GENERAL ASSEMBLY FOURTH COMMITTEE
BACKGROUND GUIDE 2013

Written By: Jenna Gleaton, Dex Ballard, Hallen Korn, Natalie Keller

NATIONAL MODEL UNITED NATIONS
nmun.org

17 - 21 March - Conference A
24 - 28 March - Conference B
POSITION PAPER INSTRUCTIONS

1. TO COMMITTEE STAFF

A file of the position paper (.doc or .pdf) for each assigned committee should be sent to the committee e-mail address listed here. Mail papers by 1 March to the e-mail address listed for your particular venue. Delegates should carbon copy (cc:) themselves as confirmation of receipt. Please use the committee name, your assignment, Conference A or B, and delegation/school name in both the e-mail subject line and in the filename (example: GA1st_Cuba_ConfA_MarsCollege).

2. TO DIRECTOR-GENERAL

- Each delegation should send one set of all position papers for each assignment to the e-mail designated for their venue: positionpapers.nya@nmun.org or positionpapers.nyb@nmun.org. This set (held by each Director-General) will serve as a back-up copy in case individual committee directors cannot open attachments.

Note: This e-mail should only be used as a repository for position papers.

- The head delegate or faculty member sending this message should cc: him/herself as confirmation of receipt. (Free programs like Adobe Acrobat or WinZip may need to be used to compress files if they are not plain text.)

- Because of the potential volume of e-mail, only one e-mail from the Head Delegate or Faculty Advisor containing all attached position papers will be accepted.

Please use the committee name, your assignment, Conference A or B, and delegation/school name in both the e-mail subject line and in the filename (example: GA1st_Cuba_ConfA_MarsCollege).

---

Two copies of each position paper should be sent via e-mail by 1 MARCH 2013

COMMITTEE

| General Assembly First Committee | ga1.nya@nmun.org |
| General Assembly Second Committee | ga2.nya@nmun.org |
| General Assembly Third Committee | ga3.nya@nmun.org |
| General Assembly Fourth Committee | ga4.nya@nmun.org |
| Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations | c34.nya@nmun.org |
| ECOSOC Plenary | ecosoc.nya@nmun.org |
| Commission on the Status of Women | csw.nya@nmun.org |
| Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice | ccpcj.nya@nmun.org |
| Economic Commission for Africa | eca.nya@nmun.org |
| Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia | escwa.nya@nmun.org |
| United Nations Children’s Fund | unicef.nya@nmun.org |
| United Nations Development Programme | undp.nya@nmun.org |
| United Nations Settlements Programme | unhabitat.nya@nmun.org |
| UN Conference on Trade and Development | unctad.nya@nmun.org |
| Human Rights Council | hrc.nya@nmun.org |
| United Nations Population Fund | unfp.nya@nmun.org |
| UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues | unfpii.nya@nmun.org |

Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People | ceirpp.nya@nmun.org |
Security Council A | sca.nya@nmun.org |
Security Council B | scb.nya@nmun.org |
Security Council C | scc.nya@nmun.org |
International Atomic Energy Agency | iaea.nya@nmun.org |

---

OTHER USEFUL CONTACTS

Entire Set of Delegation Position Papers | positionpapers.nya@nmun.org
(send only to e-mail for your assigned venue)
Secretary-General, Conference A | secgen.nya@nmun.org
Secretary-General, Conference B | secgen.nyb@nmun.org
Director(s)-General | dirgen.ny@nmun.org
NMUN Office | info@nmun.org

nmun.org
for more information
Dear Delegates,

Welcome to the 2013 National Model United Nations Conference. We are pleased to serve as the volunteer staff for the General Assembly Fourth Committee. The Directors for this committee are Jenna Gleaton (Conference A) and Dexter Ballard (Conference B). The Assistant Directors are Hallen Korn (Conference A) and Natalie Keller (Conference B). Jenna Gleaton graduated from Texas Christian University with a Bachelor of Science Degree in Political Science. This is her fifth year at NMUN and her third year on staff. Dexter Ballard is in his fifth year of NMUN staff. Dexter graduated from the University of Colorado, Boulder with degrees in International Affairs and Political Science. Dexter also minored in Technology, Arts, and Media and received certificates in International Media and Peace and Conflict Studies. Hallen Korn is in his second year on NMUN staff. He is currently a student at Columbia University and also serves as an intern at the United States Mission to the United Nations. Hallen is also a research assistant at the Saltzman Institute of War and Peace Studies. Natalie Keller studies law at the University of Bonn with a focus on private international law. This is her fourth year at NMUN and her second year on staff.

The topics under discussion for the General Assembly Fourth Committee are:

1. Israeli Settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory and Assistance to Palestinian Refugees
2. Promoting the Peaceful Use of Outer Space and Preventing an Arms Race
3. The United Nations and 21st Century Information Governance

The General Assembly Fourth Committee, also known as the Special Political and Decolonization Committee, focuses on special political and international topics ranging from Palestinian refugees and human rights to outer space and atomic radiation among a multitude of others. Delegates will create resolutions that will address these pertinent global issues, and we hope to see you practicing diplomacy as you develop these solutions.

The background guide serves as a tool to prepare you for your research by providing you with an overview of the three topics and the committee. Its only purpose is to serve as an introduction to your topics and should not be the only resource utilized in your research. The references provided in the bibliography are meant to aid you in your research as well and provide you with a strong starting point. Please be sure to take advantage of the numerous resources available on each topic in order to have a well-rounded view of the research. The position paper is an opportunity to discuss each topic from the perspective of the country you are representing. Please be sure to pay close attention to the formatting requirements for your position paper. Also take note of the NMUN policies on the website and in the delegate preparation guide regarding plagiarism, codes of conduct/dress code/sexual harassment, awards philosophy/evaluation method, etc. Adherence to these guidelines is mandatory.

If you have any questions about preparation, the committee, or the conference in general, please contact your Director and Assistant Director or the Under-Secretary-General of the General Assembly Department. The Under-Secretaries-General are Kristina Mader (Conference A) and Daniel Leyva Jr. (Conference B). We thank you in advance for all of the hard work you will devote to this committee and we wish you well in your preparation. We look forward to meeting you in March.
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Message from the Directors-General Regarding Position Papers for the 2013 NMUN Conference

For NMUN-New York 2013, each delegation submits one position paper for each assigned committee. A delegate’s role as a Member State, Observer State, Non-Governmental Organization, etc. should affect the way a position paper is written. To understand these differences, please refer to the Delegate Preparation Guide.

Position papers should review each delegation’s policy regarding the topics of the committee. International and regional conventions, treaties, declarations, resolutions, and programs of action of relevance to the policy of your State should be identified and addressed. Making recommendations for action by your committee should also be considered. Position papers also serve as a blueprint for individual delegates to remember their country’s position throughout the course of the Conference. NGO position papers should be constructed in the same fashion as position papers of countries. Each topic should be addressed briefly in a succinct policy statement representing the relevant views of your assigned NGO. You should also include recommendations for action to be taken by your committee. It will be judged using the same criteria as all country position papers, and is held to the same standard of timeliness.

Please be forewarned, delegates must turn in entirely original material. The NMUN Conference will not tolerate the occurrence of plagiarism. In this regard, the NMUN Secretariat would like to take this opportunity to remind delegates that although United Nations documentation is considered within the public domain, the Conference does not allow the verbatim re-creation of these documents. This plagiarism policy also extends to the written work of the Secretariat contained within the Committee Background Guides. Violation of this policy will be immediately reported and may result in dismissal from Conference participation. Delegates should report any incident of plagiarism to the Secretariat as soon as possible.

