's work. They also clearly highlight the urgent need for progressive and

meaningful reforms in the United Nations to ensure a more efficient, effective and responsive

Security Council.  To address the issue of reform and realignment within the body, we must first

acknowledge and recognize the independence and sovereignty of each member state.  To

effectively address the problems that arise with the composition and mandate of the Security

Council, one must first understand why the framework and mandate were established in their

current form. Looking back at the series of events that led to the creation of the United Nations

is essential to understanding the makeup and representation of the Security Council. Reconciling

the disagreements and divisions of the past is a major step towards future reforms not just in the

council, but in every organ of the UN. When considering Security Council reform, it is

imperative that member states of the United Nations understand that the best way may not

always be the most obvious or the easiest. Negotiations on this issue must be constant and

reflect the current global realities without impairing the effectiveness or mandate of the Security

Council. Reform of this magnitude will require the fundamental principles of diplomacy as well

as a strategy of patience and mutual cooperation.

**Questions**

How can a discussion of Security Council representation reform avoid the impasse that has plagued past attempts?

Are there ways to improve the efficiency, responsiveness, and diversity of views within the Security Council without altering its membership or voting privileges?

What purpose is served by the veto? Can a reformed Security Council function and prevent Great power war if the veto is modified or restricted?

If it is necessary to change the composition of the Security Council, what states should be included? Why? Should they be given veto power? Will the current veto states approve such a change? Why or why not?

Can the issue of balanced representation on the Security Council be resolved by creating regional blocs of nations, such as found in the models of the European Union and the African Union? What are some of the advantages and disadvantages that may result from such actions?

Besides the "Group of Four," name three other member countries or interests that warrant further consideration for Security Council expansion and why.

If reforms can be made in other committees or organs of the U.N., what are they and where should they be applied? Can any institutional procedures be amended to provide a check against the authority of the Security Council?

**References**


UN Security Council Homepage  http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/

2004 Report of the Secretary-General's High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change
http://www.un.org/secureworld/

The Center for UN Reform Education   http://www.centerforunreform.org/node/23

Security Council Reform - http://www.globalpolicy.org/security/reform/2005/0713theses.htm

Japan Says No to G-4 Bid -
http://www.globalpolicy.org/security/reform/cluster1/2006/0107bid.htm

Security Council Reform - http://www.reformtheun.org/index.php/issues/1737?theme=alt4

Citizens for Global Solutions - http://www.globalsolutions.org/issues/security_council_reform

Security Council Reform: Where it Stands - http://www.dw-
world.de/dw/article/0,1564,1618479,00.html

General Assembly

Coordination of UN Humanitarian Assistance


Coordination and cooperation between nations is key to the concept of the United

Nations.  It is what makes the organization work.  Many issues, from matters of conflict, to

humanitarian assistance, to development aid, all require coordinated efforts on the part of many

nations in order to be successful.  It is therefore vital to the operation of the United Nations that

frameworks for coordination be developed and implemented, and that nations accept that their

coordination and cooperation are necessary.  The need for coordinated action is clearer and more

obvious on the subject of humanitarian aid, than on any other issue save perhaps conflict

prevention.

The United Nations first considered the question in these terms in 1991, when the

delegation from the Netherlands petitioned for its inclusion in the agenda (A/46/194).  Its request

noted the number of crisis situations in the preceding years and read in part, "Comprehensive and

speedy responses to these emergencies require the active involvement of the United Nations

system…" Since then, the body has considered the issue during every year's session, as one

might expect for such an important topic.

In that year, resolution 46/182 was passed by the General Assembly; this provided the

framework for all future consideration of issues along these lines.  46/182 noted many points,

including but not limited to:

- placing the primary responsibility for coordination on the shoulders of the nation in whose

territory the event took place;

- that neighboring states should also play a key role, specifically in ensuring passage for

humanitarian assistance as needed;

- that assistance... "should be provided in ways that will be supportive of recovery and long-term development";

- that disaster-prevention measures are also key to these efforts, and that information-sharing is key to ensuring these measures are successful.

The document also called for a fund to be established in order to help facilitate a rapid response, and clarified the leadership role of the Secretary-General in terms of the coordination between UN organizations for disaster relief, along with a host of other measures.  Also, as stated before, the question has been re-considered annually since the adoption of 46/182. Probably the most important portion of this is the Secretary-General's annual report on the issue's status, allowing a clear picture how close the world has come to reaching the goals of 46/182.

Current:

Regardless of what frameworks exist, it cannot be denied that responses to various disasters and crises have not always been completely effective, or even reasonably effective. Many relief efforts are under-funded; there is a fund in place to address these situations by dispensing additional grants, but it is only a partial solution.  Furthermore, as recently as 2006, in the Secretary-General's report on this issue (A/62/87-E/2007/70), it was noted in the introduction that while the resources available for relief and aid had grown, "…coordination mechanisms, however, have yet to employ such resources to optimum effect."  The report suggested, among other things, a "cluster leadership approach" wherein groups of humanitarian organizations work in concert on certain issues; it also stressed the need to find more non-UN actors to assist relief efforts – perhaps via financial incentives for these organizations to work with the UN, or simply appealing to their sense of charity.  (It is important to note that many of these organizations may

well receive tax breaks within the nations where they have their headquarters, so there may be already-existent financial incentives available.)

Additionally, many nations that have had to deal with disasters have considered the international response to be inadequate, and have said as much; one example of this would be in the 52nd Plenary in 2006, where the delegation from Grenada (A/61/PV.52, p.5-6) cited recent environmental disasters, for example hurricanes, in the Caribbean, affecting that nation as well as nearby Guyana, Haiti and Jamaica.  They were particularly critical of the international response to these, and the implication was that they found the financial support to be inadequate.  The Grenadian delegation did praise the launching of the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF), but called for states to make solid commitments to keeping the fund's available assets at acceptable levels.

Also, we see in some instances that not even the best cooperation between many nations can be effective, if the nation in which the problem exists do not itself cooperate.  There are numerous recent and ongoing examples for this type of complication, perhaps too numerous to list.  One obvious such example is the ongoing crisis in the Darfur region of Sudan; this has, of course, seen large numbers of people killed, and an even greater number of refugees displaced (IHT).  Complicating the issue is a distinct lack of cooperation from the Sudanese government with respect to brokering peace, and distributing (or allowing the distribution of) aid, as well as limiting media reports (Human Rights Watch). This presents a dilemma: the United Nations can coordinate relief efforts, but cannot properly execute them; nor can it do so without the consent of the Sudanese government due to the principles of the UN Charter, chief among these being the respect of each member state's sovereignty.

A similar contemporary issue has more recently turned up with respect to the aftermath of Cyclone Nargis, which struck the coast of Myanmar in May 2008.  The aftermath was devastation: upwards of a hundred thousand killed (CNN), a million without homes, and over ten billion dollars in damage.  The international response was both swift and well-coordinated.  However, the government – which is generally isolationist in nature at the time – delayed or seized many shipments of supplies entering the country, and outright refused other offers of aid (The Guardian).  Naturally, this resulted in many who desperately needed assistance and supplies in the critical first days of the aftermath, having to go without.  What supplies Myanmar did accept, were mostly distributed by the government itself, and not foreign aid workers (IHT); overall, the restrictions on incoming aid imposed by the government of Myanmar seriously impaired the effectiveness of the relief efforts.

The Israel-Palestine situation is not separate from this issue, either.  Bombings, military operations, and general mayhem seem all too frequent, and the longer the conflict drags on, the longer services for people on both sides are blocked.  This differs from some of the above situations in that both entities have no issues with accepting outside help, both for services or for participation in negotiations.  The problem lies in the complete inability for either party to find any common ground of note.  There is no area in which cooperation between nations is more important, than in the issue of the negotiation of grievances. There is also a tragic insistence – particularly on the part of Israel, unfortunately – on not respecting existing agreements or resolutions, which further compounds this lack of cooperation.  For example, the lack of efficient access to and from the West Bank and the Gaza Strip (due to the barriers constructed around each territory) complicates the United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) assistance to refugee camps in both areas.  And of course, the lack of good faith negotiations that

characterizes the conflict prevents any possibility of effective, enforceable right of return for refugees. Water rights remain a major issue as well, with the territory outlined for the Palestinian state having little access to this vital resource in what can be characterized as an attempt to ensure it becomes a failed state should it ever gain independence. The Palestinians' hands are not clean either, of course, particularly on the part of Hamas - and to a lesser but still notable extent, the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) itself. Their inability to compromise on some points has been perhaps as disastrous as the Israeli government's inability to do the same.

It is made abundantly clear, then, that the UN's constant re-consideration of this question has merit; that re-consideration is necessary due to the inability of these prior efforts to fully realize a solution. Progress has of course been made, and attempts to improve funding issues, frameworks, and the level of responses are of course admirable. However, there is still a long way to go towards success. In order to ensure that success, nations must be more willing to respond, to accept outside help and cooperate with other nations, and to both negotiate in good faith and respect the agreements they enter into.

Questions to consider:

Is the existing cooperative framework "reasonably" effective in terms of ensuring efficient responses to disasters? If not, why not?

Should the role of NGOs in disaster relief be changed? If so, how? Or, put another way – should relief efforts be more dependent on NGOs such as the Red Cross, should the UN itself shoulder more of the burden, or should individual (but coordinated) national relief efforts have more of an emphasis?

Which nations should bear the primary burden of a) coordinating efforts, and b) funding such efforts?

Are there as-yet untried ways of securing funding for relief efforts, considering the often-underfunded nature of these efforts?  Should member states simply be asked to contribute more?

Should already-existent funding be diverted from other programs to these efforts?
Is the role of the Secretary-General in these matters effective and proper?  If not, should the role of that office for coordinating these efforts be strengthened or weakened (or changed entirely)?  If weakened/changed, who or what should bear that responsibility instead?

How should the United Nations deal with situations in which the nations in which a crisis problem exists, fail to cooperate effectively with the international community or outright refuse to do so?  Is there an equitable solution that is also in keeping with the sovereignty principles of the UN Charter?

References

A/61/PV.52, 2006 (plenary):
http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/61/PV.52&Lang=E

A/46/194, 1991; "Request For The Inclusion Of A Supplementary Item In The Agenda Of The Forty-Sixth Session" :
http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/46/194&Lang=E

A/RES/61/132, 1991; "Strengthening emergency relief, rehabilitation, reconstruction, recovery and prevention in the aftermath of the Indian ocean tsunami disaster" :
**http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/61/132&Lang=E**

A/62/72-E/2007/73; "Central Emergency Response Fund (Report of the Secretary General)":
**http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/62/72&Lang=E**

A/62/87-E/2007/70; "Strengthening of the coordination of emergency humanitarian assistance of the United Nations (Report of the Secretary General)":
**http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/62/87&Lang=E**

46/182, 1991; "Strengthening of the coordination of emergency humanitarian assistance of the United Nations":
**http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/46/182&Lang=E**

"Strengthening of the coordination of humanitarian and disaster relief assistance of the United Nations, including special economic assistance; Assistance to survivors of the 1994 genocide in Rwanda, particularly orphans, widows and victims of sexual violence: joint debate": http://www.un.org/ga/62/plenary/reliefrwanda/bkg.shtml

Darfur:

International Herald Tribune (IHT), **http://www.iht.com/articles/2005/05/10/news/journal.php**

Human Rights Watch, **http://hrw.org/reports/2004/sudan0504/2.htm**

Myanmar:

CNN, **http://www.cnn.com/2008/WORLD/asiapcf/05/07/myanmar.aidcyclone/**

The Guardian, **http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2008/may/09/cyclonenargis.burma4**

International Herald Tribune (IHT),
**http://www.iht.com/articles/ap/2008/05/10/news/Myanmar-Cyclone.php**

**http://www.nytimes.com/2008/05/09/world/asia/09myanmar.html?_r=1&oref=slogin**

<center>**Second Committee**

**The Agricultural Subsidy Impact**

**by** Jason Entsminger</center>

***Multi-lateral and Bi-lateral Options***

The world's food, fiber and natural resources industry is essential to human existence. It provides the raw materials and value-added products that are basic to daily life and common amongst all societies- rich and poor, developed and developing. Today our planet faces an ever quickening pace towards a "global marketplace", but somehow this core industry has been caught behind the starting gate on the fast-track to the trade liberalization that defines the principles of a free-marketplace. Chief among the causes of this road-block is a seemingly endless diplomatic impasse in agricultural subsidy negotiations. It seemed at first that a bright future lay ahead for global agricultural trade when the Uruguay Round Agreement on Agriculture (URAA) took the first steps towards reducing trade-distorting practices. It was with that jump-start that the current "box" system was established, creating a classification structure that identifies the trade-hostility level of policies and support programs. It was there as well that the need for further reform was solidified.

However, the initial time period for URAA has long expired, and only minimal movement has been made since that initial bolt from the starting line. Since 2001, dismal failures under the World Trade Organization's Doha Round have characterized a seemingly unstoppable decline in the ability of world governments to find consensus, and make concessions on issues surrounding trade-distorting price supports and other income supplements. While the initial

Ministerial Conference in Doha, Qatar, and its Doha Development Agenda, ended with a commitment by all countries to negotiate on opening agricultural markets, each of the subsequent Ministerial Conferences and working meetings ended with little or no progress on subsidies. In many instances these failures were a result of a developed-developing state rift. Many in the developing world argue that the subsidies granted to agricultural producers in developed economies are unfair not only because the subsidies increase the competitiveness of these producers in the world market place, but also because governments of developed economies have the financial means to actually provide the payments.

It must be note that the break downs in negotiations are not simply due to a North-South disparity. Evolving South-South and North-North conflicts are also beginning to play an important role. As lesser developed countries (LDCs) fear the growing behemoths of China, India and Brazil, and those more agriculturally dominated economies battle with industrial-based nations, a complex network of interests have been built, strangling progressive action on subsidy liberalization. It is clear from these failures that a renewed effort to develop innovative multi-lateral institutions which promote solidarity must be made. Also, a critical evaluation of recent actions must take place. Most notable among these is the movement to payment decoupling by developed nations.

Further, for much of the past several decades international trade policies have focused on the multi-lateral level of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and the subsequent World Trade Organization (WTO). In more recent years all trade, and agricultural trade in particular, has experienced a renewed interest in bilateral (and to an extremely limited extent, unilateral) trade liberalization through a system of complex Regional Trading Agreements (RTA's). These RTA's offer many states alternatives that suit specific and

immediate needs.  They offer greater flexibility and the opportunity to minimize the much more stringent or competing demands in the larger conglomeration of nations.  However, even though its popularity with governments is growing, this bilateral route has still proven to be as susceptible to the powerful domestic and international agricultural lobbies as is the broader multilateral course.  In addition, many policy analysts criticize RTA's between developed and developing nations as being overtly one-sided and providing little achievement in meeting the challenges of global development.

### *Why the argument over subsidies?*

In large-part, price and income support programs are one of the last remaining trade and price distorting instruments remaining in the global marketplace.  When implemented, these programs bolster the ability of producers to enter markets in which their products would otherwise not be competitive.  Within the agricultural sector, the three most commonly discussed forms are (a) "production subsidies," payments given to producers to defray their costs of production, (b) "price-supports", insurance-structured payments that guarantee a minimum price level, and (c) "export subsidies", payments given to exporting-agents that ensure a competitive price-earned.  Increasingly "decoupled payments" are entering into the discussion as a proposed, less-distorting alternative to direct subsidies.  These payments are blanket amounts given to those who meet certain criteria, regardless of the product produced.  Many developing nations argue that these support mechanisms lead to market dumping by firms that would otherwise be uncompetitive, an increase in world prices for agricultural products, and an unnatural loss of comparative advantage.  In return, developing nations tend to claim the need to protect domestic agriculture sectors for health and safety, national sovereignty and independence, and environmental conservation.  It should also be noted that protectionist policies also have a

tendency to result in sub-optimal allocation of resources in both domestic and global economies.

Overall, nations have a wide variety of economic motivations for and against subsidies in

agricultural sectors, each of which are driven by principles of self-promotion and incentivisation.

***Why is agriculture the most distorted and controversial sector?***

In total, seven main reasons for protectionist policies in agriculture can be identified. The

first is the strong motivation for national governments to maintain a secured supply of basic

commodities in case of political conflict. Second, preferences on food security and safety drive

the use of preferential treatment in agricultural trade policies. Third, because agriculture, unlike

any other industry, is highly susceptible to natural phenomena, there is a large incentive to

provide free insurance programs to maintain sector stability in times of downturn. Fourth, a

strong sense of cultural identity lies within rural and agricultural lifestyles. Fifth, there are

powerful domestic and multi-lateral political lobbies for agricultural sectors. Sixth, there is an

increasing focus on the need to promote environmental conservation and protection. Finally,

negotiations regarding agriculture are characterized by coercive and strong-hold negotiation

tactics employed within agricultural trade liberalization initiatives.

In combination, these seven attributes promote behaviors that protect domestic

agricultural interests and, in turn, markets. These barriers to negotiation must be resolved in a

compassionate and mutually beneficial way which highlights both the positive and negative

economic implications for trade and development. Many argue that alternative programs can be

developed which address many of these concerns, but which do not have negative trade and price

distorting effects. As these seven attributes are present at all levels of development, solutions

must have application in both developed and developing communities and be adaptable to the

broad range of cultural and economic positions.

*Challenge*

Together, multilateral and bilateral avenues show great potential for moving agricultural trade liberalization forward if member states can commit to active participation in both realms. While the exact impact of trade liberalization on macro-economic measures like Gross Domestic Product varies widely, many simulations suggest that there are substantial effects on poverty reduction. Thus, the impact of subsidy reduction and elimination can prove to be a vital step in promoting global development, an aspect that may move to the forefront of most policy discussions. Further, the emergence of Non-Tariff Barriers to Trade, commonly known as Technical Barriers to Trade, must also be incorporated into the discussion, as these policies are often as trade-distorting as a direct production payment or price support, and show evidence of abuse as a means of by-passing agreements and commitments at both the bilateral and multilateral levels. New innovations in the trade arbitration and negotiations processes can also play a vital role in ensuring global economic justice in the agricultural sectors and work to enhance the ability of global bodies to adjudicate issues that lend to the impasse. Incentives must be provided for nations who take action to self-reform, and the mutual benefits and costs of eliminating trade-distorting agricultural support programs must be identified. Finally, there must a be renewed, emboldened course of action that creates innovative institutions and policies that can move the world's most essential industry to a structure that ensures access to basic commodities for all through safe production and at fair prices. We must find a solution to this impasse, and move forward as a global community to provide for a positive world future.

**Questions**

What can the United Nations do to assist in trade negotiations in external (non-system) bodies?

What lessons have we learned from the past that help us plan for the future?

What direction can be given to the Secretary-General of UNCTAD regarding agricultural subsidies negotiations?

How do we clearly define a system for identifying the impacts of agricultural subsidies?

What role does market access play in development?  In meeting the Millennium Development Goals?

Is payment decoupling really a step forward?

What are the economic impacts of subsidy removal on developed and developing nations? What incentives or disincentives are there for removal?

What non-market factors enter, or should enter, into the valuation process?

The following is a listing of "basics to know":
Is my nation a net-exporter or importer of food?  How might this position impact my stance on subsidies?

What position did my nation's government take in relation to each of the following:
- The Uruguay Round Agreement on Agriculture
- The 3rd UN Conference on Least Developed Countries in Brussels, Belgium
- The Doha Ministerial Conference
- The UN International Conference on Financing for Development in Monterrey, Mexico
- The World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg, South Africa
- The period between the start of the Cancún Ministerial Conference and end of the Geneva (2004) meeting
- The Paris (May 2005) pre-conference negotiations
- The Hong Kong Ministerial Conference
- The Geneva (2006) negotiations
- The Potsdam (2007) negotiations
- The Geneva (July 2008) negotiations

How does my government view special and differential (S&D) status?

Identify how economists quantify the trade-distortion of price-support mechanisms and income supplements.

The basics of supply and demand graphs and the relationship of subsidies to shifts and movements along these curves.

The basic notions of "social welfare", deadweight loss, "non-market valuation", and "comparative advantage" (please note this is NOT "competitive advantage", in economics there is no such technical term)

How does the agricultural subsidy question relate to development, and agreements on development, such as the Monterrey Consensus and the Johannesburg Declaration?

What is the relationship of the UN to the WTO?

What unilateral actions has my government taken related to domestic agricultural subsidies? Related to the subsidy negotiations?

How are prices like "signals" in the marketplace?


The following is a listing of suggested references:

International Economics. Carbaugh, Robert. Eight edition or later. South-Western College Pub.

*Stop the dumping!* Godfrey, Claire. Oxfam International, October 2002. Oxfam Briefing Paper 31

*Multilateralism and Regionalism: The New Interface.* United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, 2005. Editors: Mina Mashayekhi and Taisuke Ito. UN Publication Symbol: UNCTAD/DITC/TNCD/2004/7

*Liberalization of trade in agriculture: Issues and implications for Asian and Pacific developing economies.* (Conference Presentation) Mikic, Mia. WTO/ESCAP/ARTNeT Regional Seminar on Agriculture Negotiations for Asia-Pacific Economies, 29-31 March 2006, Xian, China

*Agricultural Trade Liberalization: Time to Close Windows of Exception.* Mikic, Mia. Asian-Pacific Trade and Investment Review. Vol. 2, No. 1, May 2006, pp 71-91

*International Trade Centre Annual Report: 2007.* April 2008. Available: www.intracen.org

*Agricultural Trade Liberalization and Poverty in Tunisia: Macro-simulation in a General Equilibrium Framework.* Chemingui, Mohamed Abdelbasset and Chokri Thabet. African Trade Policy Centre of the UN Economic Commission for Africa. Work in Progress No. 67. September 2007.