Delegation’s position papers may be given an award as recognition of outstanding pre-Conference preparation. In order to be considered for a Position Paper Award, however, delegations must have met the formal requirements listed below and be of high substantive standard, using adequate language and showing in-depth research. While we encourage innovative proposals, we would like to remind delegates to stay within the mandate of their respective committee and keep a neutral and respectful tone. Similarly to the minus point-policy implemented at the conference to discourage disruptive behavior, position papers that use offensive language may entail negative grading when being considered for awards. Please refer to the sample paper following this message for a visual example of what your work should look like at its completion. The following format specifications are required for all papers:

- All papers must be typed and formatted according to the example in the Background Guides
- Length must not exceed two single-sided pages (one double-sided paper, if printed)
- Font must be Times New Roman sized between 10 pt. and 12 pt.
- Margins must be set at one inch for the whole paper
- Country/NGO name, school name and committee name must be clearly labeled on the first page,
- National symbols (headers, flags, etc.) are deemed inappropriate for NMUN position papers
- Agenda topics must be clearly labeled in separate sections
To be considered timely for awards, please read and follow these directions:

1. **A file of the position paper** (.doc or .pdf format required) for each assigned committee should be sent to the committee email address listed in the Background Guide. These e-mail addresses will be active after November 15, 2012. Delegates should carbon copy (cc:) themselves as confirmation of receipt.

2. Each delegation should also send **one set of all position papers** to the e-mail designated for their venue, Conference A: positionpapers.nya@nmun.org or Conference B: positionpapers.nyb@nmun.org. This set will serve as a back-up copy in case individual committee directors cannot open attachments. These copies will also be made available in Home Government during the week of the NMUN Conference.

Each of the above listed tasks needs to be completed no later than **March 1, 2013 (GMT-5)**.

Please use the committee name, your assignment, Conference A or B, and delegation/school name in both the e-mail subject line and in the filename (example: GA1st_Cuba_ConfA_Mars College).

A matrix of received papers will be posted online for delegations to check prior to the Conference. If you need to make other arrangements for submission, please contact Hannah Birkenkötter, Director-General (Conference A), or Nicholas Warino, Director-General (Conference B), at dirgen@nmun.org. There is an option for delegations to submit physical copies via regular mail if needed.

Once the formal requirements outlined above are met, Conference staff use the following criteria to evaluate Position Papers:

- Overall quality of writing, proper style, grammar, etc.
- Citation of relevant resolutions/documents
- General consistency with bloc/geopolitical constraints
- Consistency with the constraints of the United Nations
- Analysis of issues, rather than reiteration of the Committee Background Guide
- Outline of (official) policy aims within the committee’s mandate

Each delegation can submit a copy of their position paper to the permanent mission of the country being represented, along with an explanation of the Conference. Those delegations representing NGOs do not have to send their position paper to their NGO headquarters, although it is encouraged. This will assist them in preparation for the mission briefing in New York.

Finally, please consider that over 2,000 papers will be handled and read by the Secretariat for the Conference. Your patience and cooperation in strictly adhering to the above guidelines will make this process more efficient and it is greatly appreciated. Should you have any questions please feel free to contact the Conference staff, though as we do not operate out of a central office or location, your consideration for time zone differences is appreciated.

Sincerely,

*Conference A*
Hannah Birkenkötter
Director-General
hannah@nmun.org

*Conference B*
Nicholas Warino
Director-General
nick@nmun.org
The issues before the General Assembly Plenary are: The Use of Economic Sanctions for Political and Economic Compulsion; Democracy and Human Rights in Post-Conflict Regions; as well as The Promotion of Durable Peace and Sustainable Development in Africa. The Mexican Delegation first would like to convey its gratitude being elected and pride to serve as vice-president of the current General Assembly Plenary session.

I. The Use of Economic Sanctions for Political and Economic Compulsion

The principles of equal sovereignty of states and non-interference, as laid down in the Charter of the United Nations, have always been cornerstones of Mexican foreign policy. The legitimate right to interfere by the use of coercive measures, such as economic sanctions, is laid down in Article 41 of the UN-charter and reserves the right to the Security Council.

Concerning the violation of this principle by the application of unilateral measures outside the framework of the United Nations, H.E. Ambassador to the United Nations Enrique Berruga Filloy underlined in 2005 that the Mexico strongly rejects “the application of unilateral laws and measures of economic blockade against any State, as well as the implementation of coercive measures without the authorization enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.” That is the reason, why the United Mexican States supported – for the 14th consecutive time – Resolution (A/RES/60/12) of 2006 regarding the Necessity of ending the economic, commercial and financial embargo imposed by the United States of America against Cuba.

In the 1990s, comprehensive economic sanctions found several applications with very mixed results, which made a critical reassessment indispensable. The United Mexican States fully supported and actively participated in the “Stockholm Process” that focused on increasing the effectiveness in the implementation of targeted sanctions. As sanctions and especially economic sanctions, pose a tool for action “between words and war” they must be regarded as a mean of last resort before war and fulfill highest requirements for their legitimate use. The United Mexican States and their partners of the “Group of Friends of the U.N. Reform” have already addressed and formulated recommendations for that take former criticism into account. Regarding the design of economic sanctions it is indispensable for the success to have the constant support by all member states and public opinion, which is to a large degree dependent on the humanitarian effects of economic sanctions. Sanctions must be tailor-made, designed to effectively target the government, while sparing to the largest degree possible the civil population. Sanction regimes must be constantly monitored and evaluated to enable the world-community to adjust their actions to the needs of the unforeseeably changing situation. Additionally, the United Mexican States propose to increase communication between the existing sanction committees and thus their effectiveness by convening regular meetings of the chairs of the sanction committees on questions of common interest.

II. Democracy and Human Rights in Post-Conflict Regions

As a founding member of the United Nations, Mexico is highly engaged in the Promotion of Democracy and Human Rights all over the world, as laid down in the Universal Declaration on Human Rights (UDHR) in 1948. Especially since the democratic transition of Mexico in 2000 it is one of the most urgent topics to stand for Democratization and Human Rights, and Mexico implements this vision on many different fronts.

In the Convoking Group of the intergovernmental Community of Democracies (GC), the United Mexican States uphold an approach that fosters international cooperation to promote democratic values and institution-building at the national and international level. To emphasize the strong interrelation between human rights and the building of democracy and to fortify democratic developments are further challenges Mexico deals with in this committee. A key-factor for the sustainable development of a post-conflict-region is to hold free and fair election and thus creating a democratic system. Being aware of the need of post-conflict countries for support in the preparation of democratic elections, the United Mexican States contribute since 2001 to the work of the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA), an intergovernmental organization operating at international, regional and national level in partnership with a range of institutions. Mexico’s foreign policy regarding human rights is substantially
based on cooperation with international organizations. The Inter American Commission of Human Rights is one of the bodies, Mexico is participating, working on the promotion of Human Rights in the Americas. Furthermore, the Inter-American Court of Human Rights is the regional judicial institution for the application and interpretation of the American Convention of Human Rights.

The objectives Mexico pursues are to improve human rights in the country through structural changes and to fortify the legal and institutional frame for the protection of human rights on the international level. Underlining the connection between democracy, development and Human Rights, stresses the importance of cooperation with and the role of the High Commissioner on Human Rights and the reform of the Human Rights Commission to a Human rights Council.

Having in mind the diversity of challenges in enforcing democracy and Human Rights, Mexico considers regional and national approaches vital for their endorsement, as Mexico exemplifies with its National Program for Human Rights or the Plan Puebla Panama. On the global level, Mexico is encouraged in working on a greater coordination and interoperability among the United Nations and regional organizations, as well as the development of common strategies and operational policies and the sharing of best practices in civilian crisis management should be encouraged, including clear frameworks for joint operations, when applicable.

III. The Promotion of Durable Peace and Sustainable Development in Africa

The United Mexican States welcome the leadership role the African Union has taken regarding the security problems of the continent. Our delegation is furthermore convinced that The New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD) can become the foundation for Africa’s economic, social and democratic development as the basis for sustainable peace. Therefore it deserves the full support of the international community.