*Tackling Trade in Agriculture.* Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development. Policy Brief 00 2005 5N 1 P4. November 2005.

The Chair highly encourages delegates to also review a selection of those references cited within those listed above. Delegates are also encouraged to find common, general references at the following sites:

The World trade Organization: www.wto.org

The UN Conference on Trade and Development: www.unctad.org

The Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development: www.oecd.org


Delegates wishing to receive further assistance from the chair with preparation may contact him at entsming@unr.nevada.edu.

Second Committee

Reformation of the Bretton Woods Institutions and the Global Financial System

By Cassandra Shaft

## Overview

In order to understand the importance of the Bretton Woods Institutions (BWI's) within the global economic system and the United Nations, a brief history of how and why the institutions came to be will be provided first. The next aspect in determining future action is the examination and scrutiny of successes and failures of the BWI's in their sixty-year history. The last is the multitude of plans and proposals that have been made with regard to reforming the essential BWI's.

The Bretton Woods system was created in 1944 when delegates from 44 nations gathered at the United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference in Bretton Woods, New Hampshire. The conference produced an agreement establishing a postwar international monetary system of convertible currencies, fixed exchange rates, and free trade. To facilitate these goals, two international institutions were created: the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (the World Bank, WB). These institutions are the backbone of the global economy that was created by the world powers following the end of the Second World War While the goals of the two bodies were essentially the same their structure and manner of achieving said goals differed greatly.

This topic will focus on the IMF and the World Bank. However, it is important to recognize a third pillar of economic policy that was also created in the last days of World War II. During the Bretton Woods meeting, the creation of an International Trade Organization (ITO) to compliment the works of the IMF and WB was proposed. In 1946 the UN Economic and Social Council passed a resolution which gave birth to the ITO. Also, during the Bretton Woods meetings, plans were laid for the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). In 1947 there was an attempt to combine the works of the ITO with the GATT (GATT came into being that same year) but, due to the importance of the GATT in the world economy many felt that the GATT could not wait for the creation of the charter that ECOSOC called for in their 1946 resolution. The early application of the GATT, along with misgivings of states to trust an international organization with their trade relations, caused the ITO to become unnecessary in the eyes of the stronger economic countries and the idea of the ITO died out within the next decade. The GATT continued to the guideline for global trade until the World Trade Organization (WTO) was created in 1990.

Thus, GATT, and the idea of the need for an international organization to allow cooperation on trade and the elimination of trade barriers (later the WTO), were an important third part of Bretton Woods philosophy. Likewise, GATT, and later the WTO, were an integral part of the cooperative measures taken after World War II and during the Cold War to regulate the global economy. The WTO continues today as an important tool for states to foster cooperation on trade.

## **The World Bank**

The World Bank is essentially a cooperative of member states that act as shareholders who are represented by a Board of Governors. The Board of Governors is the ultimate policy

decision making body for the World Bank and its composition is made up of ministers of finance and development from a variety of member nations. The five main shareholders, France, Germany, Japan, the United Kingdom, and the United States, have consistent representation on the board along with 19 other executive directors. The Board meets twice a week to oversee the normal functions of the World Bank, such as approval of loans and guarantees, new policies, the administrative budget, country assistance strategies, and borrowing and financial decisions. All of these actions are done to meet the World Banks overarching objectives:

     1. Strengthen the Economic capacity of governments and educating their government officials

     2. Infrastructure Creation- "implementation of legal and judicial systems for the encouragements of business, the protection of individual property tights and the honoring of contracts.

     3. Development of Financial Systems- creating strong inter-governmental systems

     4. Combating Corruption

     5. Supporting Research, Consultancy, and Training- providing platforms for the research on development issues, consultancy, and conduct training.


     The funding for these projects comes from two primary sources. The first is the selling of bonds and the second is from the forty donor nations that replenish the banks coffer every three years. From these funds two types of loans are given: investment loans and development policy loans. Investment loans and for the support of economic and social development programs while development loans are for quickly disbursing funds to support countries' policy and institutional

reforms. The other form of financing is International Development Association (IDA) grants which are given with no necessity of repayment. These are given primarily for:

- Debt burden relief

- Amelioration of sanitation and water supply

- Support for immunization and vaccination programs

- Combating HIV/AIDS

- Supporting civil society organizations

- Creating initiatives for the reduction of greenhouse gases.


The World Bank is the international body that is depended upon for providing funds for the needs and development of the world's countries but it does not stand alone in its efforts as its sister organization within the United Nations system, the IMF, strives for similar goals.

### International Monetary Fund

The IMF, interestingly, was created with the intent that it would fulfill its role of assisting the global financial system recover after the end of WWII and then would be dismantled. Yet, as is evident by its continued existence and prevalence in global financial policymaking, this plan did not come to fruition. In a manner similar to the organization of the World Bank, the IMF is also held accountable by its Board of Governors, which is composed of representatives from its member states. Unlike the World Bank, however, the IMF's Board of Governors is composed of a governor from every one of its now 185 member constituency. Of these 185 there are there are twenty-four governors that sit on the IMFC or Executive Board that perform the day-to-day operations of the IMF. The main responsibilities of the IMF as outlined in Article I of the Articles of Agreement are as follows:

- promoting international monetary cooperation

- facilitating the expansion and balanced growth of international trade

- promoting exchange stability

- assisting in the establishment of a multilateral system of payments as well as making its resources available to members experiencing balance of payment difficulties.

Essentially, the IMF is responsible for promoting the stability of the international monetary and financial systems- "the system of international payments and exchange rates among national currencies that enables trade and financial transactions to take place between countries." The IMF relies on three main tools to meet this responsibility- surveillance, technical assistance, and, like its World Bank Counterpart, lending.

1. Surveillance is comprised of a multilateral system "under which the IMF provides periodic assessments of global and regional developments and prospects."

2. Technical Assistance, as well as training, is an option offered to member states and little cost to strengthen governments capacities to design and implement effective policies.

3. Lending, or financial assistance, is given in as a form of relief when member countries need time to correct balance of payment problems.

Like the World Bank, the IMF is dependent upon its member states for funding to accomplish its goals. The IMF functions under a quota system where every member contributes a certain amount depending upon its economic strength and size.

### The Bretton Woods Institution

Combined, these two Bretton Wood Institutions are major international entities working to maintain a thriving global economy and striving to encourage economic development in the world's struggling nations. However, reform of the existing BWI's has moved to the forefront of

discussion and debate in the international financial community. A few of the major reform issues include questions about the ability of the IMF and World Bank to continue to provide sufficient financial assistance, the terms of such aid loans, and the monetary unit in which the funds are dispersed. In addition, the reform debate has focused around creating increased accountability, transparency, and efficiency within the international monetary institutions.

In order to approach the topic of possible reform within the international monetary system there is one an area contention that needs to be understood. In terms of legality, the BWI's were created as sister or parallel organizations to the UN before the UN was officially established. As such, the bodies are not the direct control of the UN and thus any recommendations for changes in policies or in the actual organization of the World Bank can only be phrased as a recommendation of the UN body. This situation could only be changed by combined action by the General Assembly and the Security Council in activating Article 58 of the UN charter which would enable "the UN General Assembly to make recommendations for the coordination of policies and activities of Specialized Agencies (the category under which the IMF and World Bank fall)". This action would "reinvigorate Articles 57, 64, and 74" bringing all of the intergovernmental organizations of specialized agencies into a specialized agency relationship with the UN and put them under the coordinating role of the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC). Taking all of this into consideration, there are still a number of possible actions that can be taken by the Second Committee to encourage change within the current global economic framework.

The first option is that the Second Committee, which is the foremost body in the UN on economic policy, could present proposals for adaptations and changes to be made within the body to increase the effectiveness, transparency, and saliency of the World Bank and the IMF.

One of the most common criticism of the World Bank and the IMF is the unequal representation of the underdeveloped nations on the Executive Boards of the two bodies. This imbalance creates a polarity of information and of policy as the Boards as headed by the largest donors and contributors, which means that those who most require the funds have little-to-no say in how and under what conditions funds are dispersed. This situation was created by the method of eligibility and selection for Executive committees, which in the World Bank is based upon percentage of donor contributions, while in the IMF the quota system based on economic size make the determination. A proposal to make these decision making bodies more representative of all member states by means of mandate or selection reformation could have a significant impact of the effectiveness of the bodies in terms of dispersion of funds.

It should also be noted that donor states who are willing to contribute such a large sum of money to help other states, often assert their right to influence who receives money. For example, the U.S. has blocked funding of projects in Iran. Along the same line of thought, another problem surrounding the lending practices of the BWI's is the terms and conditions applied to any government receiving funds. One needs look no farther than the 40% jump in unemployment in Indonesia after the IMF required immediate government action after the Asian financial crisis in the late 1990s. While the IMF aided the government to stay in power, the average Indonesian suffered seriously because of the immediate drop in government support and services. These conditions range from social to governmental, an often prevent governments from qualifying for funds despite the desperate needs of their citizens, and often place the recipient countries under impossible deadlines. A new set of guidelines for qualification allowing aid to reach those in need and in accordance, change the method of measurement of progress for the loans could greatly increase their effectiveness.

Another issue is the massive debt that many developing states face. The IMF and World Bank are heavily criticized for either failing to alleviate this debt, or actually causing it through their activities. For example, the "Heavily Indebted Nations Initiative" of the IMF and World Bank has failed to reduce the debt carried by many African states. The Initiative was set up to help them repay the debts they incurred to develop, but instead, they are burdened with even greater debt being owed directly to the IMF and World Bank.

## Issue of Transparency

Transparency in the activities of the IMF and the World Bank are another area of concern. For example, IMF and World Bank funding has sometimes been used fraudulent (see Whistleblower article in references). In terms of the transparency, the IMF has succeeded in increasing the transparency reports of its relations with its member states to the point where more than three quarters of the IMF country reports are published. But, the concern is that the countries who refuse are the ones whose financial relations are most in need of scrutiny. Under current IMF guidelines transparency reports are not required in order to qualify for any of its programs, addressing this failure of oversight could impact not only the transparency of the organization but ensure the proper application of funds. The same logic and policy recommendations could be applied to the World Bank, which with increased transparency could allow for encourage faster repayment from loans and enable better decision making regarding loan applicants.

Beyond these policy and organization change recommendations for the pre-existing institutions, the United Nations could take other actions to influence the actions of the BWI's. Because of the lack of direct oversight, the United Nations rarely takes up matters that are handled by the World Bank or the IMF, and instead normally defers the issues to the

organizations themselves. If the UN, especially the Second Committee, were to take a more active approach in the discussion and recommendation of policies for currency exchange and development funds, it might create more of an interconnected system between the UN and its sister organizations.

The lack of transparency and oversight creates much unrest with underdeveloped nations. Because the global economy is driven primarily by states in North American and Europe, many underdeveloped countries see increased or total transparency and oversight as necessary actions the UN must take to improve the work of the BWI's. The creation of the Bretton Woods Project is an example of a reaction to this common thought. The Bretton Woods Project (BWP) has an oversight committee consisting of a large group of non-governmental organizations (NGO). However, the BWP was started by a group of British NGOs which may continue criticism from underdeveloped nations regardless of continuous updates and oversight by the BWP. Another problem for proponents of a non-western oversight on the BWI's is that the BWP is not directly controlled by the UN and therefore not under the direct influence of the UN and its member states.

The fact of the matter is that the UN has historically taken a back seat with regard to international development loans and international economic policy. This cannot continue as an increasingly interconnected world requires creative thinking and new ideas about the global economy as the post-war BWI's are failing to keep up with the rapidly changing needs of the international community. Now is the time for the United Nations to take action in either adapting the current system or creating a new one that can be crafted by the truly representative body of the UN.

**Questions**

Why do many underdeveloped states see the Bretton Woods Institutions as tools to control their state's economic prosperity?

In what ways and at what times have the Bretton Woods Institutions failed the contributing and receiving members?

Is the Bretton Woods Project a viable option to provide oversight of the World Bank and the IMF, and has the "project" been successful?

What approaches should be taken to reform these institutions while balancing the needs of the contributing and receiving members?

Should funding of the Bretton Woods Institutions be shifted to other developed states?

How are the Bretton Woods Institutions responding in the most current global economic crisis? Is there opportunity for reform within this process?

**References:**

Bank Information Center, <http://www.bicusa.org/en/Article.3512.aspx>. (US – World Bank funding not to Iran)

Bretton Woods Project, <http://www.brettonwoodsproject.org/project/about.shtml>.

ECOSOC Res. 13. UN Doc. E/22 (1946). (Creation of GATT)

Global Issues Article (critique of the World Bank and IMF) <http://www.globalissues.org/article/23/imf--world-bank-protests-washington-dc>.

Heavily Indebted Nations Initiative, <http://www.africaaction.org/action/hipc0206.htm>.

International Monetary Fund, < http://www.imf.org/external/index.htm>.

Whistleblower.com <http://www.whistleblower.org/doc/2008/Privatization%20and%20Corruption.pdf> (Azerbaijan and World Bank Corruption)

World Bank, < http://www.worldbank.org/>.

**Second Committee**

**Food Safety or Addressing Supply Shortages**

By: Olivia U. Maduka

The global food crisis has rapidly deteriorated in the past year. The severity of the situation is heightened by the fact that not just the poor countries are suffering from this, but many developed nations are being affected in some way or the other. The progress that was made in recent years – after hunger was put on as one of the focuses of the Millennium Development Goals – has been stalled and with the recent financial meltdown, many nations are finding it extremely difficult to handle the crisis.

Whether it is the food riots in the world's poorest countries like Haiti and Bangladesh or stores setting limits on the number of rice bags an individual can buy in the more developed nations, like the United States and the United Kingdom, the situation is fast becoming a global crisis. There is not a single factor driving the rising cost of foodstuffs; increase in the price of fuel, climate changes, social and economic inequality and increasing demand for meat and dairy products from rapidly developing economies are just some of the contributing factors to this situation.

For the past couple of years, rapidly increasing oil prices plagued the international community. Even before reaching a record of $147 per barrel, nations began to focus resources on alternative fuels. The increase in demand for biofuels greatly depleted the global wheat and maize stocks and drove up the prices of most agricultural products used as alternative fuels. The demand for grain for fuel has diverted a huge portion that would have normally gone to food stocks towards the production of ethanol and other biodiesels, industrial farmers in the US and European Union are being encouraged – with subsidies and tax breaks –to give up some of their

land for biofuel productions and all the financial speculation in grains have driven the prices up. Some reports actually claim that this trend for biofuels have forced global prices up by up to 75%.

Due to climate changes, natural disasters like floods, droughts, storms, and erosions have become increasingly rampant and are decreasing the amount of available land we have available for agricultural production. In June 2008 the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) conducted "High Level Conference on World Food Security: the Challenges of Climate Change and Bioenergy". The study predicts water shortage in the Mediterranean Sea basin, the western U.S., parts of southern African, and northeastern Brazil (2). These climate changes have intensified adverse effects on forests and water resources and by extension, the hundreds of millions of people directly dependent on them.

Many argue that the food crisis is an effect of unprecedented global growth which increased the demand for food. It is true that the hungriest people live in the nations with the fastest growing populations but a study conducted by Cornell University sociologists[i] found no evidence that rapid population growth. The populations of these poorer countries and the poorest 20% of the populations earned a smaller percentage of the countries' total income, had less to eat. So it was more poverty and inequalities that cause hunger. More so, according to the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) there is more than enough food in the world to feed everybody. Food production has actually increased steadily by about 2% each year for the last 20 years and the rate of population growth has dropped to 1.14% a year (3). So the issues are not about population growth but the pricing out of people from the food market. Due to social and economic inequality, a huge percentage of the world production is being consumed by the wealthiest few.

The decline in the value of the US dollar is another of the significant factors that can be traced to the crisis. Many agricultural commodity prices are listed in US dollars and as its value has declined in the past years so has the purchasing power of the developing countries whose currencies track the dollar. Only about 7% of the world's rice supply is exported because local demand and production are just about equal. So any significant increase in rice stockpiles decreases the amount available for export and thus the increase in price. Because such a small supply of rice is being traded, the shock from the weakening dollar was more than enough to double its price.

Economic growth in developing nations like China and India has also affected the food market. More people have been lifted out of poverty and can now afford to buy not just more food but imported food. These populations are shifting away from their traditional vegetables and grains and demanding more of the imported meat and dairy products. This is turn has increased the demand for corn (the food for the animals). The yield per acre being used for livestock breeding is much smaller than that being set aside as arable land.

Some other minor issues that have been traced as catalysts to the crisis are the displacement of people from their homes due to war and unstructured market reforms made by some countries. Displaced individuals who would otherwise have contributed to the agricultural productivity of their countries are unable to do so. In response to the threat of hunger, some countries responded by restricting exports or abolishing protective tariffs. These are unilateral decisions that may provide short term relief but in the long run add to the prevalence of the global price increases.

This crisis is a threat to all progress being made of the Millennium Developmental Goal, to eradicate extreme poverty and hunger. The UN has taken note of the seriousness of the

challenges caused by the escalation of food prices and recognized the need for the

Comprehensive Framework for Action (CFA) as put forward by the High Level Task Force

(HLTF) under the chairmanship of the Secretary General to address the crisis and its root causes.

The HTLF consisted of UN funds, specialized agencies, Bretton Wood's institutions, other

relevant parts of the UN secretariat. It is not a permanent fixture or as a reason to create new

mechanisms but a medium between stakeholders as they formulate initiatives to tackle the

problems (4).

This threat to global food security is multifaceted and will not be solved by unilateral

move made by individual countries. Delegates are charged with assessing the situation in the

context of their constituents and engaging in multilateral dialogues with fellow delegates to

determine the most effective and efficient ways to address the situation to achieve the benefits

across the board. Present international economic constraints, specific country contexts and the

CFA are to be considered when putting through resolutions.

**Questions:**

What causes food shortages?

What are the major aspects and players (UN leading officials and committees) of the food safety
and security?

In what way does climate change affect food security and how is the UN attempting to deal with
it?

How do biofuels and bioenergy create food shortages?

How is the global economy affecting food prices, safety and food shortages?

The FAO document "High Level Conference on World Food Security: the Challenges of Climate
Change and Bioenergy" is a comprehensive out line of what is happening and needs to be done
about food security, is this document the right way to approach food security or is it lacking in its
focus on the economics of the Global market?

**Sources:**

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations "High Level Conference on World
Food Security: the Challenges of Climate Change and Bioenergy" June 3-5 2008.
<http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/foodclimate/HLCdocs/HLC08-inf-1-E.pdf>

Frederick H. Buttel and Laura T. Raynolds, "Population Growth, Agrarian Structure, Food
Production, and Food Distribution in the Third World," in *Food and Natural Resources*,
ed. David Pimentel and Carl W. Hall (New York: Academy Press, 1989), 325-361.

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
<http://www.fao.org/corp/publications/en/>

Comprehensive Framework for Action, "High Level Taskforce on the Global Food Security
Crisis" July 2008 <http://un.org/issues/food/taskforce/Documentation/CFA%20Web.pdf>

**Fourth Committee**

**Implementing International Law Regarding Torture**

**By Thomas Elliott**

The international community has long condemned the inhumane practice of torture, yet despite numerous efforts, it remains a reality for prisoners of war or crime, voices of political opposition, religious or ethnic minorities, and even ordinary civilians throughout the world. Torture is a tool used by governments, militaries or other actors to extract information, demonstrate consequences of opposition, or to instill fear in individuals, communities and movements. Whether physical or mental, torture leaves residual trauma for its initial victims as well as entire families and communities. The Fourth Committee will work to strengthen existing institutions or develop new methods to implement and define current international laws, so as to more effectively prevent and punish acts of torture.

The creation of the Geneva Conventions and thereby contemporary International Humanitarian Law represented the first collective step towards ending torture and other forms of cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment during times of conflict. The Geneva Conventions are comprised of four separate conventions and three additional protocols, all of which govern the actions of States and Non-State actors during times of conflict (both international and internal).

The concepts reflected in the in 1949 Conventions were first conceived in 1864 when the newly formed International Committee of the Red Cross, with the help of the Swiss government, hosted a conference with delegates from 16 different states. The product of this conference is now known as the First Geneva Convention.

Over an eighty-five year period, the Convention developed through revisions, the

addition of several adaptations, and the passage of a Second Geneva Convention in 1929.

Finally in 1949, following the horrors of World War II, the four Geneva Conventions were

further revised and then ratified.

While the Geneva Conventions cover a vast array of issues in International Humanitarian

Law, they are especially important regarding torture. All four Conventions share a common

article prohibiting torture; however, the third convention, "relative to the prisoners of war," most

unambiguously prohibits the use of torture. It states that "No physical or mental torture, nor any

other form of coercion, may be inflicted on prisoners of war to secure from them information of

any kind whatever…"

Most importantly the Conventions explicitly identify torture as one of several "grave

breaches," which obligates signatories to prevent and punish acts of torture within their

jurisdiction.