The development of the United Mexican States in the last two decades is characterized by the transition to a full democracy, the national and regional promotion of human rights and sustainable, economic growth. Mexico’s development is characterized by free trade and its regional integration in the North American Free Trade Agreement. Having in mind that sustainable development is based not only on economic, but as well on social and environmental development, President Vicente Fox has made sustainable development a guiding principle in the Mexican Development Plan that includes sustainability targets for all major policy areas.

The United Nations Security Council has established not less than seven peace-keeping missions on the African continent, underlining the need for full support by the international community. In post-conflict situations, we regard national reconciliation as a precondition for a peaceful development, which is the reason why Mexico supported such committees, i.e. in the case of Sierra Leone. The United Mexican States are convinced that an other to enhance durable peace in Africa is the institutional reform of the United Nations. We therefore want to reaffirm our full support to both the establishment of the peace-building commission and the Human Rights Council. Both topics are highly interrelated and, having in mind that the breach of peace is most often linked with severest human rights’ abuses, thus need to be seen as two sides of one problem and be approached in this understanding.

As most conflicts have their roots in conflicts about economic resources and development chances, human development and the eradication of poverty must be at the heart of a successful, preventive approach. Lifting people out of poverty must be seen as a precondition not only for peace, but for social development and environmental sustainability.

The United Mexican States want to express their esteem for the decision taken by the G-8 countries for a complete debt-relief for many African Highly-Indebted-Poor-Countries. Nevertheless, many commitments made by the international community that are crucial for Africa’s sustainable development are unfulfilled. The developed countries agreed in the Monterrey Consensus of the International Conference on Financing for Development (A/CONF.198/11) to increase their Official Development Aid (ODA) “towards the target of 0,7 per cent of gross national product (GNP) as ODA to developing countries and 0,15 to 0,20 per cent of GNP of developed countries to least developed countries”. Furthermore, the United Mexican States are disappointed by the result of the Hong Kong Ministerial conference of the World Trade Organization, which once more failed to meet the needs of those, to whom the round was devoted: developing countries and especially African countries, who today, more than ever, are cut off from global trade and prosperity by protectionism.
Committee History

Introduction

The United Nations (UN) was founded as an international organization on October 24, 1945 by 51 countries.\(^1\) Over the ensuing decades, more countries applied for and were accepted as Member States resulting in the current 193 members we have today.\(^2\) The primary concerns of the UN, as laid out within the *Charter of the United Nations*, are international peace and security, the development of friendly relations among nations, and the promotion of social progress.\(^3\) The General Assembly was established in 1945, pursuant to Chapter IV of the Charter of the United Nations and is a main body of the organization.\(^4\) Although the General Assembly is a deliberative organ, it may take action in a case where the Security Council fails to do so according to the “Uniting for Peace” resolution of November 1950, is also the body responsible for electing members of the UN Security Council, and also adopts the budget of the United Nations.\(^5\) One of the main committees is the General Assembly Fourth Committee (GA4), which is also known as the Special Political and Decolonization Committee.\(^6\) It deals with a wide range of topics such as outer space, mine action, public information, decolonization, peacekeeping, and Palestinian refugees and human rights.\(^7\)

As stated in Article 9 of the Charter of the United Nations, the General Assembly consists of all Member States of the United Nations.\(^8\) The Charter further outlines the functions and powers of the General Assembly in Articles 10-17.\(^9\) Each Member State has one vote and for important questions there needs to be a two-thirds majority of the members that are present and voting.\(^10\) For decisions on other questions a majority of the members that are present and voting is sufficient.\(^11\) According to Article 22 of the Charter of the United Nations, the establishment of subsidiary organs that the General Assembly determines are necessary in order to follow its functions, is possible.\(^12\)

Topics and Committees of the General Assembly Fourth Committees

As the Special Political and Decolonization Committee, the General Assembly Fourth committee deals with decolonization as well as political topics that are not subject of the General Assembly First Committee.\(^13\) The committee has undergone some reform over the last few decades, in order to get to where it is today. At its inception, the primary role of GA Fourth was decolonization, but as countries became independent, the workload reduced significantly, leading to the merging with the Special Political Committee in 1993.\(^14\) An additional change that was made was in regards to the overlap between the GA First Committee and the GA Fourth, both of which dealt with similar topics in the realm of conflict and conflict-affected situations.\(^15\) In order to reduce this overlap, it was then decided, that the First Committee would deal with questions such as arms control and disarmament whereas the GA Fourth would discuss particular conflicts.\(^16\) Some of the other topics this committee deals with are public information, atomic radiation, demining or peacekeeping.\(^17\)

Another important topic for the fourth committee is outer space. Both GA First and GA Fourth deal with the topic of outer space, but in different areas. The First Committee focuses on the weaponization of outer space, whereas the

---

15 Peterson, *The UN General Assembly*, p. 60.
16 Peterson, *The UN General Assembly*, p. 61.
Fourth Committee is responsible for the peaceful use of outer space. In 1959, the General Assembly setup the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (COPUOS) confirmed by resolution 1472 (XIV) to deal with subjects concerning outer space. The committee consists of 71 Member States and two subcommittees. COPUOS works on a consensus basis and expresses recommendations to the General Assembly. Since the topic of outer space has a wide range of subjects, there is a Scientific and Technical Subcommittee, and there is also the Legal Subcommittee. COPUOS and the two subcommittees meet annually to work on questions that are presented to them by the General Assembly.

The topic of Palestinian refugees and human rights is also of great importance to the General Assembly Fourth Committee, and is in fact the only General Assembly Committee which considers the topic of Palestinian refugees by making it a cornerstone of the Committee's work. In the past sessions, the committee worked on a large amount of draft resolutions and decisions concerning this topic. When the General Assembly Fourth Committee considered the work of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People and Other Arabs of the Occupied Territories, there was a number of delegates expressing concern about the progress of a possibility of peace in that area. It was stressed that every possible effort has to be exercised in order to reach peace and delegates recommitted to the goal of establishing peace and security in the region.

Peacekeeping is a topic that consists of a variety of complex issues which remain challenging, even today, to implement. These challenges include operationalizing the protection and promotion of human rights, electoral assistance, protection of civilians, and mine action. In areas of conflict, peacekeeping can help in providing security, but also helping countries to overcome conflict and achieve peace. Important principles for UN peacekeeping operations are impartiality, consent of the parties, and particularly no use of force except for self-defense as well as the defense of the mandate. Currently there are 16 UN peacekeeping operations and there have been 67 peacekeeping operations since 1948. Many of those peacekeeping operations concern the Middle East. One of those is the UN Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) which maintains the ceasefire between Israel and Syria after their disengagement of their forces in the Golan Heights. There are also the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO), the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL), and the United Nations Support Mission in Libya (UNSMIL).