In addition to the four Conventions, the additional protocols, which are similar to

amendments, are also important regarding the universal prohibition of torture. The first protocol

remains the most controversial because it grants the same rights as prisoners of war to what the

United States and other countries deem to be "unlawful enemy combatants."

The second protocol is also of importance as it allows for the Geneva conventions to

apply to internal conflicts rather than solely international conflicts.

While the Geneva Conventions represent Humanitarian Law's response to torture,

International Human Rights Law has its own reaction: the 1984 UN Convention Against Torture

and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. The distinguishing feature

between the UN Convention Against Torture and the Geneva Convention lies in the situations

where each is applicable. The Geneva Conventions only apply to times of international or

internal conflict, while the Convention Against Torture applies during times of conflict and peace, which creates a more complete legal prohibition of torture.

In addition to requiring states to ban torture within their own territory, Article 3 of the Convention Against Torture prohibits contracting parties from returning people to another state "where there are substantial grounds for believing that he would be in danger of being subjected to torture."

Another important detail lies in its attempt to define torture:

For the purpose of this Convention, torture means any act by which severe pain or suffering, whether physical or mental, is intentionally inflicted on a person for such purposes as obtaining from him or a third person information or a confession, punishing him for an act he or a third person has committed or is suspected of having committed, or intimidating or coercing him or a third person, or for any reason based on discrimination of any kind, when such pain or suffering is inflicted by or at the instigation of or with the consent or acquiescence of a public official or other person acting in an official capacity. It does not include pain or suffering arising only from, inherent in or incidental to lawful sanctions.

This definition, however, is plagued by ambiguity and is open to a multitude of interpretations. Therein lies one of the many problems facing both the UN Convention Against Torture and the Geneva Conventions: clarity.

While the International Community has succeeded in creating laws to prohibit torture, the problem now lies in ensuring respect for and implementing both the Geneva Conventions and the UN Convention Against Torture. Each has its own designated committee, which oversees its implementation and monitors compliance. The UN Committee Against Torture (CAT) is

responsible for monitoring the UN Convention Against Torture, while the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) is charged with supervising the Geneva Conventions. Before going into their responsibilities it is also important to define what each committee is. The CAT is a body of ten independent experts, which was created under Article 17 of the Convention Against Torture for the purpose of overseeing it. The ICRC on the other hand is an international non-governmental organization, which was responsible for creating the Geneva Conventions and was subsequently charged with their oversight.

Looking first at the Geneva Conventions, the ICRC is primarily tasked with advising states during their implementation and monitoring their compliance with the Conventions. First the ICRC provides an advisory service to help states in enacting necessary preventative duties such as: spreading knowledge of the Geneva Conventions, training qualified personnel to facilitate their implementation, the appointment of legal advisers in the armed forces, adopting legislative and statutory provisions to ensure compliance with International Humanitarian Law, and translating the texts of the Conventions.

Second, the ICRC also stresses that states must implement measures to halt and deter violations; these include "the obligation for the national courts to repress grave breaches considered as war crimes, the criminal liability and disciplinary responsibility of superiors, and the duty of military commanders to repress and denounce offences."

Third, the Geneva Conventions, in Article 126 of the third convention, grant the ICRC an enquiry procedure, or "permission to go to all places where prisoners of war may be, particularly to places of internment, imprisonment and labour."

This gives the ICRC the ability to oversee the compliance of nations especially regarding torture. Lastly if violations are serious and repeated, the ICRC reserves the right to take a public

stance.

Essentially, the ICRC can publicly condemn states for failures to prevent or halt "grave breaches" such as torture in an attempt to use international and domestic media publicity as a means to alter the government's behavior.

The UN Committee Against Torture monitors states' implementation of the UN Convention Against Torture in a fairly similar fashion. First, CAT requires that states submit regular reports on the status of their implementation through which it can evaluate the positive aspects, subjects of concern, and give recommendations to improve the state's program. Additionally, the committee may hear complaints from states, NGO's and individuals regarding "grave breaches" of the Convention Against Torture. Lastly, under the Optional Protocol of the Convention Against Torture, a Subcommittee on Prevention was created which can take these complaints and conduct "in-country inspections of places of detention… in collaboration with national institutions."

However, the Optional Protocol, and thereby the authority of the subcommittee to investigate, is not recognized by many of the signatories to the Convention.

In theory the Geneva Conventions and the UN Convention Against Torture would comprise a complete and total prohibition against torture, whether in times of peace or conflict; however, reality has proven otherwise. The next section provides a brief overview of some of the current problems hindering the implementation of the Conventions and the abolition of torture.

**Challenges:**

As with terrorism and many other issues plaguing the international community, torture lacks a clear, formal, and universally recognized definition. The ambiguity of current definitions

leaves room for states to define for themselves what constitutes "severe pain or suffering," and ultimately which acts amount to torture. The international community's efforts to suppress "grave breaches" of both the Geneva Conventions and the UN Convention Against Torture have been, and will continue to be, stifled by the lack of a commonly held and enforced definition.

The problems associated with the vague definitions of torture have manifested themselves in various forms. One explicit demonstration is the debate over Waterboarding and other controversial practices. Waterboarding simulates drowning and is used as a method to extract information via coercion. Waterboarding was invented during the Spanish Inquisition and has been used throughout history as a means of interrogating prisoners; today it has been widely publicized for its use in the "War on Terror."

A 2005 ABC News report described the act as such: "The prisoner is bound to an inclined board, feet raised and head slightly below the feet. Cellophane is wrapped over the prisoner's face and water is poured over him. Unavoidably, the gag reflex kicks in and a terrifying fear of drowning leads to almost instant pleas to bring the treatment to a halt."

Members of Human Rights Watch have referred to the practice as "mock execution" and claim that it is illegal under international law.

Additionally, in February 2008, former United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights Louise Arbour stated, "I would have no problems with describing this practice as falling under the prohibition of torture."

She further added that these violations of the UN Convention Against Torture should be prosecuted.

Perpetrators of this act maintain that it does not constitute "severe pain and suffering," and thereby does not constitute an act of torture under the conventions.

In addition to Waterboarding, the international community has become aware of clandestine facilities and rendition flights being used to transport and detain prisoners. Amnesty International defines renditions as "the transfer of individuals from one country to another, by means that bypass all judicial and administrative due process."

Essentially countries are capturing prisoners in war zones or domestically and then secretly flying them to prisons in foreign countries for detainment and interrogation. These secret facilities, titled "Black Sites" by the United States Central Intelligence Agency, are in multiple countries throughout the world and have held suspects of terrorism outside of the knowledge and surveillance of any organization capable of ensuring compliance with international law. Additionally, some detainees who have undergone the program have alleged that they were tortured while in the covert prisons.

Regarding secret and indefinite detention, "The UN Committee against Torture has determined that the uncertainty regarding the circumstances surrounding their loved ones' fate 'causes the families of disappeared persons serious and continuous suffering'" Also, Amnesty International states that, "incommunicado detention has been condemned by human rights bodies as a human rights violation that both facilitates torture, and constitutes a form of torture or cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment in itself."

While the legality of the detention centers and rendition flights themselves is in question, Professor Manfred Nowak, the UN Special Rapporteur on Torture, has also raised concern over the consequences they create. He primarily cites their ability to "[outsource] torture to third parties and [send] terrorist suspects to countries where there was a likelihood that torture would be used in interrogation."

Essentially, "Black Sites" and renditions can be used by states as a loophole to conduct

torture outside the jurisdiction of their own domestic anti-torture laws and outside the observance of bodies capable of ensuring that they respect international law.

Another challenge involves the use of torture during conflicts. While governments often condone or carry out torture, it is also used by non-state parties in conflict situations, which are difficult to address since neither governments nor other bodies such as humanitarian agencies or non-governmental organizations have access to the victims.

In summary, despite extensive efforts through International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights Law, the use of torture and the lack of effective means to punish those who carry it out remain major problems for the international community. The Fourth Committee will work to address these concerns and take steps to ensure that all actors respect International Law in regards to torture.

**Questions**

How can the International Community work to better define and create consensus on what acts do or do not constitute torture?

Are states that conduct acts of torture outside their own jurisdiction violating the conventions?

How can States be encouraged to punish those who have committed acts of torture?

What can be done to address the actions of non-state actors who commit torture?

Because current measures for implementation require that the State implement laws and punishments for "grave breaches," what can the international community do when states are the perpetrators of torture?

What is the appropriate role for UN bodies, regional organizations, NGOs, or other entities in addressing these issues?

**References**

"Challenges to the Absolute Prohibition of Torture." <u>University of Nottingham Podcasts</u>. 15 Dec. 2006. University of Nottingham. 21 Oct. 2008 <http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/podcasts/details/07_02_manfred_nowak.php>.

"Committee Against Torture." <u>Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights</u>. United Nations. 13 May 2008 <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cat/index.htm>.

"Convention (III) Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War. Geneva, 12 August 1949." <u>www.ICRC.org</u>. 12 Aug. 1949. International Community of the Red Cross. 13 May 2008 <http://www.icrc.org/ihl.nsf/7c4d08d9b287a42141256739003e636b/6fef854a3517b75ac125 641e004a9e68>.

Esposito, Richard and Ross, Brian. "CIA's Harsh Interrogation Techniques Described." <u>ABC News</u> 18 Nov. 2005. 14 Dec. 2006. <http://abcnews.go.com/WNT/Investigation/story?id=1322866&page=1>

"From the battle of Solferino to the eve of the First World War." <u>www.ICRC.org</u>. 28 Dec. 2004. International Community of the Red Cross. 15 May 2008 <http://www.icrc.org/web/eng/siteeng0.nsf/html/57JNVP>.

"International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights." <u>Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights</u>. 16 Dec. 1966. United Nations. 13 May 2008 <http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/a_ccpr.htm>.

"International Humanitarian Law: Answers to Your Questions." <u>www.icrc.org</u>. Oct. 2002. 13 May 2008 <http://www.icrc.org/Web/Eng/siteeng0.nsf/htmlall/p0703/$File/ICRC_002_0703.PDF!Open>.

"Optional Protocol to the Convention Against Torture." <u>Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights</u>. 18 Dec. 2002. United Nations. 14 May 2008 <http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu2/6/cat/treaties/opcat.htm>.

"Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts (Protocol I)." <u>www.ICRC.org</u>. 8 June 1977. International Community of the Red Cross. 13 May 2008 <http://www.icrc.org/ihl.nsf/7c4d08d9b287a42141256739003e636b/f6c8b9fee14a77fdc125 641e0052b079>.

Priest, Dana. "CIA Holds Terror Suspects In Secret Prisons." <u>Washington Post</u> 2 Nov. 2005. 7 Dec. 2006. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/11/01/AR2005110101644_pf.html>

Rosenberg, Mica "U.N. says waterboarding should be prosecuted as torture." <u>Reuters UK</u>. 08
    Feb. 2008. 17 Oct. 2008
    <http://uk.reuters.com/article/topnews/idukn0852061620080208?rpc=401>

"The Geneva Conventions: the core of international humanitarian law." <u>www.ICRC.org</u>. 19 Jan.
    2006. International Community of the Red Cross. 15 May 2008
    <http://www.icrc.org/Web/Eng/siteeng0.nsf/htmlall/genevaconventions>.

"Turning bad policy into bad law." <u>Amnesty International</u> 29 Sept. 2006 1 Dec. 2006.
    <http://web.amnesty.org/library/Index/ENGAMR511542006>

"UN Convention Against Torture." <u>Human Rights Web</u>. 25 Jan. 1997. United Nations. 13 May
    2008 <http://www.hrweb.org/legal/cat.html>.

"UN torture investigator blasts US White House defense of waterboarding." <u>International Herald
    Tribune</u>. 06 Feb. 2008. 17 Oct. 2008 <http://www.iht.com/articles/ap/2008/02/06/news/un-
    gen-un-waterboarding.php>.

"Universal Declaration of Human Rights." <u>www.un.org</u>. 10 Dec. 1948. United Nations. 13 May
    2008 <http://www.un.org/Overview/rights.html>.

"USA: Below the Radar: Secret Flights to Torture and 'Disappearance'." <u>Amnesty International</u> 5
    Apr. 2006. 22 July. 2008.
    <http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/asset/AMR51/051/2006/en/dom-
    AMR510512006en.pdf>

**Fourth Committee**

**Addressing Terrorism**

**by Elizabeth Sgarella**

"Terrorism has been on the international agenda since 1934, when the League of Nations took the first major step towards outlawing the scourge by discussing a draft convention for the prevention and punishment of terrorism."

The United Nations system has provided a framework for several international, multilateral and regional conventions as well as many successful summits. As terrorism has become an increasingly more pressing problem, the General Assembly has worked to coordinate its counter-terrorism efforts. The Security Council has passed several resolutions regarding counter terrorism and established several subsidiary bodies. Several of the United Nations agencies and programs have been reorganized to focus on specific operations to combat terrorism and further assist Member States in their fight against terrorism.

The most significant step taken to combat terrorism by Member States is the Global Counter Terrorism Strategy adopted on 8 September 2006 and formally launched on 19 September 2006. The Global Counter Terrorism Strategy is the first document where countries around the world have agreed on a common strategic approach to fight terrorism.

Since 1963, the global community has elaborated 13 conventions to prevent terrorist acts. These conventions were created under the advisement of the United Nations, agencies, and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). All Member-States may participate in the conventions.

The 13 Conventions are the following:

- Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 14 December 1973.

- International Convention against the Taking of Hostages, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 17 December 1979.

- International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 15 December 1997.

- International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 9 December 1999.

- International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism New York, 13 April 2005.

- Convention on Offences and Certain Other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft, signed at Tokyo on 14 September 1963.

- Convention for the Suppression of unlawful Seizure of Aircraft, signed at the Hague on 16 December 1970.

- Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation, signed at Montreal on 23 September 1971.

- Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, signed at Vienna on 3 March 1980.

- Protocol on the Suppression of Unlawful Acts of Violence at Airports Serving International Civil Aviation, supplementary to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation, signed at Montreal on 24 February 1988.

- Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, done at Rome on 10 March 1988.
- Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms Located on the Continental Shelf, done at Rome on 10 March 1988.
- Convention on the Marking of Plastic Explosives for the Purpose of Detection, signed at Montreal on 1 March 1991.

In 2005, the international community agreed on substantive changes to three of the 13 international conventions. "On 8 July of that year States adopted the Amendments to the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, and on 14 October they agreed to both the Protocol of 2005 to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation and the Protocol of 2005 to the Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms Located on the Continental Shelf." These changes made the conventions more relevant to modern threats of terrorism.

The 14th international treaty concerning terrorism is currently being negotiated. The working draft of the convention complements the existing framework set forth by the other 13 conventions on terrorism. It would expand upon principles in other anti-terrorist conventions including "the importance of criminalization of terrorist offences, making them punishable by law and calling for prosecution or extradition of the perpetrators; the need to eliminate legislation which establishes exceptions to such criminalization on political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or similar grounds; a strong call for Member States to take action to prevent terrorist acts; and emphasis on the need for Member States to cooperate, exchange information and provide each other with the greatest measure of assistance in connection with

the prevention, investigation and prosecution of terrorist acts."

The Security Council has been addressing modern day terrorism since the early 1990s. The Council has imposed sanctions on nations with links to certain acts of terrorism: "Libya (1992); Sudan (1996) and the Taliban (1999 - expanded to include Al-Qaida in 2000 by resolution 1333)."

Before the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the 1267 Committee, created in 1999 by Security Council resolution 1267, was a strong counter-terrorism tool.  The committee was comprised of all the members of the Security Council and was primarily tasked to monitor sanctions against the Taliban and later Al-Qaida.

After the 9/11 terrorist attacks on the US, the Security Council established the Counter Terrorism Committee, under resolution 1373.  Resolution 1373 requires Member States to "to take a number of measures to prevent terrorist activities and to criminalize various forms of terrorist actions, as well as to take measures that assist and promote cooperation among countries including adherence to international counter-terrorism instruments."

In more recent years the Security Council has created other counter-terrorism committees and working groups to address more specific problems.  Alongside the World Summit on 14 September 2005, the Security Council adopted Resolution 1624, which condemns "all acts of terrorism irrespective of their motivation, as well as the incitement to such acts."

The most crucial aspect of this resolution was that it "called on Member States to prohibit by law terrorist acts and incitement to commit them and to deny safe haven to anyone guilty of such conduct."

The General Assembly has acknowledged terrorism as an international problem since 1972.  The body addressed the issue in the 1970's and 1980's through resolutions.  In December

of 1994 the GA redirected its attention to the issue of terrorism by way of a Declaration on Measures to Eliminate International Terrorism, which resulted in the creation of an Ad hoc Committee on Terrorism in 1996.  Since the declaration the GA has been consistently addressing the issue of terrorism.

On 8 September 2006, as noted above, the General Assembly adopted the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy. The strategy is in the form of a resolution (A/RES/60/288) with an annexed plan of action.  It is "a unique global instrument that will enhance national, regional and international efforts to counter terrorism."

Jean-Paul Laborde, Chief of UNODC's Terrorism Prevention Branch said "When it was adopted in 2006 it was the first time member states agreed to a common strategic approach to fight terrorism, sending a clear message that terrorism in all its forms and manifestations is unacceptable." The strategy's Plan of Action is made up of four pillars: "Measures to address the conditions conducive to the spread of terrorism; measures to prevent and combat terrorism; measures to build state capacity to fight terrorism and to strengthen the role of the United Nations in combating terrorism; and measures to ensure the respect of human rights while countering terrorism."

The Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy recognizes a need for greater United Nations involvement in preventing and combating terrorism.  The only way the Strategy will be successful is if the global community works collectively to implement it.  It outlines tasks that each Member State must undertake individually; it is essential for member states to increase coordination and transparency in their fight against terrorism.  To promote international cooperation states must coordinate with regional organizations like NATO, the AU and EU to "identify and share best practices to prevent terrorist attacks on particularly vulnerable targets."

To gain this international cooperation, the United Nations must play a larger role in the international effort to prevent and combat terrorism.

The most recent discussions on terrorism took place on 4-5 September 2008 at a special two-day debate on the Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy held in New York.  In introducing the debate, Secretary-General Ban Ki Moon noted that "Two years ago, the General Assembly took a courageous step and boldly, with unanimous voice, said 'no more.'   One hundred and ninety-two Member States said we can, we must and we will do more to protect our citizens, and do it together."  He indicated that action should be guided by three main principles: First, being innovative in developing tools to address terrorism; second, carrying out multilateral counter-terrorism efforts in partnership with regional and subregional organizations and with civil society; and third, taking advantage of comparative strengths and the collective approach of the United Nations.

During the debate, sixty-seven speakers took the floor including representatives of the European Union, the Organization of the Islamic Conference, the Arab Group, the African Group and the Council of Europe.  In general they affirmed the important role the UN should play in coordination efforts and called for "institutionalizing the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force" that the Secretary-General had established in July 2005.  In addition, they noted that "full respect for values such as democracy, human rights and the rule of law constituted the most effective tool in countering terrorism in the long run.," and that "terrorism could not be linked o any specific religion, culture o ethnic groups, and that there must be a clear distinction between terrorist acts and the legitimate struggle for the right to self-determination."

Following the debate, Member States adopted, without a vote, a draft resolution entitled "The United Nations Global counter-Terrorism Strategy' (*currently listed as A/62/L.48*).  The

resolution reaffirms the Global Strategy and its four pillars, calls upon states who have not done so to consider ratifying the various conventions on terrorism, stresses the need to enhance cooperation, and called for interaction with the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force. This resolution builds on a previous resolution, "Measures to eliminate international terrorism" (A/RES/62/71) adopted during the 62$^{nd}$ Session of the General Assembly.

Thus, the United Nations has taken action against terrorism. It has elaborated conventions, adopted declarations and resolutions, and created committees to attempt to prevent and combat terrorism in it many forms. It has condemned and placed sanctions upon state sponsors of terrorism. While all of these actions have been taken the United Nations does not have an internationally agreed upon definition of terrorism. To better work as a global community with a common understanding, it would be prudent to clarify terrorism through the U.N. lens. While this fundamental term goes undefined, other questions go unanswered. How do we differentiate between a terrorist and a political prisoner? How are their rights different? What is considered harboring a terrorist? How is it prevented? How can we stop the flow of funds for terrorist activities? Can we afford to give up civil liberties in the fight against terrorism? Would addressing other issues, such as poverty, be a more effective approach to addressing the root causes of terrorism?

Delegates at the 59$^{th}$ session of MUNFW can explore these issues as well as discussing what additional steps might be taken to fight terrorism. In addition, they may want to consider what elements could go into a definition of terrorism, bearing in mind the complicating notion that "one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter."

Delegates may also wish to review recent UN documents related to this issue, most notably A/RES/62/71 on "Measures to eliminate international terrorism," A/62/L.48 on "The United

Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy," and the report of the Secretary-General on "The United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy: activities of the United Nations system in implementing the Strategy" (A/62/898).

Finally, while this paper has not focused on the issue, another significant concern is the impact of terrorism on its victims. Delegates might want to consider what can be done to mitigate the negative consequences of terrorism on the innocent civilians who are harmed by terrorist acts, both physically and psychologically. What should governments do to provide for their care or for the families of victims – medical assistance, psychological services, financial restitution, or other means of support?