The General Assembly Fourth Committee also deals with the topic of public information. In order to address this topic fully, the General Assembly established the Committee on Information (COI) as a subsidiary body. The COI has several responsibilities, such as providing guidance on policies, programmes and activities, as well as overseeing the work of the Department of Public Information. The mandate of the COI was stated in General Assembly resolution 34/182, which was adopted in 1979. The committee currently has 113 Member States and any country that is not currently a member of the COI can request membership. In its annual general debate, the committee

---

adopts one draft resolution, which is adopted by consensus and then further debated by the General Assembly Fourth Committee.37

The 66th Session of the General Assembly Fourth Committee

The General Assembly Fourth Committee held its 66th session from 2011-2012. In this session, the committee worked on topics such as international cooperation in the peaceful use of outer space, assistance in mine action, questions relating to information, and also Palestinian refugees and human rights.38 In November 2011, the Fourth Committee sent 24 draft resolutions and two draft decisions to the General Assembly Plenary and 9 of those drafts related to the Middle East, which included Palestinian refugees and Israeli practices affecting human rights.39 This highlights the importance of this topic in particular to this committee. Furthermore, the Committee sent drafts concerning atomic radiation, assistance in mine action, and international cooperation in the peaceful use of outer space.40 The importance of peacekeeping was also stressed during this meeting, when proposals submitted by the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations which dealt with gender and peacekeeping, strengthening the role of police in peacekeeping operations, and enhancing working methods amongst other things.41

The 67th session of the General Assembly Fourth Committee is from 2012-2013. The program of work and timetable for the committee includes six meetings concerning the topic of Non-Self-Governing Territories, three meetings concerning the international cooperation in the peaceful use of outer space, three meetings concerning questions relating to information, four meetings concerning peacekeeping, and five meetings overall concerning the topic of Palestinian refugees and also the investigation of Israeli practices affecting human rights.42 Although the work load concerning the topic of decolonization became less with the independence of countries, it is still a topic which is discussed at the 67th session.43 During this session countries could proudly report on their improvements concerning space exploration and technology.44 These improvements are valuable for economic growth and social benefits and countries recommitted to a peaceful use of outer space.45 The debates that started already, and the ones that are to come, show the significance of the GA Fourth Committee. Furthermore, this shows the willingness of delegates to recommit to important topics and work towards the peaceful use of outer space, peace when it comes to Palestinian refugees, as well as advancements in public information.

Annotated Bibliography


The General Assembly was established under the Charter of the United Nations. The Charter can therefore provide a framework for delegates to understand the structure of the United Nations and especially the General Assembly. This document states the functions and powers of the General Assembly and furthermore gives the basic details such as the composition, voting, and procedure.


This is a great source for current information on the work of the committee. The press releases give a great overview of the topics the General Assembly deals with but also provide information on the committee’s work such as draft resolutions.


The latest session of the General Assembly Fourth Committee was the 66th Session, which began in 2011. This website provides draft resolutions and decisions as well as meeting records and reports to the General Assembly. These documents can be very helpful for delegates to understand the work of the committee on each topic and the draft resolutions also show the countries positions.


This Web site provides helpful information concerning outer space. It outlines all the subjects that are connected to this topic and introduces different programmes and committees that deal with this topic. There are furthermore reports and publications as well as a register of space objects.


This source is great for understanding what peacekeeping actually is and how it works. The Web site also provides information on current peacekeeping operations and peacekeeping issues. It furthermore outlines the challenges and difficulties as well as the principles of peacekeeping. There are also reports related to that topic by the Secretary-General.
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I. Israeli Settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory and Assistance to Palestinian Refugees

“The 45-year Israeli occupation of Gaza and the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, the continuing blockade of Gaza, the illegal but relentless settlement expansion, are destroying the ability of Palestinians to build a productive and peaceful future.”46

Introduction

The Israeli-Palestinian conflict has a long history, which has led to around five million Palestinian refugees in the region.47 The United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) defines a Palestinian refugee as “people whose normal place of residence was Palestine between June 1946 and May 1948, who lost both their homes and means of livelihood as a result of the 1948 Arab-Israel conflict.”48 This definition means that many more refugees exist beyond the five million: students, persons who worked outside of Palestine, and persons who were expelled in other conflicts related to the region.49 Palestinian refugees are scattered across the surrounding regions, including Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, the Gaza Strip and the West Bank, and East Jerusalem.50

The General Assembly Fourth Committee, also known as the Special Political and Decolonization Committee, handles a multitude of issues, including Palestinian refugees and human rights.51 The Fourth Committee is committed to promoting peace between Israel and Palestine, assisting Palestinian refugees, and preventing the continued settlements of Israelis in the Occupied Palestinian Territory (oPt).52 At the twenty-second meeting of the Fourth Committee, it was noted that Israel and Palestine must “overcome the resentment built up over the years” and do what is necessary to reach a peaceful solution before the opportunity is missed.53 The Fourth Committee, along with other United Nations entities and the international community, are devoted to finding such a peaceful solution and assisting Palestinian refugees in the process.

The History of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict and the Development of Palestinian Refugees

Throughout the decades of war and violence in the Middle East, Palestinians have been forced to leave their homes behind and have suffered social, economic, and political hardships as a result. During World War I, Palestine fell under British control and through what is referred to as the Hussein-McMahon Correspondence, Britain “promise[d] independence to what is now Syria, Palestine (Israel), Jordan, Iraq, and the Arabian Peninsula should the Allies win the war.”54 However, in direct contradiction to this, in November of 1917, the Balfour Declaration, signed with France, proclaimed British intentions of promoting the creation of a Jewish territory within Palestine.55

At the end of the War, tensions escalated between the Arab and Jewish populations.56 Immigration of Jews to Palestinian territory increased as Jewish persecution intensified in Eastern Europe, leading up to World War II, further exacerbating the tension between the opposing groups.57 One of the first major displacements of Palestinians resulted from the Arab-Israeli War of 1948.58 The precursor to this event was United Nations General Assembly (GA) resolution 181, adopted on November 29, 1947, which separated Palestine into “Jewish and Arab states” and was after the British government relinquished its control over Palestinian territory.59 The Palestinian Arabs were not satisfied with the outcome because they deemed it as “unfair to the Arab population that would remain in Jewish territory under the partition” and they considered the land to be theirs and felt as though they were having their land

---

46 Grandi, Commissioner-General’s opening statement to UNRWA Advisory Commission, June 2012, 18 June 2012.
47 UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, Palestine refugees, 2012.
48 UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, Palestine refugees, 2012.
49 Akram, Palestinian Refugees and their Legal Status: Rights, Politics, and Implications for a Just Solution, 2002.
50 UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, Palestine refugees, 2012.
51 UN GA, Special Political and Decolonization: Fourth Committee, 2012.
52 UN GA Fourth Committee, Sixty-sixth General Assembly Fourth Committee 22nd Meeting (GA/SPD/498), 8 November 2011.
53 UN GA Fourth Committee, Sixty-sixth General Assembly Fourth Committee 22nd Meeting (GA/SPD/498), 8 November 2011.
58 Tajweed Centre, Palestinian Refugees, 3 September 2012.
stripped from their control. Fighting broke out between the two groups and increased on May 14, 1948 when Israel proclaimed its independence. Israeli came to know this war as the “War of Independence,” while Palestinians refer to it as the Nakba, or “the Catastrophe.” The UN plan for the ceasefire proposed that “Jerusalem become an independent zone, free from both Arab and Jewish control,” however the eventual 1949 Armistice “divided the city into two halves - one controlled by Jordan and the other by Israel.” Contrary to the goals of this armistice, “the divided control did not quell, but only exacerbated tensions in the area.” The 1948 war that led to the creation of the State of Israel also created a Diaspora of Palestinians, as over 1 million Palestinians fled or were expelled, most of them settling in Jordan. After the events of 1948 and the subsequent Arab-Israeli War, which lasted until February 1949 when Israel began signing separate armistice agreements with the Arab countries, Israeli forces annihilated approximately 50% of Palestinian villages. In addition, 13,000 Palestinians lost their lives and roughly 700,000 were forcibly displaced.

Following the Arab-Israeli War, there were periods of violence and periods of peace. Tensions peaked again in 1967 in what came to be known as the “Six-Day War,” which lasted from June 5-11, 1967. The Six Day War broke out because of mounting tension between Israel and its surrounding Arab neighbors, with the major cause being repeated attacks by both sides over issues such as the control of limited water resources. During this time, Israel took over the Sinai Peninsula, West Bank, Golan Heights, and East Jerusalem, which, except for the Sinai Peninsula, have remained under Israeli occupation to this day. As a reaction to the Six-Day War, the UN Security Council adopted Resolution 242 in November 1967, which “stipulated that the establishment of a just and lasting peace should include the application of two principles: (1) Withdrawal of Israel armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict; and (2) Termination of all claims or states of belligerency and respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty.” Further, the resolution also “affirmed the territorial inviolability of every State in the region and called for “achieving a just settlement of the refugee problem.” The 1967 war created a new set of refugees, with 15,000 being forced out of the West Bank, 58,000 from the Gaza Strip, and 16,000 Palestinians living in the Golan Heights.

Current Situation of Palestinian Refugees
Palestinian displacement continued after the 1948 and 1967 wars because of continuing Israeli settlements in the West Bank, Gaza Strip and East Jerusalem, and has been exacerbated by recent events. Additionally, Palestinians have not been able to get the resources they need because of Israel’s 2007 blockade on exports and imports within the Gaza Strip. This blockade, along with “low per capita income” that has prevented 51% of the population from obtaining the food and resources they need, has prohibited economic development among Palestinian refugees. Roughly 70% of the Palestinians in the world are refugees, according to the Negotiations Affairs Department of the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO). The continued occupation of Palestinian territory is taking a heavy toll on Palestinians by not only taking lives and creating more refugees, but also making it difficult for those in the area to prosper and work towards social and economic reconstruction. As Commissioner-General Filippo Grandi stated
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in his opening statement to UNRWA on June 2012, “refugees, in addition to the heavy burden of protracted and unresolved exile, are facing the challenges of political, social and economic change.”

International Framework and UN Action regarding Palestinian refugees

According to international human rights law, including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), Palestinians are entitled, as are all human beings, to human rights including health, education, and a better quality of life. The UN first tried to establish a legal framework to deal with the consequences of forced displacement and the norms by which to go by when addressing the issues facing refugees on December 14, 1950, with the creation of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). UNHCR was created to “lead and coordinate international action to protect refugees and resolve refugee problems worldwide,” and protect “the rights and well-being of refugees.” Following UNHCR’s inception, the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees defines who is a refugee and details their rights and the legal obligations of the states.

One of the UN’s first attempts at providing humanitarian assistance to Palestinian refugees, in the hopes of creating a better quality of life and helping them to “enjoy human rights to the fullest possible extent,” was the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA). UNRWA was created under General Assembly resolution 302 (IV) in 1949 in response to the Arab-Israeli War of 1948. Its purpose was to assist the numerous amounts of Palestinians that had been displaced. The lack of progress at solving the Palestinian refugee dilemma has caused the GA to prolong UNRWA’s mandate to June 2014 with the potential for more extensions, given its long history of renewals. UNRWA works to promote Palestinian refugees’ development by “helping them [to] acquire knowledge and skills, lead long and healthy lives, achieve decent standards of living, [and] enjoy human rights to the fullest possible extent.” General Assembly resolution 66/74 takes note of the progress being made by UNRWA and emphasizes the work still left to do, while urging the international community to strengthen their support in order to address this humanitarian issue and provide assistance to Palestinian refugees.

The GA established the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People (CEIRPP) in 1975 under resolution 3376. One part of the CEIRPP’s duties is to “recommend a programme of implementation to enable the Palestinian people to exercise their inalienable rights to self-determination without external interference, national independence and sovereignty; and to return to their homes and property from which they had been displaced.” The Committee continues to the present, most recently having its mandate renewed by the General Assembly under resolution 66/14 of November 2011. The Committee has also expressed its support of Security Council resolution 1397 (2002), which “affirm[s] a vision of a region where two States, Israel and Palestine, live side by side within secure and recognized borders.”

Both the General Assembly Plenary and General Assembly Fourth Committee have taken recent steps towards providing assistance to Palestinian refugees displaced as a result of Israeli settlements in the oPt. In its sixty-sixth session, the GA adopted resolutions 66/72 and 66/73 upon report from the Fourth Committee, both of which call for action in providing assistance to Palestinians displaced by Israeli settlements. In 2011, the Fourth Committee
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refugees live in camps in neighboring countries such as Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon, and camps in the Gaza Strip and the West Bank, including East Jerusalem. Refugees face serious hardships in some countries, such as Lebanon where refugees are refused “access to healthcare, education, and employment,” and are prevented from construction within camps. In Gaza, Palestinian refugees are considered stateless and because of Israeli control of air and land access, Gaza’s economy has been falling. Egypt’s representative at the 21st meeting of the Fourth Committee in 2011 noted that international cooperation in ceasing continued settlements and blockades is necessary in order to ensure that a peace process could continue and a two-state solution could be reached.

Legal Status of Israeli Settlements in Occupied Palestinian Territory

The consequences of Israeli Settlements in the oPt have been catastrophic for the Palestinians. According to the National Affairs Department of the PLO, there are currently seven million Palestinian refugees as a result of Israeli settlements. The July 2012 Protection of Civilians Weekly Report by the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs - occupied Palestinian territory reported that there were 46 Palestinians killed by Israeli troops in Gaza and 242 injured this year. Additionally, the report states that there were 395 Palestinian structures destroyed in the West Bank this year and 615 people displaced.

The Disputed Status of the Occupied Palestinian Territory

The Israeli government does not consider the territories to be illegally occupied and continues to broaden the range of settlements, ignoring international law. At the conclusion of the Commission to Examine the Status of Building in Judea and Samaria, which is the term Israel applies to the occupied West Bank, in July 2012, the Israeli government justified the expansion of settlements in those areas by claiming that “the relevant international conventions cannot be considered applicable to the unique and [sui generis] historic and legal circumstances of Israel’s presence in Judea and Samaria spanning over decades.” Furthermore, the Commission concluded, “the provisions of the 1949 Fourth Geneva Convention, regarding transfer of populations, cannot be considered to be applicable and were never intended to apply to the type of settlement activity carried out by Israel in Judea and Samaria.” In a statement issued in April 2012, the Bureau of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People emphasized its concern with the Israeli government’s disregard of international law by authorizing what Israel deemed as “legal” additional settlements in areas of the West Bank.

The injustices and abuses to human rights that the Palestinian refugees have to endure because of Israeli settlements, blockades, and acts of violence brings into question the legality of Israeli action. Despite Israeli argument that its actions were and are legal, several internationally accepted laws and statements indicate otherwise. Under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) (1948), everyone has the right to be protected within their own country and return to their own country; everyone also has the right to a nationality. Under Article 49 of the Fourth Geneva Convention (1949), “individual or mass forcible transfers, as well as deportations of protected persons from occupied territory to the territory of the Occupying Power or to that of any other country, occupied or not, are prohibited, regardless of their motive.”
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In a press release discussing issues debated by the Fourth Committee in 1997, the Committee concluded that the continued Israeli occupation of Palestinian territory is “illegal and an obstacle to peace and economic and social development.” The Committee went further in condemning Israel for its human rights abuses against the Palestinian people. The Bureau of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People calls for numerous actions to be taken by Israel, including the “freeze [of] all settlement activity” and restraint from “provocative acts that undermine international efforts to revive Israeli-Palestinian talks.” Furthermore, the Bureau requests that the “[Security] Council meets its legal obligations as the guardian of international peace and security, and to find the resolve to compel Israel, the occupying Power, to halt and dismantle settlements in order to safeguard the two-State solution.”

**Conclusion: Remaining Challenges and Next Steps**

Despite progress being made toward providing assistance to Palestinian refugees, there are still obstacles and challenges to preventing Israeli settlements in the oPt from causing additional displacement among Palestinians. One of the challenges is Israel’s refusal to accept that the oPt are in fact occupied and retreat from those already occupied areas. These continued settlements make it impossible to have a two-state solution, which “requires secure borders for both the State of Israel and the State of Palestine,” because of the inability of the two parties to agree on what makes up the borders. Another challenge is providing assistance to refugees that have taken refuge in regions also experiencing violent upheavals. UNRWA expressed its concern for the 500,000 Palestinian refugees in Syria. The Israeli settlements of the occupied Syrian Golan and the treatment of both Palestinians and Syrians in the area by Israelis is also of great concern as Israel has shown disregard for international law in the area. Additionally, the violence in Syria itself has spilled over to the Palestinian refugees in the region and as recently as September 2012, Palestinians have been killed due to Syrian violence. UNRWA “repeats its profound concern regarding the destructive impact of the Syria conflict on Palestine refugees and other civilians, which it strongly deplores,” and as the uprisings in the region persist, UNRWA “request[s] all parties to the conflict to ‘take measures, as required by international law, to preserve human life, to avoid forced displacement and to exercise the utmost restraint.’”