## References

Department of Public Information, United Nations. "Counter-Terrorism Strategy." UN Action to Counter Terrorism. 2008. United Nations. <http://www.un.org/terrorism/strategy-counter-terrorism.shtml>.

Department of Public Information, United Nations. "General Assembly Actions, Resolution." UN Action to Counter Terrorism. 2008. United Nations. <http://www.un.org/terrorism/resolutions.shtml >.

Department of Public Information, United Nations. "International Instruments to Counter Terrorism." UN Action to Counter Terrorism. 2008. United Nations. <http://www.un.org/terrorism/index.shtml>.

Department of Public Information, United Nations. "Security Council Actions to Counter Terrorism." UN Action to Counter Terrorism. 2008. United Nations. <http://www.un.org/terrorism/securitycouncil.shtml>.

Department of Public Information, United Nations. Press Release GA/10735, 4 September 2008. "Intensified Effort to Implement UN Counter-Terrorism Strategy …"

Department of Public Information, United Nations, Press Release GA/10737, 4 September 2008. "In remarks to General Assembly, Secretary-General …"

Department of Public Information, United Nations. Press Release GA/10738, 5 September 2008. "General Assembly concludes two-day debate by renewing commitment to strengthen international cooperation in preventing, combating terrorism

U.N. General Assembly, 60th Session. Resolution 288 ["The United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy]" (A/RES/60/288). 20 September 2006.

U.N. General Assembly, 62nd Session. (A/RES/62/71) "Measures to eliminate international terrorism"

U.N. General Assembly, Special Debate on the Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy, 4-5 September.  (A/62/L/48) "The United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy"

U.N. Secretary-General. Report of the Secretary-General on "The United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy: activities of the United Nations system in implementing the Strategy" (A/62/898)

U.N. Security Council, 4385th meeting. "Resolution 1373 (2001)" (S/RES/1373). 28 September 2001.

U.N. Security Council, 5361st meeting. "Resolution 1624 (2005)" (S/RES/1624). 14 September 2005.

**Fourth Committee**

**Dismantling the Refuse of the Cold War**

**By Jacob Genzuk**

## Historical Background

In trying to understand the ramifications of the end of the Cold War, specifically those

pertaining to the refuse that exists in the form of weaponry, one must first attempt to understand

what led to the conflict in the first place. There are many differing theories about the origins of

the Cold War, but all seem to agree that the conflict can be broken down to a conflict between

two ideologies. As the historian S.J. Ball writes:

> On the one hand were those who believed that the world economic system was
>
> unavoidably capitalist and, to a lesser extent, that the preferred political system was
>
> liberal democratic. On the other side were those who had imbibed the lessons of the
>
> Bolshevik revolution of 1917: that states would be ruled by a small self-selecting
>
> revolutionary élite which could abandon capitalistic economic organization (Ball 1998,
>
> 1).

These conflicting philosophies were exemplified by an East-West division in Europe, and would

be primarily represented by the United States and the Soviet Union as the other "winners" of

Europe (France and Britain) slowly, but importantly, faded into the background of the conflict

(Gaddis 2005, 22).

In this hostile aftermath of the second Great War, the so-called Allied "victors" had

greatly differing views on the reorganization of Europe and her borders, especially in eastern

Europe along the Soviet borders. The views also differed on how to go about post-war security in

the increasingly unstable continent (Gaddis 2005, 13-23). The "western" views assumed that if

US-style governments could be successfully and widely established through the European theater, conflicting nations would be able to work through their disagreements peacefully with the help of international organizations such as the soon-to-be-created United Nations, based somewhat on the unsuccessful League of Nations that was created following World War I (Gaddis 1990, 156). The Soviets view, on the other hand, was highly dependent on the security of their borders (Gaddis 1990, 176). This grew out of the frequency with which their borders were invaded by the West in the previous 150 years, as well as the very large amount of damage that had been inflicted during both World Wars (Gaddis 2005, 7). Moscow found itself working to ensure that the new order of Europe's reconstruction would be committed to guaranteeing long-term security for the Soviet Union, and it sought to eliminate the chances of a government that was hostile to the Soviets from growing along the Soviet-western border. In order to do so, it found itself working to control neighboring governments (Gaddis 2005, 13-23).

As the years passed, the division in ideologies deepened and a general tension grew between the Soviets and the West, specifically the United States, prompting the adoption of a policy of "containment" of Soviet-leaning communism to the areas in which it was already in place (Kennan 1984). Essentially, instead of attempting to rid the world of communism (at least for the time being) the West would simply keep it from "infecting" anyone else. The Marshall Plan was an example of this, by attempting to "buy" a pro-Western realignment of Europe (Gaddis 2005, 32). This economic assistance to rebuilding the destruction of World War II led to a reactionary implementation of the Molotov Plan by the Soviets (LaFeber 1991, 194-197).

The development of fission weapons technology, which began during World War II as an Allied deterrent against what they feared was the same type of weaponry being developed by Nazi Germany, also led to deep, and potentially apocalyptic, tensions. This project, known as the

"Manhattan Project," was kept from the Soviet Union in the hopes that its own development would be hindered. Spies and informants, however, ensured the development of a Soviet sister project in secret, and the twin tests of the projects' fruits (the western test at Alomogordo, New Mexico on July 16, 1945, and the Soviet test on August 29, 1949) ensured that the political battle between east and west took on a decidedly military (and potentially horrific) tilt (Byrd 2003).

Not long after these tests, Mao Zedong's Red Army defeated the Kuomintang (the Chinese Nationalist Party), which was supported by the US. This led to a quickly formed alliance between the two communist governments of China and the Soviet Union (Gaddis 2005, 39). The US responded by expanding its policy of containment to Asia, Africa, and Latin America, often fighting against USSR-backed-and-funded communist governments (Gaddis 2005, 212).

Perhaps the most significant consequence of the expansion of the Cold War was the outbreak of the Korean War. While the Soviets and Americans had been fighting conflicts by proxy, this was the first time that American troops were actually used in a conflict (LaFeber 1991, 194-197).

Paired with the development of fission weapons technology came the development of long-range weaponry for the delivery of this technology. The need for the development of this technology, coupled with the desire to keep the appearance of such development under wraps, interestingly, led to the so-called "Space Race" between the Soviets and the US (Gaddis 2005, 142). In August and October 1957, the Soviets launched the world's first Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles (ICBMs), capable of carrying nuclear weaponry across the expanse of the Atlantic, under the guise of Sputnik and the Soviet space program (Lackey 1984, 49). This nuclear arms race eventually brought the US and Soviet Union to the brink of a nuclear war in the early 1960s. After creating an alliance with Fidel Castro in Cuba, the Soviets installed

nuclear weapons throughout Cuba, well within striking distance of many points in the US (Gaddis 2005, 76). The US responded with a naval blockade of Cuba in 1962, during what was called the Cuban Missile Crisis. Though this would bring the world closer to nuclear destruction than it had ever been before, it also showed both superpowers (and the world) that neither was ready nor willing to use its nuclear power in an offensive sense. This fear of retaliation led to a doctrine of mutually assured destruction, which kept both sides from acting for the rest of the Cold War period (Gaddis 2005, 80). This also led to the first real efforts toward disarmament, but was never more than a beginning to the process itself (Palmowski 2004).

Though tensions cooled very much following the Cuban Missile Crisis all the way up to the beginning of the 1980s, they lay dormant and waiting for a reawakening. This came in the form of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 (Gaddis 2005, 210). Ronald Reagan won the American presidency on promises of military spending and fighting Communism "everywhere," while British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher vowed to leave the "evil empire" on the "ash heap of history" (Gaddis 2005, 189-197). This did not last for long, however, as the Cold War was nearing its end. Mikhail Gorbachev came to power as the last head of state of the Soviet Union in 1985 and begin to initiate economic, political, and social reforms almost immediately (Gaddis 2005, 231-233). In November of that year, the Soviets began to make major concessions that would bring the war to an end. Reagan and Gorbachev agreed on a proposal calling for 50 percent reductions in each nation's nuclear arsenals (BBC 1985). Two years later, the two would again meet and agree to the Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces Treaty, which eliminated all nuclear-armed, ground-launched ballistic and cruise missiles with ranges between 500 and 5,500 kilometers and their infrastructure (INF 1987). The INF was the first agreement of its kind to reduce the total number of nuclear weapons since their invention (BBC 1985). The heated

tensions that had existed for so long, sharply declined in the second half of the 1980s, and in 1989 the Soviets officially declared that they would no longer get involved in the affairs of Eastern Europe (Gaddis 2005, 248). The next year, Gorbachev and Reagan's successor, George H. W. Bush, declared in Malta that the Cold War was over (BBC 1989).

**The Current Situation**

However, though the Cold War itself was over, its ramifications for the world continued well beyond the fall of the Berlin Wall and the reunification of Germany, from unexploded mines to abandoned or lost nuclear waste, and accidents that grew out of the projects of the Cold War.

Unexploded ordinance poses a major threat throughout the world. In their modern incarnation, landmines were first used for modern style warfare in the first World War, though not extensively. Their use grew more in the second World War, but it was not until the Korean and Vietnam conflicts that landmines gained widespread and offensive use in warfare. In fact, just in Vietnam, anti-personnel landmines accounted for as much as eleven percent of fatalities and fifteen percent of casualties experienced by the United States, as compared with less than four percent in World War II and Korea (Friesen and Roy 1999, ii). Currently, unexploded landmines and other explosive remnants of war still exist and endanger at least 78 countries, with the number of mines still emplaced in the ground between 45 and 50 million (Affairs 2001). This remaining ordinance is responsible for 15,000 to 20,000 injuries or deaths every year, and most of the victims are civilians (E-MINE LPDR). Cluster bombs also grew during World War II, and have evolved to be among the most deadly conventional weapons. They are produced by thirty-four nations, and in use by at least twenty-three. However, the problems arise when as many as ten to fifteen percent of the "bomblets" contained in the bomb fail to explode (with reported

failure rates as high as eighty percent) (Cumming-Bruce 2007). This can lead to heavy contamination of non-war zones. The Lao People's Democratic Republic has the dubious honor of being, per capita, the most heavily bombed nation in the world. As a battleground during the conflicts of the Cold War during the 1960s and 1970s, ground battles and bombing raids left the country full of unexploded ordinance in the form of both landmines and unexploded bomblets (E-MINE LPDR).

Many steps have been taken to help rid the world of unexploded ordinance, as well as to prevent further problems with it in the future. In 1997, the United Nations General Assembly created the United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS) to "support the UN's vision of 'a world free of the threat of landmines and unexploded ordinance, where individuals and communities live in a safe environment conducive to development, and where mine survivors are fully integrated into their societies.'" UNMAS serves as the focal point of mine action throughout the UN, and collaborates with thirteen other UN departments, agencies, programmes and funds to "ensure an effective, proactive and coordinated response to the problems of landmines and explosive remnants of war" (E-MINE UNMAS). UNMAS also works to help rid contaminated areas of unexploded bomblets from cluster bombs. Also in 1997, the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on their Destruction (also known as the Ottawa Treaty or Mine Ban Treaty) was signed, though it did not become effective until March 1999 when it received its fortieth ratification by nation states. The treaty is extremely comprehensive, completely banning all anti-personnel mines, and deals with mine use, mine production, mine trade, victim assistance, mine clearance, and stockpile destruction. As of March 2008, only thirty-seven nations remain completely outside the treaty, including the People's Republic of China, Russia, Israel, and the United States (icbl.org).

Though work on landmines has been in place for over a decade, and international legislation for just under that amount of time, it was not until May 2008 that legislation on cluster bombs was finally drafted. The Convention on Cluster Munitions was formally endorsed in Dublin, Ireland in May 2008, and will open for signing in December of 2008 in Oslo, Norway. The treaty prohibits the use of cluster bombs, and signing nations agree to "never under any circumstance" use, develop, produce, acquire, stockpile, retain, or transfer cluster munitions (Munitions 2008). However, as with the Ottawa Treaty, China, Russia, Israel, and the United States remain outside the treaty (Countries that have adopted the Convention on Cluster Munitions 2008).

With regard to nuclear weapons, a joint study in 1989 by Greenpeace and the Institute for Policy Studies found that an estimated fifty nuclear warheads and nine nuclear reactors lie on ocean floors because of accidents involving the American and Soviet militaries (Rosenthal 1989, 14). Other investigations and released documents have shown large losses of weapons and materials from both sides, though the US is far more open with the information that it releases. Radiation continues to leak from a lost American hydrogen bomb that fell off an American aircraft carrier south of Japan in 1965 (Kearl 2007). Between 1956 and 1965, the US completely lost five nuclear weapons (without their nuclear cores) off the Eastern coast of the United States and in the Pacific Ocean, and in 1956 also lost two weapons with nuclear components when a US aircraft completely disappeared over the Mediterranean (Dhanapala 2002). In the 1990s malfunctions with Soviet nuclear missile technology led to many missiles suddenly being switched to combat mode. And later that year the United States Federal Energy Department revealed that enough plutonium to manufacture seven nuclear weapons had escaped into air ducts at a weapons plant near Denver, making the area extremely dangerous (Kearl 2007).

These problems have not been left to simply fix themselves though. In 1973 the United

Nations Environmental Program (UNEP) created Earthwatch, a mechanism "to coordinate,

harmonize and catalyze environmental observation activities among all UN agencies for

integrated assessment purposes," in an attempt to allow UN agencies to work together to combat

environmental problems, such as nuclear waste (EARTHWATCH 2003). One of Earthwatch's

problem topics is radioactive waste, and more specifically, military waste problems. It is,

however, only one source of help. And as revelations about the cost and time needed to clean up

the leftovers of the Cold War ($375 billion and 75 years for the US weapons program alone

(Nuclear Legacy 1995, 11)), we can only hope that more help will come.

With so much danger left in the world as a result of conflict that defined the world's

international political climate for nearly half the 20th century, delegates to the Model United

Nations conference have much to discuss.

Questions for Discussion

Can the international community help promote a solutions or are actions by individual nations
the most affective approach to the problems?

Are the current international treaties working?

With the more militarily adept nations not being party to the international treaties on landmines
and cluster munition, can any progress really be made?

What more can be done by the international community to help keep nuclear accidents and the
loss of nuclear weapons from occurring?

How did the tensions that arose in Soviet-supported governments in Balkan states affect the
tensions between the East and the West?

How effective has the work of the fourteen UN organs which are part of "Mine Action and
Effective Coordination: the United Nations Inter-Agency Policy" been? What needs to change?
Who should pay for the cost of cleaning up the "refuse of the Cold War"?

References

1985: Superpowers aim for 'safer world'. November 21, 1985.
http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/november/21/newsid_2549000/2549897.stm
(accessed August 15, 2008).

1989: Malta summit ends Cold War. December 3, 1989.
http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/december/3/newsid_4119000/4119950.stm
(accessed August 15, 2008).

Ball, S.J. The Cold War: An International History, 1947-1991. London: Arnold, 1998.

Byrd, Peter. "Cold War." In The concise Oxford dictionary of politics. Oxford: Oxford
University Press, 2003.

Counties that have adopted the Convention on Cluster Munitions. 2008.
http://www.stopclustermunitions.org/the-solution/the-treaty/?id=84 (accessed August 16,
2008).

Cumming-Bruce, Nick. "Austria bans cluster munition." International Herald Tribune, December
7, 2007.

Dhanapala, Jayantha. "Nuclear Disarmament: Towards Securing a Global Future for Humanity."
Seminar on Nuclear Disarmament: Towards Securing a Global Future for Humanity. Dublin:
United Nations, 2002.

Friesen, Shaye K, and Roger L Roy. HISTORICAL USES OF anti-personnel LANDMINES:
IMPACT ON LAND FORCE OPERATIONS. Department of National Defense, Canada,
1999.

Gaddis, John Lewis. Russia, The Soviet Union, and The United States: An Interpretive History.
Columbus, Ohio: McGraw-Hill, 1990.

—. The Cold War: A New History. New York: The Penguin Press, 2005.

—. The United States and the End of the Cold War. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

—. We Now Know: Rethinking Cold War History. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

"Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces." Federation of American Scientists. June 1, 1987.
http://www.fas.org/nuke/control/inf/index.html (accessed August 15, 2008).

Kearl, Michael C. Nuclear Destruction - A brief history of Cold War nuclear developments, The
proliferation. 2007. http://www.deathreference.com/Me-Nu/Nuclear-Destruction.html
(accessed August 15, 2008).

Kennan, George F. American Diplomacy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Lackey, Douglas P. Moral principles and nuclear weapons. Totowa, New Jersey: Rowman &
Allanheld, 1984.

LaFeber, Walter. The Reader's companion to American history. New York: Houghton Mifflin,

1991.

Lao People's Democratic Republic. http://www.mineaction.org/country.asp?c=15 (accessed August 16, 2008).

Munitions, Diplomatic Conference for the Adoption of a Convention on Cluster. "Convention on Cluster Munitions." Dublin Diplomatic Conference on Cluster Munitions. May 30, 2008. http://www.clustermunitionsdublin.ie/pdf/ENGLISHfinaltext.pdf (accessed August 16, 2008).

New Scientist. "Nuclear Legacy." April 15, 1995.

Palmowski, Jan. "Cold War." In A Dictionary of Contemporary World History. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Rosenthal, Andrew. "50 Atomic Warheads Lost in Oceans, Study Says." New York Times, June 7, 1989.

Time Magazine. "Pas de Pagaille!" July 28, 1947.

United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS). http://www.mineaction.org/overview.asp?o=22 (accessed August 16, 2008).

United Nations System-Wide EARTHWATCH > About. July 4, 2003. http://www.un.org/earthwatch/about/about.html (accessed August 15, 2008).

What is the Mine Ban Treaty? http://www.icbl.org/tools/faq/treaty/what (accessed August 16, 2008).

**Right to Nationality: The Right to Have Rights**

By Keenan Jones

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) guarantees rights to all citizens of the world with 30 articles describing the qualities of life of which no person should be denied. Of all the rights offered in the document, Article 15 introduces a right which speaks to many peoples who have little or no representation within the United Nations. It states, "Everyone has the right to a nationality," and, "No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality nor denied the right to change his nationality." The term nationality has been confused among laymen with other legal terms such as citizenship and anthropological terms such as race and ethnicity. According to Helen Hartnell, a professor of law at the Golden Gate University School of Law, however, "nationality is the traditional international legal term that refers to the link between an individual and a state" (342). The contribution continues by explaining the constraints of international law when addressing individuals' rights to a nationality.

Due to the sacred notion of sovereignty in today's international political climate and that naturalization laws fall under each nation's jurisdiction, the enforcement of the right to a nationality has been diminished to nearly suggestion by the UN. Twenty years after the adoption of the UDHR, the UN published an assessment of its progress addressing the human rights offered in the UDHR. The publication addressed a study of statelessness and those without a nationality administered by the UN immediately following the adoption of the UDHR. To combat the statelessness uncovered by the study, the UN recommended two initiatives that would effectively terminate statelessness: "(a) every child must receive a nationality at birth; and

(b) no person throughout his life should lose his nationality until he has acquired a new one"

(24). Furthermore, the publication articulates the importance of self-determination regarding

human rights and nationality. It states, "One of the purposes of the United Nations, as defined in

Article 1 of the Charter, is to 'develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the

principle of equal rights and self-determination of people'" (35). The Declaration Regarding

Non-Self-Governing Territories, Article 73 of the UN Charter, extends the importance of self-

determination by stressing the need to protect non-self-governing territories which may not have

direct representation in the UN. The declaration also calls for the development of self-

government for those peoples who aspire to such political means.

 Although the significance of nationality and self-determination has been explicitly

outlined within the UN Charter and the UDHR, the world continues to face statelessness as a

growing problem. According to *The Economist* of December 1, 2007, the United Nations High

Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) found that the number of stateless persons increased from

2.4 million people to 5.8 million people in 2006 alone. The article claims that the UNHCR

underestimates the actual number and cites Maureen Lynch of Refugees International as

claiming the number closer to 11 million. Some estimates even reach 15 million. Furthermore,

the article discusses the main reasons behind the growing statelessness problem, stating:

> Some people become stateless because they are forced out of one country, and no other
>
> nation will accept them, or even grant them the rights which "refugees" – people who
>
> seek shelter because of a proven risk of persecution – can claim. Some people never leave
>
> home but find they are stranded by a shift in borders. Also ranked among the stateless are
>
> marginal groups who cannot claim civic rights because their births went unrecorded.

*The Economist* explains that the suggestions offered by the UN in 1968 in the published assessment of human rights have yet to be implemented. To address the enforcement of Article 15, the notion of nationality at birth must first be considered as well as the ease and possibility of acquiring or changing one's nationality. Secondly, the UN must determine the significance of self-determination in terms of nationality and its role in a sovereign world.

The notion of nationality permeates every aspect of an individual's life in addition to the well-being of a nation-state. Abbas Shiblak, a Research Associate at the Refugee Studies Centre at the University of Oxford, claims that possessing a nationality allows individuals the opportunity to collect on other rights. Specifically, "it is the right from which other rights and entitlements can flow – to education, medical care, work, property ownership, travel, state protection – in short, to full participation in a world composed of nation states" (Shiblak, 9). Without a nationality, individuals cannot claim any of the other rights in the UDHR because nations must ensure those rights, not the UN itself. The necessity of nationality extends beyond individual rights, however. According to Anthony Smith of the London School of Economics, "Nationalism provides the best soil, indeed the only proper soil, for a flourishing industrial civilization" (455). In order for a people to excel in today's globalizing world, people must be able to rally together beyond all other ties save a common nationality. The current global economy requires certain amounts of specialization within a national economy. This specialization allows for that individual nation to offer its specific goods or services to acquire other goods and services it may need. To achieve such specialization, however, the citizens of that individual nation must find a common characteristic. With differing ethnicities, religions, and cultures within countries' borders, only a national bond allows a people to thrive in the economically and globally driven ambiance on the international stage.