Recommendations contained in the most recent report of the Secretary-General on the Israeli settlements include for the Government of Israel to abide by and uphold international legal obligations, end all settlement activities, and make all attempts to prevent the displacement of Palestinians. Further options for addressing the situation include strengthening the international community’s support in the area of budgetary and fiscal support, as well as through ongoing review and targeting of the highest priorities of Palestinian refugees.
The road to a peaceful solution to the Israel-Palestine conflict has been and will continue to be long and complicated. The Palestinian people have endured years of struggles and displacement as Israeli settlements in the oPt grew to overwhelming numbers; however, the UN and the international community continue to work towards finding ways to assist the Palestinian refugees and find a solution to the conflict. There are a multitude of challenges and questions that delegates should consider while researching this topic. What are the UN, its organizations, and the international community doing to provide assistance to Palestinian refugees? How can the UN, its organizations, and the international community work towards a peaceful solution between Israel and Palestine? How can these bodies address the illegal actions of Israel and prevent future settlements of oPt? How can the General Assembly Fourth Committee specifically respond to the legal matters, assist refugees, and promote the peace process? Delegates should reflect on these questions, along with others formed throughout the research, while delving into this topic and formulate solutions for addressing Israeli settlements in oPt and assistance to Palestinian Refugees.
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Israeli attacks, use of force, and other human rights violations in the Occupied Palestinian Territories have destroyed a high number of Palestinian homes, taken numerous lives, and displaced a large number of Palestinian’s creating an influx in Palestinian refugees. This report outlines this and other events, within the past five years, that have lead up to the current situation. Furthermore, this report gives statistics such as death rates, number of bombings, prisoners, and displaced persons. This information will provide delegates with a strong background and statistical information that emphasizes the direness of the situation.


The Israeli-Palestinian conflict continues to produces more Palestinian refugees each day. This journal policy paper emphasizes the necessity of a two-state solution in order to prevent the creation of more refugees and the hardships of those that already exist. The paper also recognizes the challenges of establishing a two-state solution. The paper provides recommendations on how to achieve a two-state solution, despite the challenges. Delegates will find this policy paper as a useful example of a suggested solution to the issue.


Delegates should be able to easily access the UN Charter. It outlines the basic structure of the UN, its roles and functions. For this topic, Chapter IX: International Economic and Social Co-Operation is important to take note of because of Article 55 and how it relates to this topic. That is just one of the many Articles in the Charter that can be applied to this topic, and that is why it is essential for delegates to utilize.


This resolution by the GA 4th Committee notes the current status of refugees and attempts to address the matter. It acknowledges and calls for continued efforts at assisting Palestinian refugees. This resolution provides delegates with recent UN action and will allow them to analyze what has and has not worked as a result of this resolution.


The resolution observes Israeli actions and the affects those actions have had on Palestinian human rights. It reaffirms court rulings, the responsibility of the international community, the Geneva Convention, and various other international standards for upholding human rights. The resolution c brings to the international community’s attention Israel’s violations to these international standards and demands Israel stop the creation for more settlements. It further emphasizes more ways in which to promote Palestinian human rights. This resolution will provide delegates with the UN’s recent attempts at deterring Israeli practices affecting the human rights of the Palestinian people.


This contains the full text of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This is important for delegates because it outlines the human rights given to all people of all countries, and it is vital to know the basic structure of the issue and have a solid foundation for beginning research. It will assist delegates in their research of the human rights issues Palestine refugees are facing and what rights they are guaranteed. This was a groundbreaking document because it was one of the first to outline specific human rights. Some of the rights include freedom from slavery, torture, and
arbitrary arrest, and the right to be recognized as a person before the law.

This is the main Web-site of the General Assembly Fourth Committee. It contains information regarding the Fourth Committee’s duties, recent documents, press releases, past sessions, and related links. This site will provide delegates with a solid background of the Fourth Committee.

The United Nations Information System on the Question of Palestine (UNISPAL) provides UN documents, news, and information on the Question of Palestine. This Web site provides links to relevant information on Palestine and refugees. This is a good resource for delegates to familiarize themselves with, especially when researching current UN, international, and regional action.

The United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East is an organization that was created to provide assistance to the refugees in Jordan, Lebanon, and Syria. The Web-site outlines structure and history, and it provides a definition for what constitutes a Palestinian refugee. Additionally, it contains documents with that provide useful information on the status of Palestinian refugees. This Web-site will assist delegates in their research by providing background information on an organization dedicated to providing assistance to Palestinian refugees and giving a basic definition of Palestinian refugees.

This Web-site gives a brief history of the Arab-Israeli War of 1948 and the events that lead up to the current displacement of Palestinians. This war is noteworthy because it is one of the first events that created the first major displacement of Palestinians. The history and steps leading up to the current situation are important to know because it allows for a better understanding of the situation and how it can be resolved.
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II. Promoting the Peaceful Use of Outer Space and Preventing an Arms Race

“Outer space is one of the most exciting and challenging topics [on the agenda today]. And perhaps of all the important topics on the agenda of the United Nations, none quite captures our imagination like outer space. [The] importance of space science, technology and applications in every day life, in helping us address some of today's most urgent problems [cannot be emphasized enough]. Coupled with advances made in other fields of science and technology, they offer a wide range of specific tools and solutions that are transforming weather forecasting, environmental protection, humanitarian assistance, disaster management and more.”

Introduction

Amid international efforts to relieve humanitarian crises, bring peace to conflict-ridden regions, and make the promise of Universal Human Rights a reality, the use of outer space is often seen as a secondary issue; its vast inaccessibility removes it from the headlines and our concerns; its ubiquity in science fiction films post-dates it as a problem of the future, not of our present. Nevertheless, how the international community decides to use outer space is a vital contemporary test of global governance at the United Nations. The vital challenges and opportunities are numerous: increasing amounts of space debris endangers its very use, and the very real possibility of the weaponization of outer space threatens to turn it into the fourth terrain of combat. Outer space also has an irreplaceable role to play in addressing humanitarian concerns, enhancing peace and security initiatives, and enforcing human rights norms—not to mention the function of our daily lives. These are pressing concerns that affect the entire international community, not invented futuristic fears that only matter to a select few.

The United Nations and Outer Space

On October 4, 1957, the Soviet Union succeeded in putting Sputnik, the world’s first artificial satellite, into orbit around the Earth. Occurring within the context of the burgeoning Cold War, Sputnik’s effect on international peace and security debates cannot be overstated. Approximately a month later, and for the first time, the United Nations General Assembly (GA) addressed outer space in Resolution 1148 (XII)—a resolution primarily concerned with arms reduction and the agenda of the Disarmament Commission. The GA set out the goal that all objects sent “through outer space shall be exclusively for peaceful and scientific purposes.” In 1958, the General Assembly Fourth Committee held a debate on “Questions of the Peaceful Use of Outer Space,” and in the following year, the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (COPUOS) was established as a permanent subsidiary body of the GA Fourth. Thus, in a relatively short period, the United Nations, and the General Assembly Fourth Committee in particular, established itself as central to the not entirely dichotomous aim of promoting the peaceful uses of outer space and preventing its weaponization.

Five international treaties and five UN resolutions constitute the primary foundation of international space law. The five main treaties that govern the use of outer space are succinctly referred to as: the 1967 Outer Space Treaty (OST), the 1968 Astronaut Rescue Agreement, the 1972 Liability Convention, the 1975 Registration Convention, and the 1979 Moon Agreement. The OST bans the deployment of weapons of mass destruction into space, guarantees that no national territorial claims can be made of any part of outer space, protects property rights of all objects launched into space, and discourages actions that might interfere with the space operations of other member states. The Astronaut Rescue Agreement aims to ensure international cooperation in providing for the safe return of all astronauts. The Liability Convention stipulates that “launching states” will be “absolutely liable to pay compensation for damage caused by its space object on the surface of the Earth or to aircraft in flight.” The Registration Convention requires Member States that are party to the treaty to maintain and share a record of the
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function, orbital path, and appropriate designator of every space object it has launched into space. The Moon Agreement echoes the rhetoric and goals of the OST by stressing the “peaceful use” of the moon and other celestial bodies in the solar system, but goes a step further by requiring that “all space vehicles, equipment, facilities, stations and installations on the Moon shall be open” to inspection by other Member States. It is important to note that not all Member States are party to these treaties. There are 101 Member States that are party to the OST, with 26 signatories. The Rescue Agreement has 91 parties and 24 signatories. The Liability Convention has 88 parties and 23 signatories. The Registration Convention has 56 parties and four signatories; and there are only 13 parties and four signatories to the Moon Convention (none of the major space powers—i.e. the United States (U.S.), the Russian Federation, or the People’s Republic of China (PRC)—are amongst these seventeen parties and signatories). The United Nations General Assembly has also passed a series of resolutions regulating the use of space, commonly referred to as the UN Space Principles. These five resolutions outline the legal right to space exploration, broadcast satellite use, remote sensing technology, the use of nuclear power, and international cooperation. Delegates should be familiar with the details of these ten documents as they establish the norms of international activities in space.

There is a distinct division of labor within the UN system when addressing issues related to outer space. Strictly speaking, the Conference on Disarmament (CD), under its agenda item: “Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space” (PAROS), is the only non-General Assembly UN body mandated to address the weaponization or militarization of outer space. Conversely, COPUOS and the UN Office of Outer Space Affairs (UNOOSA) are intended to address its peaceful uses. UNOOSA serves as the secretariat to GA Fourth (when it discusses outer space), COPUOS, and to COPUOS’s sub-committees and related working groups. UNOOSA houses and manages several databases, does research and report writing for COPUOS, and serves as the main bureaucratic apparatus for all UN actions related to the peaceful use of outer space. Since its creation in 1959, COPUOS has been the main deliberative body charged with discussing the peaceful use of outer space. COPUOS guides the work of two standing subcommittees: the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee and the Legal Subcommittee, both of which provide COPUOS and other interested UN bodies with vital research and reports related to their perspective fields. For example, the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee reports on debris mitigation and disaster management issues related to the geostationary orbit of space-based communications technology. Although this is a highly technical body with a very narrow mandate, many have argued that its decisions and regulations have come to influence and constitute de facto space law. Member States of the ITU are obliged to follow the provisions of the ITU’s founding treaty, the Constitution of the International Telecommunication Union and their Radio Regulations—both of which regulate the operations of telecommunications facilities. It should be noted, however, that the ITU Constitution states, “Member States retain their entire freedom [from these regulations] with regard to military radio installations.” While the ITU constitution goes on to ask that these installations, “so far as possible,” observe the regulatory provisions, this clear exemption for military satellites speaks both to the privilege afforded to security concerns within these debates and the contradictions inherent to the peaceful use of outer space.

Lastly, there is the International Telecommunications Union (ITU), which allocates radio frequency and addresses issues related to the geostationary orbit of space-based communications technology. Although this is a highly technical body with a very narrow mandate, many have argued that its decisions and regulations have come to influence and constitute de facto space law. ITU General Assembly, United Nations Treaties and Principles on Outer Space, 2002, p. 33. UNOOSA, Status of International Agreements relating to Activities in Outer Space, 2012. ITU General Assembly, United Nations Treaties and Principles on Outer Space, 2002, pp. 39-56. ITU General Assembly, United Nations Treaties and Principles on Outer Space, 2002, pp. 39-56. ITU, Collection of the basic texts of the International Telecommunication Union adopted by the Plenipotentiary Conference, Ch. VII, Art. 48, p. 56. ITU, Collection of the basic texts of the International Telecommunication Union adopted by the Plenipotentiary Conference, Ch. VII, Art. 48, p. 44.
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Contemporary United Nations’ Responses to the Challenges and Possibilities of Outer Space

The United Nations has several space-based programs dedicated to the peaceful use of outer space, and its promotion: the UN Platform for Space-based Information for Disaster Management and Emergency Response (UN-SPIDER), the Operational Satellite Applications Programme (UNOSAT), and the Department of Field Support Cartographic Section (DFSCS). While DFSCS is the main map producing entity of the UN, providing maps for the Secretariat and its reports, UN Peacekeeping operations also rely on it for space-based Geographic Information Systems (GIS) imagery. UNOSAT, a program run by the UN Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), performs satellite-based and GIS analysis to provide actionable information for a variety of UN bodies. UNOSAT offers the ability to support fact-finding missions, monitor human rights abuses in inaccessible regions, and verify or disprove claims of violations of human rights or international humanitarian law. In highly dynamic and fluid situations, UNOSAT often supports the work of the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (UNOHCHR), the International Criminal Court (ICC), and the UN Security Council, with GIS data and analysis. UN-SPIDER, housed within UNOOSA, aims to provide universal access to, and capacity building for, “all types of space-based information and services relevant to disaster management.” UN-SPIDER has launched and continues to build a Knowledge Portal, which is an internet-based platform containing space-based information and solutions regarding disaster and emergency response. UN-SPIDER supports capacity building and regional coordination of space-based responses to disaster management through its various Regional Support Offices and its partnerships with Member State-nominated national organizations. These three UN programs exemplify how the use of outer space can be peaceful, and can also be used to address many of the international community’s greatest challenges.

The Sustainable Use of Outer Space

The dissemination of space technologies over the last decade has resulted in a sharp increase in outer space actors and fears about the long-term sustainable use of outer space. Concerns include: an increase in space debris, overcrowding of orbital slots and radio frequencies, and preventing space’s weaponization.

A central and crosscutting issue to sustainability in outer space is space debris. Currently there are “22,000 items in space bigger than a softball,” which include “the upper stages of launch vehicles, disabled spacecraft, dead batteries, solid rocket motor waste, and refuse from human missions.” With many of these items travelling at speeds up to 22,000 miles per hour, velocities at which “even flecks of paint” could be potentially damaging, space debris poses a serious threat to the continued use of outer space. In large part due to two events, space debris has nearly doubled in last decade. The first event occurred in 2007, when the PRC tested an Anti-Satellite Weapon (ASAT) on one of its own defunct weather satellites. Two years later, in 2009, a Russian and U.S. satellite collided unintentionally. These two events alone created over 5,000 new pieces of catalogued space debris larger than 10 centimeters, with more pieces being catalogued every year.
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In recent years there have been three distinct UN initiatives aimed at addressing the sustainability of space. In 2008, the General Assembly adopted resolution 62/217, the Space Debris Mitigation Guidelines, a set of voluntary principles aimed at addressing the production of space debris.\textsuperscript{159} The seven guidelines include avoiding intentional destruction and accidental collision of spacecraft, and limiting debris released throughout missions.\textsuperscript{160} In 2009, the Long-term Sustainability of Outer Space Activities Working Group (LTSSA) was established under the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee of UNCOOUOS, with the goal of identifying possible measures to ensure the safe and sustainable use of outer space.\textsuperscript{161} In 2011, Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon established the Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on Transparency and Confidence-building Measures (TCBMs) in Outer Space Activities.\textsuperscript{162} In general, TCBMs are a tried and true method for arms control and nonproliferation negotiations.\textsuperscript{163} They were widely relied upon during the bilateral U.S.-Soviet talks of the Cold War and make up a large part of the OST and the other space treaties as well.\textsuperscript{164} TCBMs are typically built around establishing norms of information exchange, the transparent demonstration of capabilities, notification of use, reliable consultations on persistent issues, and thematic workshops.\textsuperscript{165} Both the GGE and LTSSA are due to submit their recommendations to the Secretary-General in 2014.\textsuperscript{166} Lastly, in 2010 UNOOSA and the ITU merged their respective databases of satellite positions, “which OOSA monitors through the UN Registry of Space Objects and the ITU through its Master International Frequency Register, which registers radio frequency transponders rather than actual satellites.”\textsuperscript{167} Because most Member States do not register their military satellites with UNOOSA, but still register the transponders of these military satellites with the ITU, this merger created the most comprehensive and universally accessible database of satellites in outer space.\textsuperscript{168}