Although the UN and scholars alike have pinpointed the utter importance of nationality, multiple peoples continue to strive for the rights guaranteed in Article 15 of the UDHR. The most contentious people afflicted with the denial of such rights remain the Palestinians. Previously cited Shiblak offered a past, present, and predicted future chronicle of the plight of the Palestinians in his submission to the *Forced Migration Review*. Currently, "more than half of the eight million or so Palestinians are considered *de jure* stateless person" (8). This means that more than four million Palestinians hold either the "Refugee Travel Document" issued by an Arab country, a nationality of convenience (usually a temporary Jordanian passport), or a Palestinian passport issued by the Palestinian Authority (PA) but is only considered a travel document until the creation of a legitimate Palestinian state. None of these documents denotes nationality. Palestinians have such trouble acquiring a nationality for multiple reasons. The UN guaranteed a two-state compromise with the adoption of UN General Assembly Resolution 181 in 1947 with the Jewish and Palestinian peoples inhabiting present-day Israel. Following a string of armed conflicts, the Palestinians' nationality came into question because of Israeli success in the conflicts. According to the verbiage used by the UN in Security Council Resolution 242, the state of Israel acquired lands through war formerly inhabited by the Palestinians. Initially, Palestinians' nationalities were "left to the successor state, Israel, to determine entitlement to nationality" (8). Due, however, to long-time rivalries and wars over what is known as the Holy Land, Israelis wanted nothing to do with the offering of nationality to a people with conflicts with their own people. Furthermore, "if expelled from a country they are at risk of finding themselves in 'perpetual orbit' as stateless individuals" (9). They had been expelled from Israel, and no Arab nation wants to offer nationality either. To do so would initiate a mass flow of Palestinians within the borders of the nation offering nationality. Because "statelessness is a

major 'push' factor leading to large-scale irregular migration" (9), many Arab countries see mass influxes of Palestinian populations within their borders. The latter, however, seems to be the "lesser of two evils." Still, the Middle East and the entire globe have begun to see the negative outcomes of such a populous stateless people. "There is a wider awareness of the need to make the international refugee regime relevant for Palestinian refugees and to formally acknowledge the impacts of statelessness" (9). The Palestinians themselves have begun to acknowledge the impacts of statelessness first and foremost, beginning to recognize the need for a nationality to receive other human right. In fact, in July of 2005, Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas "welcomed the naturalization of Palestinians 'if any of the host countries choose to do so.' An opinion poll found most Palestinians agreed with him" (9).

The UN has taken an active role addressing the statelessness of Palestinians by participating in the Quartet on the Middle East, along with the European Union, the United States, and the Russian Federation. The creation of the Quartet in 2003 offered a Road Map to peace, which called for a two-state compromise by the end of 2008. Expected nonviolence from both the Israelis and Palestinians was never seen and that Road Map has been derailed. Parties of the Quartet, however, met at the end of 2007 at the Annapolis Conference to reaffirm the Road Map and the continuation of its plans for peace, overseen primarily by the United States ("Joint Understanding…"). Tony Blair, the current envoy to the Middle East under direction of the Quartet, has offered a new plan encouraging Palestinian control over a portion of the West Bank to foster economic interdependence between Israelis and Palestinians to cultivate nonviolent relations between the two factions and allow for a peaceful shift to a two-state system. He calls it "a mistake to think that politics can work without the reality on the ground" (Kershner, 11).

Based on the remarks by the President of the PA, however, it seems that the UN's focus should shift from the creation of a Palestinian state to the insurance of nationality for Palestinians.

The opinion poll of Palestinians showed that most valued nationality more than their own state. Many cultures, however, define their nationality by just that: culture. The remaining Palestinians may very well perceive their nationality the same, by culture, and therefore, they may continue to advocate for a state that encompasses all persons of the same culture. Similarly, elsewhere in the world, some cultures have taken "their regional Islamic culture as their new *national* identity" (Smith, 456). He cites Muslim Bosnians as the prime example, but Albanian Kosovars fit this assessment as well. If this assessment is generalized to address all ethnic minorities, one must remember that "the demographic makeup of these countries is anything but homogenous, in all cases compromising several regional ethnic groups within their borders" (Strakes, 87). Strakes denotes countries such as former Soviet republics. However, even Western nations succumb to the compromising of ethnic minorities, especially in a world made up of arbitrary borders perpetuated by colonial powers acting under the long since adopted Westphalian system. These ethnic groups, particularly those who adopt culture as their nationality, may seek to change their nationality, guaranteed by Article 15 of the UDHR, to one which suits their culture better. Before acquiring a nationality that suits them, they may sense a condition of "statelessness," especially if no nationality yet exists to appease their desires. Strakes addresses this condition stating, "This pervasive condition of 'statelessness' is particularly evident in nations in which governments or formal administration structures have been externally imposed or have largely been the purview of military or revolutionary elites, seizing power by force" (88). The colonial powers, working under the Westphalian system, did not take into consideration the importance and strength of ethnicity on an individual's sense of

identity. According to Smith, "ethnic affiliations and national loyalties fluctuate considerably, and change their meanings, according to the particular situations in which the individuals or groups find them" (453). Broadly, he claims there is a "fairly clear-cut distinction between *ethnie* and nation, and between ethnicism and nationalism." He continues:

> How clearly ethnicism has anticipated the ideals of modern nationalisms, how vital are the characteristics which *ethnie* share with nations as opposed to the traits they do not share – these are fundamental but unresolved questions to which there is no easy solution. (Since *ethnies*, in several senses of the term, survive very frequently into the modern era within or alongside accepted 'nations,' the question is not merely historical and academic: the survival of many 'state-nations' depends upon answers to it). (457)

Smith writes that this conflict of ethnicism and nationalism has occurred across the globe throughout history. Because of the importance of culture and the connections people feel with persons who share similar lifestyles, attitudes, and beliefs, ethnicism has generally trumped nationalism in the past and may continue to do so in the future.

Current trends, however, show a concentration of ethnic movements for nationalism in the Middle East and Central Asia. Strakes concludes his contribution to the *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs* by offering a glimpse into the future, which has become much more modern since 2006. He states "that in social orders such as the multi-national transitional states of Central Asia, popular mobilization of ethnically diverse populations will take form different from those familiar to classical nation-states as defined by Western European experiences" (97). Presently, the UN witnesses ethnic movements for the acquisition of, a change in, even the creation of a new nationality in the Middle East with the Palestinians and Kurds, in Eastern Europe with the Kosovars, and in Central Asia with the South Ossetians and Abkhazians of

Georgia. Ethnic movements for nationality permeate the entire globe, including the Americas, Western Europe, and Asia. The UN, however, has done little to facilitate the acquisition of those peoples' guaranteed rights in Article 15 of the UDHR and Article 73 of the UN Charter. Shlomo Avineri, a professor of political science at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, explains why many national movements are never recognized by declaring that "for a national movement to be successful, it needs geopolitical allies. National movements that lack them – for reasons of history, geography, or consanguinity – usually fail" (29). Within the UN system, the permanent representatives on the UN Security Council (UNSC) represent the necessary geopolitical allies for a national movement to succeed. Current national movements cannot convince all of the permanent members of the UNSC to support them, forcing the UN to remain impotent to enforce those individuals' right to a nationality.

**References**

Avineri, Shlomo. "Self-Determination and Realpolitik." Dissent (00123846) 52.3 (2005), 29-33.

Hartnell, Helen Elizabeth. "Belonging: Citizenship and Migration in the European Union and in Germany." Berkeley Journal of International Law 24.1 (2006), 330-400.

"It's tough to live in limbo." Economist 385.8557 (2007), 75-75.

"Joint Understanding Read by President Bush at Annapolis Conference." Palestine - Israel Journal of Politics, Economics & Culture 14.4 (2007), 120-121.

Kershner, Isabel. "Blair Unveils Proposals to Improve Life on the West Bank." New York Times [No Volume/Issue] (2008), 11-11.

Shiblak, Abbas. "Stateless Palestinians." Forced Migration Review no. 26 (2006), 8-9.

Smith, Anthony D. "Ethnic persistence and national transformation." British Journal of Sociology 35.3 (1984), 452-461.

Strakes. "Tools of political management in the New Central Asian Republics 1." Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs 26.1 (2006), 87-98.

*United Declaration of Human Rights*. Paris: United Nations, 1948.

*United Nations Charter*. San Francisco: United Nations, 1945.

*United Nations and Human Rights*. New York: United Nations, 1968.

**Suggested Readings**

Human Rights Council – official website: http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/
Human Rights Council Orientation Page – both UN and NGO documents:
      http://www.hrgoweb.org/council/
UN Road Map: http://www.un.org/media/main/roadmap122002.html
Other UN Resolutions on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict:
      http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2003/oct/22/israel2
UN Charter: http://www.un.org/aboutun/charter/
Universal Declaration of Human Rights: http://www.un.org/Overview/rights.html
United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo: http://www.unmikonline.org/
United Nations Observer Mission in Georgia: http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/missions/unomig/
Encyclopedia Britannica on Kurds:
      http://www.britannica.com/worldsapart/3_timeline_print.html
BBC News on Kurds: http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/218849.stm


**Questions**

How do the concepts of sovereignty and human rights interact with one another?

Which concept does the United Nations hold in higher regard: sovereignty or human rights?

Should the United Nations push for a nation or a nationality for the Palestinian people?

Does an individual's right to change his or her nationality include the right to create his or

her own nationality by creating a new nation utilizing self-determination?

• If so, how should the United Nations address the creation of new nations and new

   nationalities?

If not, how should the United Nations address those who believe self-determination and the

right to change nationalities allow for the creation of new nations?

Are the Kurdish peoples more in need of a nationality than the Palestinians?

Are these questions regional issues or does Article 15 of the UDHR affect all individuals of

the world?

**Human Rights Council**

**Duty to Protect**

*By Ben Schwarz*

Since the beginning of the United Nations in 1945, one of the main goals has been to promote peace. Not only was this peace intended between countries, but also inside each country. The atrocities of the Holocaust left the world with a tremendously well-documented case of genocide that shocked the world. How can the world keep this from happening again? The answer seemed to come to fruition in the form of Article 260A (III), the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (CPPCG) on December 9th, 1948. The CPPCG was aimed at defining genocide and found that:

...any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnic, racial or religious group, as such:

(a) Killing members of the group;

(b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;

(c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;

(d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;

(e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

- (CPPCG, Article II)

Article II gives a very detailed description of what genocide is. In later articles, the topic of punishment is articulated, as is a list of what crimes are punishable. It does not, however, evaluate the idea of preventing genocide.

The effectiveness of the CPPCG was also limited at first due to the fact that not all of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council signed on immediately. The Soviet Union ratified in 1954, the United Kingdom in 1970, the People's Republic of China in 1983, and the United States in 1988. This delay has hurt the application of Article 260A (III). Several atrocities were not addressed during this time period: The Australian abduction of the Aborigines, the Guatemalan genocide against the Mayan Indians, the planned murder of the Bengali intellectual, cultural, and political elite and the removing of the Hindu population by East Pakistan, the Khmer Rouge regime's slaughter of ethnic minorities, and the Ugandan genocide. Some of these cases are still currently in hearings attempting to bring charges against those who participated.

The concept of deterrence has little evidence to support the notion that past punishments can keep other countries clean. As Kofi Annan said in his report to the General Assembly in 2005, "If only two peace agreements had been successfully implemented in the early 1990s — the Bicesse Accords in Angola and the Arusha Accords in Rwanda — we could have prevented the deaths of almost three million people." These atrocities can be prevented. In the case of Rwanda it may have gone beyond the success of peace agreements. Report to the Commision on Human Rights by Mr. B.W. Ndiaye, Special Rapporteur, on his mission to Rwanda from 8-17 April 1993 outlined the human rights violations in Rwanda just a year before the genocide. Ignorance of reports like this may have contributed to the inability of the UN to prevent future violence and genocide.

Security Council Resolution 1366, passed in 2001, attempts to answer the question of prevention. The resolution suggested that any state could approach the Security Council with a potential small arms conflict involving a member state so that it could be properly investigated

by the UN. Also included are: increased communication about possible conflicts, preventative

force for conflicts, and increased UN awareness of necessary means to prevent conflicts.

Resolution 1366 begins to apply the concept of "duty to protect."

      Kofi Annan addressed the media in a press release on April 7th 2004 the tenth anniversary

of the Rwandan Genocide. In the press release Annan laid out a 5 step process on how to prevent

genocide and what the UN needs to work on and why. The steps included:

      1) Preventing armed conflict,

      2) Protection of civilians in armed conflict,

      3) Ending impunity through judicial action,

      4) Information gathering and early warning through a UN Special Advisor for Genocide

Prevention,

      5) Swift and decisive action.

Kofi Annan started working on the plan soon after he spoke in the press release. On 12 July

2004, the Secretary-General appointed Juan Méndez of Argentina as the Special Adviser on the

Prevention of Genocide. Outlined duties include:

(1) Collecting existing information, in particular from within the UN system, on massive and
serious violations of human rights and international humanitarian law of ethnic and racial
origin that, if not prevented or halted, might lead to genocide;

(2) Acting as an early-warning mechanism to the Secretary-General, and, through him to the
Security Council, by bringing to the latter's attention potential situations that could result
in genocide;

(3) Making recommendations to the Security Council through the Secretary-General, on
actions to prevent or halt genocide;

(4) Liaising with the UN system on activities for the prevention of genocide and working to enhance the UN capacity to analyze and manage information relating to genocide and related crimes.

In 2007, Francis Deng of the Sudan was selected by Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon to take over for Mr. Méndez as Special Advisor. Along with this appointment of Mr. Deng, the Secretary-General mentioned the possible addition of another advisor who would be focused on the responsibility to protect. This addition is needed to further the UN's investigative rights and its ability to head off potentially dangerous situations.

In the ravaged region of the now infamous Darfur, hundreds of thousands of helpless people have died. More than a hundred people die in Darfur each day. When a member-state is knowingly participating in or ignoring acts of genocide within the state it is the duty of the UN to protect the people of the world and promote peace. As outlined in the report "The Responsibility to Protect," by the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, "Where a population is suffering serious harm, as a result of internal war, insurgency, repression or state failure, and the state in question is unwilling or unable to halt or avert it, the principle of non-intervention yields to the international responsibility to protect." It is the responsibility of the UN to protect the people when a nation cannot help itself; the UN can prevent more deaths from occurring.

**Questions Discussion:**

What are the rights of sovereign nations and UN peacekeepers' rights in times of possible ethnic and other conflict?

What would the powers be of a potential Special Advisor on the Responsibility to Protect?

Is Kofi Annan's list on genocide prevention thorough enough to completely stop genocide, or was the former Secretary General off base with his conclusion?

How can Resolution 1366's ideas be expanded upon to protect against other forms of genocide (abduction, preventing birth, etc.)?

Are there other options not being looked at that could help prevent genocide? What potential areas could use development?

**References:**

"Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide." Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. 9 Dec. 1948. United Nations. <http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/p_genoci.htm>.

International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, ed. The Responsibility to Protect: The Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty. Ottawa: IDRC/CRDI, 2002.

"Office of the Special Adviser." Office of the Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide.2006. United Nations. <http://www.un.org/depts/dpa/prev_genocide/>.

Security Council. "Resolution 1366." 30 Aug. 2001. United Nations. <http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/undoc/gen/n01/524/48/pdf/n0152448.pdf?openelement>.

Stanton, Gregory H. "The 8 Stages of Genocide." Genocide Watch. 1998. <http://www.genocidewatch.org/aboutgenocide/8stagesofgenocide.html>.

Ndiaye, B. W. "Report by Mr. B.W. Ndiaye. Special Rapporteur, on his mission to Rwanda from 8 to 17 April 1993"

Annan, Kofi. "UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan's Action Plan to Prevent Genocide." UN Press Release: SG/SM/9197 AFR/893 HR/CN/1077, April 7th 2004. <http://www.preventgenocide.org/prevent/UNdocs/KofiAnnansActionPlantoPre entGenocide7Apr2004.htm>

**Human Rights Council**

**Protecting the Rights of Children: Child Trafficking, Labor, and Soldiering**


By Greg Doyle

In the summary of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees' (UNHCR) Executive

Committee Conclusion on Children at Risk the committee states that, "Children should be among

the first to receive protection and assistance."[1] It is important to understand the foundation that

children currently provide for the world. Stability and promise for the future always have been

commonly associated with children; a view that many still do not grasp or understand. This is

why children are exploited, used as tools in a global society that breathes greed; they are a source

of income while never seeing the fruits of their hard earned labor. Many work to support their

families, others for themselves or even their employers' gain. Child labor is a serious problem;

one that affects over 250 million children worldwide,[2] and 122.3 million in the Asian-Pacific

region alone. Most of these children living in rural areas are used in agricultural labor (around

69% of all working children), while many urban children work in trade and general services and

a small number work in the manufacturing and construction trades. These children do not receive

proper medical care, education, or even the most basic, normal childhood. The UK Committee

for UNICEF has concluded that poverty is the number one cause of child labor[3]. Many children

work to feed their families daily, often suffering terrible consequences. Some are confined,

---

[1]The UN Refugee Agency.org, "Summary of UNHCR's Executive Committee on Children at Risk," UNHCR,
&lt;http://www.unhcr.org/protect/PROTECTION/4868ada74.pdf&gt;.
[2] United Nations, "United Nations Cyber Schoolbus on Child Labour," United Nations, &lt;http://www.un.org/Pubs/CyberSchoolBus/briefing/labour&gt;.
[3]Global Issues.org, "Child Labor – Global Issues," Global Issues, &lt;http://www.globalissues.org/article/62/child-labor&gt;.

beaten and reduced to slaves. Many are abducted and forced to work, while others are denied the freedom of movement and are confined to the boundaries of their workplaces, not allowed to visit their families.[4] Tragic is the only word that can describe this horrific practice; it is a device that destroys families and the children that have been forced to work. Many of the children participating in child labor often see accelerated effects of arthritis, disease, and other ill effects of prolonged fatigue and overwork. In addition, a practice of homework is common, a method of increasing productivity beyond the workplace where a child is given materials to work on at home[5]. It is the child's responsibility to return those products within the following day or two, or the child faces punishment.

Steps are being taken to improve the situation for children around the world. Many organizations, including the International Labor Organization (ILO) and the United Nations, are working tirelessly to eradicate this issue worldwide, but it is clearly seen that the issue will not be resolved any time soon. In 1989 The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) called for a convention with specific concern for children's rights. What emerged from the convention was the ratification of the Convention on the Rights of the Child that gave rights to children under the age of 18. The convention allowed for the protection of the international community in situations when intervention was necessary. It was a major step towards giving children the proper upbringing and the opportunities to succeed in a growing world. Only two member nations have not ratified the document, the United States and Somalia (which presently does not have a

---

[4] Human Rights Watch, "Human Rights Watch- Child Labor," Human Rights Watch, <http://hrw.org/children/labor.htm>.
[5] Socialist Worker, "Child Labor," Socialist Worker.org, <http://socialistworker.org/2004-2/500Supp/500S_20000707_ChildLabor.shtml>.

recognized government).[6] Perhaps an even more important document pertaining to the rights of

children is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights set forth by the UN General Assembly on

December 10, 1948.  According to Article 4 of the Declaration, "No one shall be held in slavery

or servitude; slavery and the slave trade shall be prohibited in all forms." Article 5 states; "No

one shall be subjected to torture, or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment of punishment."

Article 25 cites that children are entitled to the same social protection as the rest of their family;

while Article 26 cites that everyone has a right to an education and that parents have the choice

of how their child will be educated.[7] It is known that overcoming child labor requires an in-depth

understanding of the factors that force children into inappropriate forms of work, as well as

effective interventions suited to each unique cultural and economic environment. Because the

problem of child labor is complex, most United States Department of Labor and ILO projects

employ multiple interventions that are integrated with one another and aimed at creating

solutions that fit every situation as close as possible. Of course, the objective of each project is

the removal of children from the worst forms of child labor, but further interventions are needed

to ensure that children and their families have meaningful, consistent alternatives that keep

children from returning to hazardous and oppressive labor situations.

The United States has "consistently been documented as the largest donor to the

International Labor Organization's fight to eliminate child labor and trafficking. Since 1995, the

US has provided over $255 million in aid."[8] Efforts to combat child labor gained momentum in

---

[6] UNICEF, "Convention on the Rights of the Child," UNICEF,
<http://www.unicef.org/crc/index_30160.html>.
[7] The United Nations, "The Universal Declaration of Human Rights," United Nations,
<http://www.un.org/Overview/rights.html>.
[8] United States Department of Labor, "United States Department of Labor- Youth &
Labor – Child Labor Statistics,"
<http://www.dol.gov/dol/topic/youthlabor/childlaborstatistics.htm>.

1999 with the adoption of ILO Convention 182 on the Worst Forms of Child Labor[9]. The

convention identifies the worst forms of child labor, which includes bonded labor, drug

trafficking, prostitution, and other work that pose serious threats to children's health, safety, and

well being. The convention also "requires that ratifying governments take immediate and

effective measures to eliminate these forms of child labor in their countries. As of March 2005,

153 countries had ratified it, making it the fastest ratified convention in the ILO's 82-year

history."[10]

> According to the US government

> Even before passage of Convention 182, the United States, among many
> other countries, had begun taking important steps to eradicate child labor. The
> U.S. Department of Labor's (USDOL) International Child Labor Program (ICLP)
> was created in 1993 to investigate and report on child labor around the world.
> Over the years, ICLP's expertise in global child labor issues has expanded, and its
> area of activities has increased exponentially. The ICLP specializes in child labor
> related research and intervention techniques. Awareness raising within the United
> States about global child labor has also become an important part of the program.

> Perhaps the most dramatic results have been achieved through the US
> Department of Labor's International Technical Assistance Projects. Since 1995,
> ICLP has funded more that $400 million in technical assistance projects in some
> 70 countries to rescue and rehabilitate children from the worst forms of child
> labor and provide them with educational opportunities.

---

[9] ILO – Caribbean, "ILO Convention No. 182: Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention. 1999," <http://www.ilocarib.org.tt/childlabour/c182.htm>.

[10] America.gov, "Telling America's Story" < http://www.america.gov/st/hr-english/2008/August/20080818001144SrenoD0.8041651.html>.

It has been shown that many countries wish to resolve this issue; many are concerned with its effect on their economy and its effect on how their country is viewed worldwide. [11]

Second, the use of children as soldiers is an abusive and dangerous practice that is linked with unjust labor by children. Often kidnapped, these children are forced to fight in conflicts that many of them do not even comprehend what is being fought for, if anything. It is estimated that 200,000 to 300,000 children are serving as soldiers for both rebel groups and government armed forces involved in armed conflict. They are put into the front lines of combat, serving as human mine detectors, participants in suicide missions, spies, and messengers or lookouts. These children are intimidated the moment they are captured; due to this constant intimidation, they are very cooperative soldiers. If the children are not captured, many current child soldiers join their groups out of desperation due to the breakdown of society in their homes, or even the loss of their entire families.[12] The main countries that have been identified as contributors in the child soldier practice are as follows:  Angola, Burma, Burundi, Colombia, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Lebanon, Liberia, Nepal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan and Uganda. Though child soldiering has entered the political and global stage thorough various forms of media, it is still a major problem within warring countries. Civil war brings out the most violent tendencies in people, and child soldiering is no different. Fear turns to thirst for many of the children; it has been documented that a high percentage of children suffer from Post-Traumatic Stress Syndrome from either the constant feeling of

---

[11] ibid.

[12] Amnesty International USA "About Child Labor," Amnesty International, <http://www.amnestyusa.org/children/child-soldiers/about-child-soldiers/page.do?id=1021176&n1=3&n2=78&n3=1270>.

fear, or the fighting itself. Refugee camps are set up in many places of conflict for former

child soldiers; but until the problem is resolved at its roots, it will not be entirely stopped.

This has resulted in many resolutions from the Security Council in recent years

condemning the use of child soldiers; most notably Resolutions 1539 and 1612, which

call for a mechanism for observing armed conflict and preventing the use of child

soldiers within areas of conflict. In addition, the landmark Optional Protocol (to the

Convention on the Rights of the Child) was created in 2000 and came into force in

2002.[13] The Protocol stipulates that states are obligated not to target children in conflicts,

to guarantee that children are not used as soldiers in conflict, and to provide bi-yearly

reports on the measures taken to implement the protocol.

Finally, child trafficking involves the recruitment, transportation, transfer, receipt or

harboring of a child for the purposes of sexual or labor exploitation. It is estimated that over one

million children are involved in trafficking worldwide. Both genders are trafficked, promised

false education, professional training, paid employment and more opportunity. They are moved

from border to border under life threatening conditions only to be abused by their employers

when they arrive at their destination.[14] Human trafficking is prohibited under international law.

In addition, further action has been taken under the umbrella of the Convention of the Rights of

the Child to focus on the special concerns of child trafficking and the vulnerability of children.

The "Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, on the Sale of Children,

Child Prostitution and Child Pornography" requests an increase in public awareness, prohibits

---

[13] Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict, <http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu2/6/protocolchild.htm>.

[14] UNICEF "Child protection from violence, exploitation, and abuse – Trafficking and sexual exploitation," UNICEF – Unite for Children, <http://www.unicef.org/protection/index_exploitation.html>.

the sale of children, as well as child prostitution and pornography, and the creation of domestic laws to prosecute and punish those who engage in these illegal activities.[15]

Though many see the two prior issues as more important priorities, child trafficking still is a very powerful method of contracting unknowing children into practices that they do not agree to. Those who subject children to such labor reap large profits from trafficking, and its leaders seek to expand its trade to accumulate more profit. Identifying methods of transportation can dramatically decrease the practice of child trafficking. It can furthermore be slowed by providing ways of detecting and prohibiting the methods of transportation from being used.

These issues cannot be solved tomorrow, but identifying the main bodies of aid, and establishing an effective method of intervention and solution will be instrumental in solving the issues that involve children today. The future and the world thrive on youth. It is time that the world recognizes that fact and takes charge of its future as a global community.

## Questions

How do nations with a past history of child labor, trafficking or soldiering practices react to accusations of wrongdoing? Also consider how those nations should be addressed and be held accountable for their past actions?

What further steps can be taken to encourage all states to ratify the Convention on the Rights of the Child and its Optional Protocols?

Why do nations (some being accepted members of the international community) accept these practices within their country?

Though many children work out of desperation to help their families, are there better ways to address a family in need from an international citizen's perspective?

Should the United Nations with the assistance of other organizations such as the ILO be the

---

[15] Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, on the Sale of Children, Child Prostitution and Child Pornography <http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu2/6/crc/treaties/opsc.htm>.

focal point for greater protection of children, or should states be encouraged to change their domestic laws? How can and should this be done?

Useful Internet Sources in addition to the footnotes above:

www.unicef.org –The United Nations Children's Fund

www.amnestyusa.org – NGO

www.dol.gov - The US Department of Labor

www.ilo.org - The International Labor Organization

www.hrw.org - Human Rights Watch

www.globalissues.org

www.unhcr.org – The UN High Commissioner for Refugees

**UNEP**

**Global Warming and its effects on Potable Water**

**By Ian Costello**

*"All regions of the world show an overall net negative impact of climate change on water resources and freshwater ecosystems. Areas in which runoff is projected to decline are likely to face a reduction in the value of the services provided by water resources. The beneficial impacts of increased annual runoff in other areas are likely to be tempered in some areas by negative effects of increased precipitation variability and seasonal runoff shifts on water supply, water quality, and flood risks."*

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2007

Potable water is earth's most precious and limited resource. Today, increasing quantities of water are being removed from the water cycle's regular rotations for the purposes of agriculture, drinking, industry, and development. Increasing concentrations of greenhouse gases in the Earth's atmosphere from the burning of hydrocarbons, deforestation, and many other sources prevent heat from escaping into space, thus increasing the temperature of the earth's atmosphere; this process is also known as the "green-house effect" (USEPA), global warming or climate change.

The "green-house effect" not only affects the general quality of the air but has global implications, especially where the water, or hydrologic cycle, and water resourcing are concerned. Global warming has had profound negative consequences on the delicate water

cycles in recent years. The hydrologic cycle is the process by which water moves through the earth as ice, liquid water, or vapor. Water precipitates as rain or snow and can be locked in ice, settle into the ground for plants or ground water reservoirs, or become part of a river or lake to feedback in to the ocean to be evaporated again. According to the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), "An increase in net solar radiation or temperature will effectively speed up the process within [the hydrologic] cycle (evaporation, condensation, precipitation, etc.)." The USEPA also notes that the quicker process does not mean increased rainfall for the earth. In fact, "It is difficult to predict future changes in regional precipitation patterns. Predicting regional changes in streamflow and groundwater recharge due to climate change also remains challenging particularly because…of how precipitation may change."

Higher temperatures due to global climate change negatively impact the amount of total water in the hydrologic system and therefore, usable water. Evaporation, the process by which water goes into the air, is increasingly becoming a major factor in potable water loss. Simply, if water is not on the ground in liquid form it cannot be used for drinking. Glaciers and icecaps, according to the United States Geological Survey (USGS), hold 68.7% of earth's fresh water. High temperatures lead to higher melting rates. With higher rates, runoff water moves quickly to be lost to the salty ocean water, instead a slow melt which allows for a more constant water flow and the continual filling of reservoirs. In addition, lack of development combined with untimely melts and rainfall means that countries in the most desperate need to store water to last a dry season lose that advantage as their reservoirs and water storage facilities are limited and are already at capacity. Developing countries, such as those in Africa have "developed only 3.8% of its water resources for [human] supply, irrigation, and electrical power," according to the *Water Resources Development in Africa* report.

Water shortage will have a major impact on the growing price of food worldwide. Southern Spain's water supply is dwindling. Even the usually wetter regions of northern Spain are feeling the impact of the water shortage and cannot practically send water to their Southern neighbors. Spain is already experiencing a strengthening black market due to the lack of usable fresh water for crops. In reaction to the water shortages, Spain has taken steps to ration water for farmers and developers. Since water rationing began, hundreds, if not thousands of illegal wells have dotted the south of Spain, extracting what little ground water is left and fueling the illegal markets. Spanish farmers already too poor to afford the costs of farming cannot easily buy water from the black market. As it becomes increasingly impossible for farmers to find water to grow their crops, it becomes difficult to keep up with global demand. With less supply, and ever-increasing demand for food, prices are expected to increase. Because of these extended droughts, lands that used to be "marginally" farmable have become completely exhausted. "Africanization" is a common term used to describe southern Spain and the northern Mediterranean geography, as it transforms into an arid landscape.

"Environmental refugee" is a term coined by Lester Brown of World Watch. Dr. Norman Myers explains that the term refers to, "people who can no longer gain a secure livelihood in their homelands because of drought, soil erosion, desertification, deforestation and other environmental problems, together with associated problems of population pressures and profound poverty." Environmental refugees are becoming increasingly common in Africa. As a result, the Millennium Development Goal (MDG) benchmarks are being pushed back. In Africa, competition and territorial disputes over water resources have become exceedingly common, leading to growth of the population of environmental refugees and internally displaced peoples. The New York Times argued that, "the battles of yesterday were fought over land…Those of the

present center on oil. But those of the future – a future made hotter and drier by climate change in much of the world – seem likely to focus on water."

At an expo in Zaragoza, Spain, Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon stated that the most important way to combat this issue is to look to the Millennium Development Goals and "raise awareness of the need to strengthen water-resources management." He went on to note the limited progress made on water resourcing based on the MDGs and stressed the importance of continuing to develop and achieve the goals, "using the latest knowledge, science, and technology."

International cooperation on water as a resource has come a long way since the first UN Conference on Water in 1977. The four World Water Forums have also delved more deeply into the issue. The ministers at the fourth World Water Forum in 2006 in Mexico "reaffirm[ed] the critical importance of water, in particular freshwater, for all aspects on sustainable development, including poverty and hunger eradication, water-related disaster reduction, health, agricultural and rural development, hydropower, food security, gender equality as well as the achievement of environmental sustainability and protection. We underline the need to include water and sanitation as priorities in national processes, in particular national sustainable development and poverty reduction strategies." Of importance as well is the designation of the International Decade for Action "Water for Life" (2005-2015), and the World Water Development Reports (first in 2003, second in 2006) in raising awareness of the urgency to address water as a fundamental problem for all humanity.

In addition, the International Conference on Freshwater (ICF) in 2001 in Bonn Germany, focused the attention of the world on strategies to increase freshwater and connected their recommendations to the upcoming World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg

in 2002. Sustainable development and water resources are directly related and should be addressed by measures such as "governance, mobilising financial resources, and capacity building and sharing knowledge" (ICF 2001). It is through coordinated activity from UN organizations such as the UN secretariat, UNEP, ECOSOC and UNESCO (United Nations Education, Science and Cultural Organization) that progress is being made on this issue. For example, a major step forward is the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and its subsequent reports on the effects of climate change on water, and the possibilities of adaptation.

In addition, some governments have already taken steps to study the issue to best mitigate the effects of global climate change. Individual governments such as the United States and Spain have engaged studies of their own situations. The US report, The Effects of Climate Change on Agriculture, Land Resources, Water Resources, and Biodiversity in the United States, pointed out a significant strategic problem: the ability to reasonably detect changes in order to counter the affects. The NY Times report on the study noted "that the country's capacity to detect climate shifts, and related effects was eroding, and budgets and plans for long-term monitoring of air, water, and land changes - both on the ground and from satellites - shrank." This exposed a gap in the country's policy to best predict the impact of water shortages in the different regions of the US.

Several ideas of how to best limit the effects of global warming and its impact on usable, drinkable water have been put forth. An Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) discussion paper gives a variety of strategies to reduce the impacts of drought. "Careful crop rotation…in drier years," and a new technology called, "cloud seeding," are among the strategies put forth in this discussion paper that tackles major developmental and environmental issues. These strategies have the potential to become frontline defenses against the growing issues that loom

over a great percentage of the world.

**Questions**

How vulnerable is your state to the reduction of potable water? How responsible does it perceive itself to be for climate change?

What can or should UN bodies and Member States do to raise awareness of the problem of safe drinking water?

What role should UNEP, UNDP, financial institutions such as the World Bank or the IMF play in addressing this crisis?

Is there a role for NGOs or civil society and if so what is it?

What programmes can be established to assist developing countries and others preserve or enhance their supply of potable water?

Where should funding come from for such programmes?

What steps can be taken with regard to countries that are contributing excessively to the problems of climate change and the decrease in supplies of potable water?

In cases of scarce supplies of water, who should have priority in access to these supplies?

Since some of the problems related to climate change and water supplies are regional in nature, is there a role for regional organizations in addressing these issues?

**References**

Ban, Ki-moon. "Secretary-General in Remarks at Expo Zaragoza, Stresses Need to Tackle existing Challenges, Emerging Threats in Meeting Global Water Sanitation Goals." Expo. Spain, Zaragoza. 22 Oct. 2008.

Bernstein, et al., Lenny. Climate Change 2007: Synthesis Report, Summary for Policymakers. Rep.No. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

ENS. "Global Warming Will Make Water Crisis." Environment News Service. 22 Mar. 2006. Environment News Service. 22 Oct. 2008 <http://www.ens-newswire.com/ens/mar2006/2006-03-22-01.asp>.

Goffman, Ethan. "Environmental Refugees: How Many, How Bad?" CSA Illumina. June 2006. ProQuest. 22 Oct. 2008 <http://www.csa.com/discoveryguides/refugee/review2.php>.

IPCC, section on freshwater and climate change <http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-

report/ar4/wg2/ar4-wg2-chapter3.pdf>

Miller, Kathleen, National Center for Atmospheric Research,
&lt;http://www.isse.ucar.edu/water_climate/impacts.html>.

Revkin, Andrew C. "New Climate Report Foresees Big Changes." <u>Nytimes.com</u>. 28 May
2008.The New York Times.22 Oct. 2008
&lt;http://www.nytimes.com/2008/05/28/science/earth/28climate.html?sq=&st=nyt&scp=38
&pagewanted=print>.

Rosenthal, Elisabeth. "In Spain, Water Is a New Battleground." <u>The New York Times</u> 2 June
2008.

UN. "Millennium Development Goal Report." <u>MDG Report</u> (2007): 22-25.

UNESCO, &lt;http://www.unesco.org/water/wwap/milestones/index.shtml>.

US EPA. "Water Resources." <u>Climate Change</u>. 02 Apr. 2004. United States Environmental
Protection Agency. 22 Oct. 2008 &lt;http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/effects/water>.

US GS. "The Water Cycle: Water Storage in Ice and Snow." <u>USGS.gov</u>. 13 Aug. 2008. United
States Geological Survey. 22 Oct. 2008
&lt;http://ga.water.usgs.gov/edu/watercycleice.html>.

Vastag, Brian. "Warming May Cause Widespread Water Shortages, Studies Say." <u>National
Geographic News</u>. 21 Nov. 2005.National Geographic.22 Oct. 2008
&lt;http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/pf/66722603.html>.

UNEP

"Protecting the Atmosphere"

*by a Western Oregon University Alumni*

The earth's atmosphere is composed of numerous gases that blanket the earth's surface providing an environment for life as we know it. The five layers of the atmosphere are necessary to protect and to preserve all living matter on the surface. In a way the planet itself breathes these gases through chemical reaction with organic matter on the surface and absorption by the ocean, as well as the discharge of gases by wildfires or from the earth's core such as by volcanoes. Most of the gases in the atmosphere are considered natural, or part of the natural process of the earth emitting and absorbing gases. However, some human activities can tip the natural balance of gases at different levels in the atmosphere. Human actions such as the production of energy, food, and travel can have devastating effects on the atmosphere. In addition, pollutants released from one state can easily travel through the atmosphere to other states around the world creating transboundary problems.

What happens when the composition of the atmosphere changes? It depends on when and where different gases are released into the atmosphere. The United States, Russia and China have launched rockets carry people, equipment and satellites high into the top layers of the atmosphere. The U.S. Space Shuttle brings chemicals directly to upper levels, e.g., the thermosphere, of the atmosphere with every launch. Airplanes fly in the stable stratosphere but release gases including carbon dioxide and water vapor directly into this level, rather than them rising through natural processes. The burning of fossil fuels in the form of natural gas, coal and combustion engines releases carbon dioxide and monoxide, and nitrogen oxides, among other

pollutants into the area. Some chemical manufacturing releases volatile organize compounds (VOC) that combine with other chemicals to create ozone, a potent and highly damaging air pollutant, in the troposphere, the layer in which humans live and breath. Chlorofluorocarbons and halons released in manufacturing and coolants rise to the stratosphere, and through chemical reactions bind with ozone molecules. The loss of ozone at this level of the atmosphere has reduced a gas that was responsible to block a large percentage of harmful ultraviolet (UV) rays from entering the earth's atmosphere and destroying organic matter on the earth's surface (also known as the ozone layer). The odd connection is that ozone emitted from human industrial practices at the earth surface in the troposphere creates a terrible air pollutant that damages living matter, while ozone is necessary in the stratosphere to block UV rays.

While some powerful efforts have been taken to reduce air pollution which will be discussed in a moment, air pollution is increasing in many areas of the world. According to UNEP

> It is estimated that more than 1 billion people are exposed to outdoor air pollution annually. Urban air pollution is linked to up to 1 million premature deaths and 1 million pre-native deaths each year. Urban air pollution is estimated to cost approximately 2% of GDP in developed countries and 5% in developing countries. Rapid urbanisation has resulted in increasing urban air pollution in major cities, especially in developing countries. Over 90% of air pollution in cities in these countries is attributed to vehicle emissions brought about by high number of older vehicles coupled with poor vehicle maintenance, inadequate infrastructure and low fuel quality. (UNEP – Urban Air Pollution 2008).

In the 1960s the Germans began to notice that their cherished Black Forest was dying and

the Scandinavian states began to investigate the death of fish in lakes. People in other states in Europe noticed as well that historic buildings were literally melting away. Discussions began to determine the cause of the changes, and then meetings were held to address the ways to prevent the transboundary pollution. Industrial activities such as the burning of coal releases compounds from fossil fuel that are acidic, e.g., sulfur dioxide mixes with water to become sulfuric acid. The acidic chemicals are deposited to the ground as dust, or mix with rain and/or snow and fall to the earth's surface. Increasing the acidity of water and soil can burn organic matter and wear away non-organic matter such as churches and monuments. The changing pH of lakes means that flora and fauna may be unable to reproduce or may have offspring that are genetically damaged. The impacts can have devastating impact on the production of crops as well as all organic matter requires specific pH levels.

The recent Olympics in Beijing demonstrate another difficulty with addressing air pollution. What exactly is air pollution and how do you measure it? Different states use different measurements, and include and count different sized particulates. The Chinese when presenting the level of air pollution in Beijing during the Olympics did not include "carbon monoxide, ozone or respirable suspended particulates" (Bialik). Many developing states are unable or unwilling to measure and adjust their economies to eliminate air pollutants. Even developing states differ on pollution. For example, the United States uses the Air Quality Index (U.S. Government). The European Union uses the CAFE Initiative (Clean Air For Europe) (Europa Environment).

However, China, as the UNEP notes, is the first developing state to host the Olympics. Some argue that it is more difficult for a developing state to shift its resources and economy to address air pollution. Yet, China has more stringent car emission standards than the U.S. and

implemented many measures to create a cleaner, more energy efficient infrastructure to host the

Olympics. In addition, "the current frenzied focus is marked by a modicum of amnesia - air

pollution was a major concern in Los Angeles 24 years ago. Indeed few can forget the dramatic

scenes at the end of the women's marathon when the Swiss competitor was seen staggering and

stumbling under the weight of heat and perhaps air pollution exhaustion. Air quality was also an

issue for the subsequent games in, for example Atlanta, Barcelona, Seoul and Athens" (UNEP,

Press Release 2008).

In addition, air pollution is created and impacts regions of the world in different ways.

For example, the states of Europe learned that much of their air pollution came from other states

so they had to work together to reduce air pollution. Coal power plants in the northeastern United

States send acid deposition to the eastern regions of Canada. Mercury emissions from China land

on the western U.S. and Canada.

Where the emissions land can also make a difference. If the air pollution lands on organic

matter or water resources such as snow packs or lakes, then it can be more damaging. Air

pollution in major cities, as noted in the UNEP quote above, is harming humans more and more.

The GEO-2000 Global Environment Outlook report by UNEP discusses the rise of air pollution

in Asia and its devastating impact on respiratory health, and increase of human mortality. Finally

it presents five different scenarios for the Asia-Pacific region to reduce air pollution. The choice

then becomes, what is valued more. Economic growth leads to higher standards of living and

better health, but at some point, the positive increases are tipped backwards by the damage to the

atmosphere (GEO 2000).

Responses

How then have we tried to combat air pollution?  Most causes of air pollution are found

on the local level. Yet the pollution rises up to encircle the earth and affect all living beings. One need look no farther than the impact of Chinese air pollution on Japan, and even further away on the west coast of the United States where mercury levels are rising in snow packs due to Chinese industrial activities (Oregon Ecology 2008). How can states change the behavior of other states to reduce air pollution? When does the problem become such that states will care? What can the United Nations do to bring these changes? Several effective examples are found on the regional, international and local levels.

First, some states have been cooperating on the regional and international level. For example, the Europeans broke the ground in finding international agreement to combat air pollution by creating the Convention of 1979 of Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution (LRTAP) to reduce acid deposition (LRTAP 1979). Further negotiations on this treaty have resulted in eight new protocols as well as the addition of states outside of Europe including the United States and Canada. In addition, the European Union (and formally the European Communities) has continued to recognize the need to address air pollution and has produced several initiatives including the CAFE Initiative listed above and their more recent Sixth Environment Action Programme (EAP 2002).

There are numerous international agreements that deal with specific pollutants such as VOCs, Persistent Organic Compounds (POCs) and CFCs (for a list see the U.S. State Department). Additionally, some states have also made bilateral agreements to reduce air pollution including the 1991 U.S.-Canada Air Quality Agreement. Japan and China have been in negotiation to reduce Chinese air pollution that drifts over Japan (Voice of America 2007).

Second, local steps can be taken as well with countries implementing laws to create cleaner energy and possibly alternative energy sources that do not contribute to air pollution.

Some states are seeking cleaner coal technology, placing equipment on coal plant smoke stacks that remove or capture the air pollutants, or finding new ways of igniting the coal that produces less emissions. In addition, some states are implemented taxation plans (taxing the emissions of some pollutants or giving tax breaks for those who pollute less) and some are using regulations or laws to control the amount of pollution. Others are promoting wind, solar, hydro and biothermal energy sources that do not produce air pollution. One troubling problem though is to prevent the alternative sources from create new environmental damages of their own. For example, building a dam over a river will reduce the air pollution of a state; however, the dam will have a negative impact on the ecosystem of the river. Likewise, nuclear energy as long as it is used carefully has a limited environmental impact, except when there are limited facilities to store the spent fuel. Access to nuclear technology can also threaten measures to reduce the spread of nuclear weapons.

Another alternative could be to reduce the need for energy. Economic growth is bound by the amount of energy that can be produced and transmitted to vital production areas. As economies around the world grow, more energy sources are imperative. Look no farther than China's search for fossil fuel resources. Trade and tourism are major producers of air pollution. Ships emit air pollutants as do aircraft that carry tourists around the world. Very few people are willing to give up the growing connections and prosperity provided by increased economic globalization. Yet, at what point does economic growth imperil the survival of all living beings? Can we have economic growth and maintain environmental quality? In addition, as air pollution is a transboundary problem, why should one state bear the financial cost of reducing its air pollution in order to protect another state? Can all states bear these same costs? Should developing states be held to the same standards as developed states?

**Questions**

How should air pollution be reduced? Who should reduce? When and where? Who will pay for it?

How much air pollution does your state create? How does it measure and count air pollution? What pollutants does it include and not include?

How does air pollution impact your state? Is your state more or less vulnerable to air pollution?

What local initiatives has your state taken to reduce air pollution? regional? international?

Is it possible to have economic growth and environmental quality? How and when?

How can one state convince other states to reduce their air pollution?

**Resources (see References as well):**

European Union        <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/air/quality/links.htm>

United Nations Environment Programme (resources on many subtopics and many press releases – see for example < http://www.unep.org/Search.asp?cx=00705937965475526521l %3Ajkngxjgnyii&cof=FORID%3A11&q=air+pollution#1321> [accessed 08-23-08].

United States, Environmental Protection Agency   <http://www.epa.gov/ebtpages/air.html>

**References:**

Bialik, Carl "Beijing's Murky Pollution Numbers" <http://blogs.wsj.com/numbersguy/beijings-murky-pollution-numbers-392/> [accessed 08-10-08]

EAP 2002, <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/newprg/index.htm> [accessed 08-23-08].

Europa Environment, CAFE Initiative  <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/air/index_en.htm>.

GEO 2000, Alternative Policy Study: Reducing Air Pollution in Asia and the Pacific <http://www.unep.org/GEO2000/aps-asiapacific/index.htm> [accessed 08-23-08].

LRTAP 1979 <http://www.unece.org/env/lrtap/lrtap_h1.htm> [accessed 08-23-08].

Oregon Ecology, "Mercury Drifts from Chinese Coal Plants in Oregon Rivers" 07/07/2007, <http://www.oregonecology.com/2007/11/mercury-drift-from-chinas-coal-plants.html> [accessed 08-23-08].

UNEP Press Release 2008 <http://www.unep.org/Documents.Multilingual/
    Default.asp?DocumentID=543&ArticleID=5891&l=en> [accessed 08-08-08].

UNEP – Urban Air Pollution <http://www.unep.org/urban_environment/issues/urban_air.asp>
    [accessed 08-06-08].

U.S.-Canada Air Quality Agreement, 1991, <http://canada.usembassy.gov/content/textonly.asp?
    section=can_usa&subsection1=environment&document=environment_airquality>
    [accessed 08-01-08].

U.S. Government <http://www.airnow.gov/index.cfm?action=static.aqi> [accessed 08-23-08].

U.S. State Department <http://www.state.gov/g/oes/env/c21836.htm> [accessed 08-23-08].

Voice of America, 2007, "Japan Seeking China's Cooperation to Cut Air Pollution"
    <http://www.voanews.com/english/archive/2007-09/2007-09-25-
    voa5.cfm?CFID=35652901&CFTOKEN=39090577> [accessed 08-23-08].

<div align="center">

**UNEP**
**Biofuels and food production**

by Michael Maeda

</div>

**<u>Introduction/ Main issues</u>**

Since the discovery of fire, biofuels, the use of organic materials to provide heating, lighting and motive power, have been one of the most dominant sources of fuel worldwide. Today, according to the most current studies done by the UNEP, all forms of biomass together provide about 14% of the world primary fuel supplies, and represent about 80% of the global renewable fuel supply. In some developing countries the share of biomass is as high as 90% of fuel supply, with the use of traditional biofuels for cooking and heating prevailing. The transport sector is often considered the world's largest single source of fuel use with almost a quarter of the world's fuel demand being serviced by fossil fuels. Due to the growing demand from the transport sector and increasing oil prices, liquid biofuels, such as ethanol and biodiesel, which require little or no change to today's vehicles and infrastructure, have strong potential as near-term alternative fuels. However, there is a dual need for sustainable, environmentally sound fuel and sufficient food to field the world. The challenge is how to maintain a balance between fuel and food.

The term biofuel encompasses many different forms of fuel that can be used to replace fossil fuels. Ethanol, Biodiesel, and Straight vegetable oil (SVO) can be used in a mixture form (gasoline blended with ethanol, and then Biodiesel, SVO blended with diesel, might require preheating) in the transportation sector, and with diesel generators. With the use of these many different options, slight engine modification may be required. With Ethanol the pure form comes from sugar cane, sugar beets, and corn among others, then using a process of fermentation, distillation and dehydration, ethanol is produced. Biodiesel and SVO both use oil from rapeseed ,

soy beans, palm jathropha, mustard and waste vegetable oil; then using a process of filtering of oil and transesterfication the fuel is produced. Biogas (methane) is also a viable source of fuel for the transportation sector derived from manure, solid waste and water waste, with fuel being produced from the digestion or fermentation of organic matter, and then used in the transportation sector, electricity generation and thermal combustion.

What the issue is at hand is the need for a sustainable fuel source that would be next in line to replace fossil fuels. The appeal of the replacement biofuel is mainly being forwarded with the world's transportation sector in mind with the realization that the days are numbered for crude oil and petroleum, and the problems that emerge from dependency created by importing crude oil and petroleum. Presently, the world is virtually dependent on oil for the whole transportation sector. This reliance on oil importation brings to light the vulnerability to supply disruption and oscillation of prices. It is a matter of energy security to limit reliance on imported oil and be self sufficient in terms of energy. Currently, the prices of crude oil have put a strain on the budgets of many states world wide. Therefore, the use of locally produced biofuel, would have a very high potential to reduce dependency and take the strain off the oil budget of a state and localizing access to energy.

Among other drivers for biofuel, climate change plagues our generation with the environmental sins of our ancestors. The plants grown as feedstocks for biofuel production absorb carbon from the atmosphere; combustion of the biofuel simply releases the $CO_2$ previously absorbed by the plant. As a result, biofuels have potentially far lower well-to-wheel greenhouse gas emissions than fossil fuels. However there are many pitfalls that can lead to much higher than optimal greenhouse gas emissions from biofuels. The final result depends on the methods used for growing crops, converting crops to final fuel, and the end-use efficiency.

Carbon dioxide is one of the major greenhouse gases. Although the burning of biodiesel produces carbon dioxide emissions similar to those from ordinary fossil fuels, the plant feedstock used in the production absorbs carbon dioxide from the atmosphere when it grows. Plants absorb carbon dioxide through a process known as photosynthesis which allows it to store energy from sunlight in the form of oil. After the oil is converted into biodiesel and burnt as fuel the energy and carbon is released again. Some of that energy can be used to power an engine while the carbon dioxide is released back into the atmosphere.

**Past Policies**

Policy instruments have been and are still necessary to help overcome barriers to the development of and investment in the biofuel sector. Policy instruments used over the past two decades have focused mainly on addressing economic barriers. To date biofuels are not as economically viable as compared to fossil fuels range from blending requirements, tax incentives, research and development support, to the creation of biofuel compatible infrastructure and technologies. The economics of biofuel production are site and situation specific, and each country and even location will produce different results. But no country has been able to launch a domestic biofuels industry without active government support. Brazil, for example, started its sugar cane-alcohol programme in 1975, and the programme has evolved over the past 30 years, with successes and failures of the industry. After having been heavily subsided in its early days, the ethanol industry is now recognized as an efficient sector with substantial economic benefits due to employment opportunities, reduced oil bills, and export potential says the latest article from the World Health Organization.

Food production must also be calculated into policy instruments. In early 2008 Ban Ki-Moon spoke out about the problem of a food shortage. Some of the food shortage is tied to the

over use of cash crops for fuel purposes. The World Food Program ties this to the use in over 30 states through out Asia and Africa that have yet to balance this problem. Despite large investments going into the biofuel sector, in rural areas in developing countries financing is a daunting problem at all levels: government, small-scale enterprise, and households. Governments with their Official Development Aid (ODA) and International Finance Institutions can play a critical role in providing financing and taking actions to help reduce financial risks. Another policy approach could focus on the need for establishing a biomass trade market to benefit both importing and exporting countries. This could also help to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and diversify the fuel mix of importing countries, and offers a stream of additional income and job creation for exporting countries. Significant agricultural subsidies for crops such as maize and soy in the US and EU artificially lower the grain prices, making it more difficult for developing countries to compete in the world market.

The use of local biofuels in rural Africa has been researched and the economic and environmental success rates were very high. The most appropriate crop in this region appears to be Jatropha as it is suitable to the specific climatic conditions, gives a good yield per hectare, requires the least investment and maintenance, and can be grown both as hedgerow and through intercropping with other crops. It is suggested to intercrop Jatropha with annual crops such as sunflower during the three year lead period to the first harvest. In order to reduce production complexities, it is suggested to limit production to Straight Vegetable Oil (SVO). The technical complexities and risks involved with modifying a limited number of diesel engines so that they can use SVO, are found to be smaller than those involved with commercial scale biodiesel production involving an etherification process. This Rural energy enterprise development program is an initiative offering enterprise development services and start-up financing to 'clean

energy' enterprises in five African countries (AREED), in Brazil (B-REED) and in China (C-REED). Since beginning in 2000, REED has financed 44 enterprises that are now returning capital each year to an investment fund that is then re-invested in new enterprises.

Africa is not just the only continent where change is needed; the European Union (EU) is also taking efforts to improve its biofuel program. The European union commission on renewable energy says that one of the main energy policy targets of the EU is to double the share of the Renewable Energy Sources (RES) in gross inland consumption, from 5.4% in 1997 up to 12% by 2010 (REED). Also through the Clean Development Mechanism under the Kyoto Protocol developing countries could receive funds to develop biofuel production systems as they can result in significant reductions in GHG emissions. Sustainability criteria and an assurance system, if agreed internationally would not act as trade barriers but would help to protect both natural resources and economic wellbeing of producer countries.

**Risks**

With the production of environmentally sound fuel there are risks. Despite the great potential of biofuel to spur development, especially of rural areas by job creation and by providing improved access to fuel, there are social risks alongside environmental risks. With good planning and management and participatory schemes involving local populations, these risks can be minimized. Fuel crops may compete for land with other uses, such as production of food crops or raising of livestock on grazing land, which could potentially result in increased food prices. This so called "fuel/food" problem is widely recognized, though further modeling and research is required to determine to what extent this risk will materialize. For some types of biofuel crops the land suitable may not be the same as the land required for food crops. This is the case for wood or grasses or jatropha. The latter two can even be planted on marginal or

"waste" land.

However, also for those fuel crops, the best net returns and profits may arise from using good quality land which would then lead to competition with food/feed crop cultivation. However, competition is not inevitable as new biofuel crops can fit in well with conventional agricultural production. It is recognized that crop yields in much of the developing (and even developed) world are below their potential, and improved management practices could increase yields substantially, "making room" for both food and fuel crops to be produced sustainably.

In addition, large scale industrialized investment can pose threats to indigenous people's rights if current subsistence farming in the form of family businesses or cooperatives is displaced by large scale industrialized farms, which most likely would be controlled by a national or a transnational company, and lead to dispossession of land. However, this picture is not black or white as big farms may be able to produce much larger yields than small farms and thus increase the food/fuel supply and offer employment opportunities. It is crucial to build in well-designed value-sharing systems and take a participatory approach involving indigenous people in planning and decision-making.

With the cultivation of energy crops, this can decrease biodiversity, most obviously if natural land is cleared for the production, leading to the loss of habitats (for example palm oil or soy bean grow very well in rain forest climates and large forested areas have been cleared in a number of countries), but also if bioenergy crops are grown in mono-cultures and replace more complex systems. These conflicts can be minimized by more extensive cultivation practices, mixing of crop varieties and rotation schemes, and small-scale structuring of the cultivation. The UNEP shows in their annual report that in an area of Brazil where the most density of biodiversity is occurring, there are plans to have the land cleared for energy crops (corn for

ethanol).

## What should be done

  In the effort to maintain and take steps forward, what should be done by any governing body is to find the median in the production of crops for fuel and crops for food. In light of Ban Ki-Moon's goals and his intentions for the United Nations Environmental Program in early 2008, there needs to be a balance between what states make for the use of fuel and what they need to keep their population from starving. To prevent what is happening in over 30 states, starvation for fuel is not an option for any member of the UN. The recklessness is unbecoming of any state and steps toward correcting this must be taken. In conclusion, while the production of biofuel is being promoted, the production of food must remain at an equally high priority.

## Questions

With people dying from starvation in over 30 states, how should a state balance the growth of bio energy producing crops and crops for food?

The European Union and Brazil require levels of ethanol in their fuel, is this good policy? If yes why? If not why not? Should other states require similar levels?

What can individual states do to increase the use of biofuel, and create the infrastructure utilize the fuel? What is necessary to fund these changes?

What role can and should the UN and UNEP play in the world's fuel and food production? What other intergovernmental and nongovernmental organizations can assist in this role and how?

How successful are the current UNEP programs to further the research and production of biofuels?

## Resources:

Matthews, Robert and Kimberly Robertson, eds., IEA Bio fuel Task 38, 2nd edition.

UNEP Energy Branch Annual Report, July 2008 <http://www.ieabioenergy-task38.org/publications/faq/.

Global Bio fuel Partnership, July 2007,-<http://www.globalbioenergy.org/>

Department of Communications, Marine and Natural Resources, 2005, BIOENERGY ACTION
PLAN FOR EUROPE, Report of the Ministerial Task Force On Bio Fuel.

IEA Bioenergy task 38 Workshop at the 15th EU Biomass Conference in Berlin-Policies and
Instruments to Promote Bio Energy and Bioproducts for GHG Mitigation, May 2007

International Energy Agency, < http://www.iea.org/>.

**NATO**

**Considering NATO Expansion**

**by Varvara Soldatkina**


North Atlantic Treaty Organization was established as a military alliance in 1949 after signing of the North Atlantic Treaty (NAT) by Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, France, the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada, Portugal, Italy, Norway, Denmark and Iceland. Currently it includes 26 member states and 14 major allies. The headquarters are located in Brussels, Belgium. NATO represents a system of collective defense, which implies that in case of any attack by any external party its members shall respond by mutual defense. "The Parties of NATO agreed that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all. Consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defense will assist the Party or Parties being attacked, individually and in concert with the other Parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area."

Article X of the North Atlantic Treaty describes the procedure of joining the organization by new member states: "The Parties may by *unanimous agreement*, invite any other European State in a position to further the principles of this Treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area to accede to this Treaty. Any State so invited may become a Party to the Treaty by depositing its instrument of accession with the Government of the United States of America. The Government of the United States of America will inform each of the Parties of the deposit of each such instrument of accession." Two major restrictions for non-member states

which come from the Article are: 1) *only European states may become a member of NATO*; 2) *the new states need to be approved by all the current NATO member states.* The second restriction also implies that every member state can put some limitations that have to be accomplished by new members. In practice, NATO establishes in most cases a common set of criteria, but several exceptions also took place in NATO's history. For instance, Turkey has blocked Cyprus' intentions to apply for membership until the Cyprus dispute is resolved. In response to that Cyprus has impeded Turkey's admission to the European Union for the same reason. In April 2008, Greece also blocked an application for membership of the Republic of Macedonia over a long argument concerning the latter country's name.

Also countries such as Finland, Austria, Switzerland, Ireland and Sweden are unlikely to join NATO for the reason that public opinion there does not support NATO membership. Widespread public disapproval of membership and the *polices of neutrality* existing in these countries unite to make NATO membership incongruous.

In 1995 NATO implemented and published the results of a "Study on NATO Enlargement" which examined the advantages of possible NATO expansion and the criteria on which new members should be accepted. The main conclusion was that the increase of new members would strengthen security and stability not only in Euro-Atlantic region, but also contribute to international security by "encouraging and supporting democratic reforms, including the establishment of civilian and democratic control over military forces; fostering patterns and habits of cooperation, consultation and consensus-building characteristic of relations among members of the Alliance; and promoting good-neighborly relations". Also experts in the Study stated that NATO enlargement would bring increase transparency in "defence planning and military budgets, thereby reinforcing confidence among states, and would reinforce the

overall tendency toward closer integration and cooperation in Europe". As it was mentioned in the Study, to join NATO states have to meet certain requirements such as: bringing awareness about their "functioning democratic" political system alongside a market economy; having the desire and capacity to contribute to the military sphere of the organization and to mutual cooperation with other member states; striving for peaceful resolution of disputes with neighboring countries; and treating minority populations in accordance with guiding principles of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). The Study also emphasized that as in the past, accession of new member would be regulated by Article 10 of the NAT, and that NATO's principal decision-making body – the North Atlantic Treaty would issue the invitations.

In 1999 at the Washington Summit the member states adopted the Membership Action Plan (MAP) following on the advice of the Study, which set the measures a state striving to become a member of NATO should follow. After becoming a participant of MAP a state should prepare and provide reports concerning its progress on five different measures:

• Willingness to settle international, ethnic or external territorial disputes by peaceful means, commitment to the rule of law and human rights, and democratic control of armed forces

• Ability to contribute to the organization's defence and missions

• Devotion of sufficient resources to armed forces to be able to meet the commitments of membership

• Security of sensitive information, and safeguards ensuring it

• Compatibility of domestic legislation with NATO cooperation

NATO provides feedback as well as technical advice to each country and evaluates its

progress on an individual basis.

On the 29th of March 2004 at the Istanbul Summit seven Northern European and Eastern European countries were accepted to NATO: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Slovenia, Slovakia, Bulgaria, and Romania; prior to that, at the 2002 Prague Summit, they were invited to start talks of membership. The same month, NATO's Baltic Air Policing directed to providing support to sovereignty of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia began. At the 2006 Riga Summit, Operation Peaceful Summit temporarily enhanced the patrolling of 4 fighters on the territory of Lithuania, which were provided by almost all NATO states. It was the first NATO summit held in a country that was part of the former Soviet Union.

Russia has always been opposed to NATO's expansion to the East, especially after accession of the seven Eastern European nations into the Alliance. Russia considers NATO's expansion a threat to its national security. After the accession, it announced a reconsideration of its relations with NATO and its defense strategy, and also urged NATO members to ratify an arms treaty to restrict deployment of weapons near Russia's borders. Russia stated that "NATO's expansion policy is seen as a continuation of a Cold War attempt to surround and isolate Russia".

Later, several states announced their desire to join the alliance, including Albania, Croatia, Republic of Macedonia, Georgia, Montenegro and Ukraine. At the April 2008 summit in Bucharest, Romania, NATO agreed to the accession of Croatia and Albania, while the membership of Macedonia was vetoed by Greece. It was also announced that Ukraine and Georgia would be finally accepted to the membership.

The idea of Ukrainian membership in NATO has gained support from a number of NATO members and at the beginning of 2008 Ukraine sent an official letter to apply for MAP, while Russia strongly opposed the application.

Current public opinion in Ukraine on NATO membership is quite ambiguous: according to the poll conducted by the government, 47% of the Ukrainian population support joining NATO and 45% are opposed, but on the other side a poll taken by Russian Interfax has showed that less than 20% of respondents support Ukraine membership in NATO, with 57% against. In March 6, 2008 the agreement between Ukrainian parliamentary coalition and opposition parties stated that "any international agreements regarding Ukraine's entry to NATO must be decided by referendum". The Ukrainian Government started an information campaign, aimed at informing the Ukrainian people about the consequences of membership.

In another case, NATO-Georgia relations date back to 1992, when Georgia joined the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (later renamed the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council in 1997), upon gaining independence with the dissolution of the Soviet Union. Cooperation deepened and broadened after Georgia joined the Partnership for Peace (PfP) programme in 1994 and the PfP Planning and Review Process (PARP) in 1999.

After the "Rose Revolution" in 2003, the focus on supporting Georgia's domestic reform process intensified, in particular through the development of the Georgia's first IPAP with NATO in 2004. Georgia was granted an Intensified Dialogue on membership aspirations in September 2006. After announcing that Georgia would become NATO member at their Summit in Bucharest in April 2008, NATO launched a period of intensive engagement with Georgia to address questions still outstanding pertaining to Georgia's MAP application. Future decisions on when Georgia will move to the MAP stage and eventually to membership will be based on Georgia's performance in implementing key reforms laid out in the IPAP. *However, August 2008 events in the Caucuses have brought concern and a questioning of the future of Georgia's membership to NATO.*

Returning to initial aims and principles of NATO creation, the question arises *whether the Alliance can modify its core value and expand beyond the European area, in contrast to what is stated in the NAT?* Also, when NATO was established, it gave Europe confidence that the United States would defend it in the event of a Soviet attack. *Can a similar NATO-style arrangement, for example with Africa, oblige Europe to respond to genocide, invasion, civil conflict and humanitarian disasters? Are there any possibilities for African states or states of Latin America and Asian-Pacific region to join NATO? What should be the basis of such expansion?*

**Questions for delegates to consider**

What is the position of your country on the issue of NATO Expansion?

Should NATO expanded to other regions outside of Europe?

If expansion is supported, how can the organization work to avoid the partiality and prejudice of some "interested" NATO member states when taking the decision about inviting new members to the Alliance?

What changes in criteria and mechanism of new members' acceptance can you suggest?

What other possible ways or mechanisms of cooperation between NATO and other non-member states are possible instead of the idea of NATO expansion? What should be the grounds for such cooperation?


**Suggested sources**

www.nato.int
 "Study on NATO Enlargement": http://www.nato.int/docu/basictxt/enl-9501.htm

NATO's problematic enlargement toward Central and Eastern European countries
    http://eab.ege.edu.tr/pdf/2_2/C2-S2-M6.pdf
The Globalization of Military Power: NATO Expansion
    http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=viewArticle&code=NAZ20070517&articleId=5677

NATO Enlargement and Russia http://www.sam.gov.tr/perceptions/Volume1/June
    August1996/NATOENLARGEMENTANDRUSSIA.pdf

NATO expansion and the political crisis in Europe
http://www.wsws.org/articles/2004/jun2004/nato-j10.shtml

NATO Expansion: A Model for Stability or a Grab for Power? http://www.dw-world.de/dw/article/0,2144,3283800,00.html

**NATO**
**Strengthening the partnership for peace**

**by Eduard Romanenko and Varvara Soldatkina**

NATO Partnership for Peace (PfP) was established in 1994 with the main purpose to create trusting and lasting cooperation between NATO members and other countries in Europe and former Soviet Union. Currently 23 countries are members of NATO Partnership for Peace (PfP) Program. In addition to this, the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC), bringing together 50 NATO and Partner countries, provides the overall political framework for NATO's cooperation with Partner countries and the bilateral relationships developed between NATO and individual Partner countries with the PfP programme. The PfP aim is to create strong relationships between NATO and Partner countries and among Partner countries in providing security, decreasing threats to peace and attaining stability in the regions.

The idea of partnership for peace with non-alliance Member states was embodied both implicitly and explicitly into the principles of NATO since its very creation. However, the evolution of the overall international security framework through the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century transformed the shapes of that partnership.

The original objective of NATO's partnership policy was to break down barriers and to build security through dialogue and cooperation with non-alliance Member states. In the 21<sup>st</sup> century, partner countries are engaged with NATO in tackling new security challenges, including terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and the reconstruction of failed states.

The fall of the Berlin Wall in November 1989 became the manifestation of the end of the Cold War. Within a short period, the remarkable pace of change in Central and Eastern

Europe left NATO faced with a new and completely different security environment. Allied leaders responded at their summit meeting in London , in July 1990, by extending a "hand of friendship" across the old East-West divide and proposing a new cooperative relationship with all the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. The scene was set for the establishment in December 1991 of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC), a forum to bring together NATO and its new Partner countries to discuss issues of common concern. But not only Europe was undergoing changes at incredible pace. The first meeting of the NACC itself witnessed a historic event: as the final communiqué was being agreed, the Soviet ambassador announced that the Soviet Union had dissolved during the meeting and that it now only represented the Russian Federation.

The next landmark event in the evolution of NATO's partnership was a new strategic concept for the Alliance, issued in November 1991, which adopted a broader approach to security. While the defence dimension remained indispensable, more prominence was given to economic, social and environmental issues as a means of promoting stability and security in the Euro-Atlantic area as a whole. Dialogue and cooperation would be essential parts of the approach required to manage the diversity of challenges facing the Alliance. The key goals were now to reduce the risk of conflict arising out of misunderstanding (for example, the Cold War period) or design, and to better manage crises affecting the security of the Allies; to increase mutual understanding and confidence among all European states; and to expand the opportunities for genuine partnership in dealing with common security problems.

The NACC broke new ground in many ways. However, it focused on multilateral, political dialogue and lacked the possibility of each Partner country developing individual cooperative relations with NATO. These limitations were addressed in 1994 with the launch of

the Partnership for Peace (PfP), a major programme of practical bilateral cooperation between NATO and individual Partner countries, which represented a significant step forward in the cooperative process. Along with this move, in 1997, the EAPC was created to replace the NACC and to build on its achievements, paving the way for the development of an enhanced and more operational partnership.

The EAPC and the PfP programme have steadily developed their own dynamic of partnership, generating successive steps undertaken by NATO and its Partner countries to extend security operations while building on the partnership arrangements they have created.

The first successive step was taken at the Prague Summit in November 2002 with the aim of deepening cooperation between NATO and Partner countries. A comprehensive review of the EAPC and the Partnership for Peace recommended strengthening the political dialogue with Partners and further enhancing their involvement in the planning, conduct and oversight of activities in which they participate. Moreover, a new cooperative mechanism, the Partnership Action Plan, was introduced at Prague. The first to be developed was the Partnership Action Plan against Terrorism. Another new initiative was the Individual Partnership Action Plan (IPAP), which, rather than drawing from a menu of activities, allows the Alliance to tailor its assistance to interested Partner countries which have asked for more structured support for domestic reforms, particularly in the defence and security sector, according to their specific needs and circumstances.

Building on progress made at Prague, more steps were taken at the Istanbul Summit in June 2004 to strengthen the Euro-Atlantic Partnership and further tailor it to tackle key thematic issues and address individual Partners' needs and capabilities.

A Partnership Action Plan on Defence Institution Building was launched to encourage

and support Partners in building effective and democratically responsible defence institutions. The opportunities for Partners to enhance their contributions to NATO-led operations are being increased by involving troop-contributing countries earlier in the decision-making process and providing more possibilities for political consultation. In addition, the Operational Capabilities Concept is being enhanced and Partners are being offered the opportunity of representation at Allied Command Transformation, which is responsible for promoting and overseeing the continuous transformation of Alliance forces and capabilities. This will help promote greater military interoperability between NATO and Partner country forces and the transformation of defenses in keeping with NATO's own evolving operational roles and capabilities.

A decision was also taken to focus specifically on engaging with Partner countries in two strategically important regions, namely the Caucasus (Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia) and Central Asia (Kazakhstan, the Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan). NATO has assigned a special representative for the two regions as well as two liaison officers. Their role is to assist and provide advice in implementing relevant aspects of Individual Partnership Action Plans, where appropriate, as well as the Partnership Action Plans on Defence Institution Building and against Terrorism.

Two rounds of NATO enlargement have changed the balance between Allies and Partners. As of March 2004, there were more Allies than Partners – and the remaining Partners are a very diverse group. They include Balkan countries still dealing with the legacies of their past, the strategically important but underdeveloped countries of the Caucasus and Central Asia, and the Western European non-aligned states. While some are in the process of developing their defence structures and capabilities, others are able to contribute significant forces to NATO-led operations and to offer fellow Partner countries advice, training and assistance in various areas.

Today, 23 Partners use the EAPC to consult regularly with the 26 Allies and to develop cooperation on issues encompassing many different aspects of defence and security. Their military forces frequently exercise and interact together; their soldiers serve alongside each other in NATO-led peacekeeping operations; and Allies and Partners are working together in common cause against the threat of terrorism.

The partnership in peacekeeping area has become particularly prominent since the mid-1990s as the Alliance has become increasingly involved in crisis management, initially in the Balkans, but subsequently also outside Europe. In August 2003, NATO took over responsibility for the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan. This was the first time that the Alliance engaged in military operations outside Europe. ISAF is currently NATO's largest operation.

NATO is leading the operation in Kosovo (KFOR), and led the operation in Bosnia and Herzegovina (SFOR) until December 2004, when the EU (EUFOR) took over. NATO has also been involved in promoting stability and regional cooperation in other countries in the region. Albania, Croatia and Macedonia are currently participating in the Alliance's membership preparation programme (MAP – Membership Action Plan), while Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Montenegro joined the PfP programme at the Riga Summit.

Through the EAPC, NATO and Partner countries engage in regular consultations on a wide-rage of security and defence-related issues. These range from general political discussions, for example on crisis-response missions and regional issues and tensions, to more technical exchanges on issues such defence reform, budgeting and planning.

In order to ensure that partner forces are capable of participating actively in NATO-led operations, they regularly take part in NATO exercises and training programmes. One of the

most important contributions of NATO's cooperation with Partner countries are programmes aimed at sharing expertise between NATO and partners and providing  assistance to partners in tackling the extensive problems of defence reform, as well as managing its economic and social consequences.

Meeting at very short notice a day after the September 11, 2001 attacks against the United States, ambassadors from NATO and Partner countries unconditionally condemned the attacks and pledged to undertake all efforts to combat the scourge of terrorism. In addition, through consultations with its Partner countries, the Alliance seeks to increase common understanding and information-sharing on proliferation-related issues. Several seminars and workshops have looked at specific problems. Subjects have included in-depth discussions on "Anthrax – lessons learned" which identified some of the key contingency planning points to emerge from the experience of autumn 2001 in the United States and elsewhere. Another topic has been problems associated with environmental industrial hazards and other medical-operational challenges.

The EAPC has set up an Ad Hoc Working Group on Small Arms and Light Weapons and Mine Action to provide a forum for exchanging information on how best to control the transfer of such weapons, for example, through national export controls and enforcement mechanisms.

In addition, NATO's PfP programme promotes training in stockpile management and secure storage, disposal and destruction of surplus stocks, as well as weapons collection and destruction during peacekeeping operations. In 2000, a special Trust Fund was established to support the destruction of anti-personnel landmines, surplus munitions and small arms and light weapons.

In order to ensure an effective international response to natural or man-made disasters, NATO and Partner Countries have developed and continue to refine procedures for joint disaster response operations. These are regularly rehearsed in exercises and at training seminars. Already on a number of occasions NATO and Partner countries have worked together to rescue, protect and bring relief to victims of disasters.

Two distinct NATO programmes bring together scientists and experts from NATO and Partner countries on a regular basis to work on problems of common concern. The NATO Security through Science programme concentrates its support for collaboration on research topics related to defence against terrorism or countering other threats to security. The programme of the Committee on the Challenges of Modern Society deals with problems of the environment and society by bringing together national agencies to collaborate on short and long-term studies in these areas.

Nevertheless, while the launch of the Partnership for Peace in 1994 represented a significant leap forward in NATO's cooperation with partner countries, several questions remain crucial for the future of this partnership

**Questions**

What new strategic partners can be engaged in cooperation with NATO? Can existing frameworks be utilized in order to ensure the effectiveness of this cooperation?

What new areas of concern should be included in the Partnership for Peace?

What changes can be made in formal bases of cooperation within the PfP?

How can the organization best build on the current partnership arrangements to promote further cooperation which will match with the new security environment?

**Suggested sources**

www.nato.int
http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/447704/Partnership-for-Peace

State Department Co-Hosts NATO Partnership for Peace Trust Fund Workshop
http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2007/february/80837.htm

http://www.jfcom.mil/about/fact_pfp.htm

# NATO

## Strengthening Cooperation with UN institutions

### by Eduard Romanenko

The United Nations (UN) and North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) are the two major security institutions that were created following the end of World War II, in 1945 and 1949 respectively, but both have widely different approaches to the maintenance of international peace and security. As professor Hall Gardner puts it in a metaphoric manner, "NATO… in effect, represents an offspring of its UN mother, given birth by Caesarean".

At its origin, NATO had to construct its very legitimacy from out of the UN Charter. NATO's primary mission was to build the security framework for European reconstruction and indirectly work to support UN organizations. From this point of view, NATO's mission was essentially preventative: providing collective defense in the extreme case of rupture within the UN Security Council (SC), or in case of any other potential direct threat to NATO membership (Article 5 of the Washington Treaty).

For five decades, under the prevailing politico-ideological divide of the Cold War, most of their respective member states saw little cause for or value in cooperation between the global collective security arrangement of the UN and the regional, collective defense mechanism of NATO. The turning point happened in the early 1990s, when the rise of intra-state conflict in the Balkans and the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact created a new dynamic, requiring significant conceptual and practical adjustment for both the UN and NATO.

The new security environment involved complex emergencies with military, political, economic, and humanitarian and social dimensions rather than traditional inter-state threats to which the UN and NATO were initially mandated to respond. Thus, through the 1990s, the UN

and NATO developed their operational cooperation in the field, in different formats (politically, militarily, legally and conceptually), in areas such as the former Yugoslavia, Kosovo, Afghanistan, Iraq and Darfur. Moreover, NATO has been actively involved in the implementation of a number of post-conflict peace-building settlements, based on UN Security Council resolutions (again, Kosovo, Afghanistan and Iraq).

Against this background of evolving relationships between two organizations, the task for NATO delegates within the 59th MUNFW Session is to reassess the past and present models of cooperation and advance them if there is such a need. The last addition is of particular importance for the committee as far as ongoing debate on the issue of the form of cooperation is concerned.

In a keynote address in Brussels in 2005, among others, NATO's Secretary-General, Jaap de Hoop Scheffer, argued that 'NATO will increasingly act in concert with other institutions', including the UN, pointing at NATO's cooperation on the ground in the Balkans and Afghanistan, while adding: *"However, we need to raise our sights beyond ad hoc cooperation on the ground. We need structured relationships at the institutional level as well – to coordinate strategically, not just cooperate tactically. We need to establish such relationships with the UN."*

In this context, he referred to his address to the Security Council in 2004, the first ever by a NATO Secretary-General, saying 'Kofi Annan's recent proposals for UN reform provide further opportunities for fresh thinking'.

However, Annan's report *In Larger Freedom: Towards Development, Security and Human Rights for All* of 2005, that contains those "recent proposals for UN reform", in fact, does not provide any "fresh thinking" on the issue of UN-NATO cooperation (within the report the

broader perspective of UN-regional organizations cooperation is discussed). On the contrary, the document implies that there is no need to go beyond ad hoc cooperation on the ground limiting it to collaboration in peacekeeping in the frames of a newly introduced "interlocking system of peacekeeping capacities".

One of the controversial points that contributed to these debates concerned NATO's 'status aparte' among the so-called 'regional organizations' – outside the purview of Chapter VIII of the UN Charter. While NATO in the last decade has presented itself as a powerful military instrument of the UN's collective security system, it has simultaneously made it abundantly clear that, given its character as a collective defence organization, it retains the right under all circumstances to use force without UN Security Council authorization, thereby neglecting the Council's primacy in maintaining international peace and security.

The end of the Cold War has contributed to defining the contours of NATO's institutional and operational relations with the United Nations, highlighting its inherently ambivalent character as a collective defence organization, which is also willing and capable of performing as an instrument of the collective security system, as embodied in the UN Charter. The contours were shaped as a result of NATO's performance in Bosnia, both before and after the signing of the Dayton Peace Agreement, Operation 'Allied Force' and the deployment of KFOR in Kosovo, and its presence in Macedonia in supporting the implementation of the Ohrid Agreement. This series of consecutive missions can be construed in two 'models': the so-called sub-contracting model; and the autonomy model. NATO's decision, however, in 1999 to execute Operation 'Allied Force' in Kosovo, according to its own rules under the autonomy model, made clear that the Alliance basically reserves its right as a collective defence organization to use force without the explicit authorization of the Security Council – a decision that was formalized in

NATO's 1999 New Strategic Concept. The message was clear: while NATO is prepared to act within the parameters of the sub-contracting model, the bottom line is that it is not willing to subordinate itself to the UN under all conditions. These two models developed through the 1990s laid down the framework for the relationships between the NATO and UN in the aftermath of "9/11".

Another aspect that can be under the focus of NATO simulation is the need for complementary actions of the UN and NATO. The peace of the 21st century in many ways depends upon the ability of NATO and the UN to go beyond a *modus vivendi* and work more cooperatively together in their complex relationship to achieve a new global equilibrium. However, the exact mechanism for such complex relationship is one of the tasks for NATO delegates within the 59th MUNFW Session.

Real security is multi-dimensional: its strategic and military aspects are obviously important, but not entirely sufficient to guarantee real political, economic, ecological and social (or "human") security in the long term. In this perspective, NATO needs additional support from international regimes and NGOs to cope with complex problems arising from actual and potential ethnic, territorial, religious disputes as well as human rights abuses, ecological destruction, drug trafficking, and the smuggling of arms and nuclear materiel, among other vital security concerns.

Given the real risks of military "overstretch," particularly in Afghanistan, NATO will only be able to provide the multi-dimensional aspects of security for central and eastern Europe (and elsewhere) by working in close cooperation with the UN and other international regimes and NGOs, as well as with Russia through the NATO-Russia Council. Such cooperation was built into the UN Charter, but the necessity of NATO-UN cooperation has not yet been fully

actualized by either the UN or NATO. However, the cases of Afghanistan, Bosnia, Macedonia and Kosovo (though, the list of examples is not complete) provide a retrospective background for such cooperation.

Finally, both the UN and NATO are experiencing nowadays the periods of transitions and reassessment. While the first one is undergoing the process of redefining its relations with regional organizations both practically (Hybrid Darfur operation) and conceptually (SG's reports), another one is persistently implementing its "transformation agendas" that pretend to take on new responsibilities (to become a 'global player', capable of acting wherever forces are needed, leaving behind its 'out-of-area' syndrome, and the acceptance of the concept of pre-emptive attacks). In this context, UN-NATO cooperation is often perceived to be a "missing link" in such a reciprocal transformation.

**Questions**

How can NATO build on the experience of cooperation with the UN taking into account both past and current failures and successes?

What kind of cooperation is needed: institutional, operational and/or of an *ad hoc* nature?

What are the shared interests of the UN and NATO on the type of cooperation that can be built upon between the two? What are the particular interests of NATO for such cooperation?

In what contemporary cases can a "new form" of UN-NATO partnership be applied to?
Are there any contradictions between NATO Member-States with regard to UN-NATO cooperation?

**Suggested sources**

Hall Gardner. Toward "Regional Security Communities": NATO, the UN, and the 1948 Vandenberg Resolution. www.civitatis.org

Kristin M. Haugevik. New partners, new possibilities. The evolution of inter-organizational security cooperation in international peace operations. www.nupi.no

Dick A. Leurdijk. UN Reform and NATO Transformation. The Missing Link. www.clingendael.nl

Kristin M. Haugevik. New partners, new possibilities: Inter-institutional security cooperation in international peace operations.

www.nato.org