**Persistent Challenges in the Peaceful Use of Outer Space**

A central aspect to the sustainable use of outer space is Space Situational Awareness (SSA), i.e. the “ability to detect, track, identify, and catalog objects in outer space, such as space debris and active or defunct satellites.”\textsuperscript{169} Improved SSA capabilities will be essential in both avoiding unintentional collisions in an increasingly crowded space environment and allowing for the surveillance of space objects, thus acting as a bulwark against the weaponization of space.\textsuperscript{170} Currently there are only a few Member States (the U.S., Russia, China, and India, in descending order of capacity) with space surveillance capabilities.\textsuperscript{171} Even the U.S. system, which is by far the world’s most comprehensive, has serious gaps in coverage (as evidenced by the US-Russia satellite collision in 2009).\textsuperscript{172} While many Member States have bilateral data sharing agreements with the U.S. for SSA data, the U.S. greatly limits the access that other Member States are allowed due to the inherent sensitivity of surveillance data.\textsuperscript{173} The European Union (EU) is developing its own system, but neither this nor the joint UNOOSA-ITU database will ever constitute universally accessible SSA data.\textsuperscript{174} Considering the gaps in coverage between the respective space surveillance systems and the desirable ability to compare and corroborate data, achieving a multilateral and universally accessible SSA system would not only go a long way towards achieving successful TCBMs, but would be a serious step towards the sustainable use of space.\textsuperscript{175}
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Other persistent challenges to the peaceful use of outer space are managing space traffic, orbital slots, and radio frequencies.\footnote{Williamson, Assuring the Sustainability of Space Activities, 2011, p.3} There are three basic orbital regions where today’s satellites operate: geostationary earth orbit (GEO), low earth orbit (LEO), and Medium Earth Orbit (MEO). LEO is primarily used for remote sensing and earth observation, MEO for space-based navigation systems (like GPS), and GEO used for most communications and broadcast satellites because “orbital movement at this altitude is synchronized with the Earth’s 24-hour rotation, meaning that a satellite in GEO appears to “hang” over one spot on Earth.”\footnote{Jaramillo, Space Security 2011, 2011, pp. 38.} While the ITU Constitution regulates the international distribution of both the finite radio spectrum and orbital slots needed for satellite communication, two factors are causing increases in radio interference: increased crowding in desired orbits, and a rise in radio interference from military communication and tracking devices.\footnote{Jaramillo, Space Security 2011, 2011, pp. 39, 82.} Due to their orbital trajectory and distance from earth, GEO satellites tend to generate higher-powered transmissions than other satellites, resulting in a very limited amount of satellites being able to occupy these orbital slots without causing interference.\footnote{Jaramillo, Space Security 2011, 2011, pp. 40.} While the ITU Constitution provides that radio frequencies and orbital slots “must be used rationally, efficiently and economically” to ensure all Member States “have equitable access” to both, in practice the orbital slots in GEO have been distributed on an ordinal basis. In the past decade, this practice has resulted in a variety of bureaucratic problems for the ITU, such as a surge of space actors applying for, and subsequently squatting on, slots they have no near-term intention of using.\footnote{Jaramillo, Space Security 2011, 2011, pp. 40.}

The question of whether or not to pursue active space debris removal is another issue facing the international community. While many argue that this step will be essential to the sustainable use of outer space, several Member States have raised concerns over cost sharing and whether the international community or the launching state has the right to remove space objects that are the sovereign properties of Member States.\footnote{COPUOS, Report of the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee on its forty-ninth session, held in Vienna from 6 to 17 February 2012, 2012, pp. 17, 29, 31.} While the challenges are largely technological and financial (proposed removal solutions run the risk of creating more debris and are projected to be extremely expensive) experts have posited that by simply “removing large objects from LEO, which over time will fragment and be the source of thousands of medium size debris,” the problem of sustainability would be largely addressed.\footnote{Williamson, Assuring the Sustainability of Space Activities, 2011, p.6.}

\textbf{Preventing an Arms Race}

\textit{Interpretations of Peace}

Central to any effort to prevent the weaponization of space is an understanding of the debates and interpretations over such terms as ‘peaceful purposes,’ and the difference between the militarization and weaponization of space. While the OST is often seen as the greatest legal bulwark against the weaponization of space, it lacks verification or enforcement provisions and fails to prohibit space weapons.\footnote{Jaramillo, Space Security 2011, 2011, p. 66.} Even its constant references to the “use of outer space for peaceful purposes,” is more malleable than it might appear.\footnote{UN General Assembly, United Nations Treaties and Principles on Outer Space, 2002, pp. 4-7; Wolff, ‘Peaceful uses’ of outer space has permitted its militarization—does it also mean its weaponization?, 2003, p. 8.} Many Member States maintain that “peaceful purposes” entail the non-aggressive maintenance of peace and security, an argument that has allowed for the militarization of space.\footnote{Wolter, Common Security in Outer Space and International Law, 2005, p. 31.} Approximately 70\% of all satellites in space serve full or partial military purposes, such as communication, detection, surveillance, and tracking.\footnote{Wolter, Common Security in Outer Space and International Law, 2005, p. 31.} This non-aggressive militarization of space is justified under Articles 2 (4) and 51 of the United Nations Charter; Article 2 (4)—the prohibition of the use of force—allows for the non-aggressive militarization of space, and Article 51—the right to self-defense—justifies it further.\footnote{Wolff, ‘Peaceful uses’ of outer space has permitted its militarization—does it also mean its weaponization?, 2003, p. 8.} The argument is: not only do all states have the right to defend themselves (satellites have become essential components of defense), but that “using outer space for deterrent and defensive purposes serves the cause of peace.”\footnote{Wolff, ‘Peaceful uses’ of outer space has permitted its militarization—does it also mean its weaponization?, 2003, p. 8.}
of peace.” This is a pernicious logic. A space-based missile defense shield, ostensibly a mechanism of deterrence and defensive, could be justified under the same logic and would put weapons with offensive capabilities into space. Furthermore, due to the heavy reliance that modern militaries—and societies at large—have on satellite communication and tracking, many military strategists have begun to view communication satellites as priority and high-risk targets; the sudden and calculated destruction of communication and tracking satellites could cripple a military’s ability to respond to threats on the ground or a Member State’s ability to communicate effectively. The targeting of satellites is a contemporary security challenge. In 2007, the PRC and in 2008 the U.S. both successfully launched ASATs and destroyed each of their own defunct weather satellites. The logic of self-defense could equally be used to justify the deployment of weapons into space to defend vulnerable satellites. Once the threshold of placing weapons in space is crossed, an international arms race might become inevitable.

The Challenge of Verification

To this escalatory logic, those in the international community that fear this outcome have proposed a space weapons ban. While various legal and diplomatic obstacles make completing a space weapons ban difficult, one of the most challenging practical concerns centers around realistic forms of verification. Like other weapons bans and verifications systems, such as executed by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), a successful space weapons verification regime will likely center around a mix of self-reporting, inspections, detection, deterrence, and confidence building. The nature of space weapons does lend themselves to verification in some ways however. For instance, launching an object into space can be detected through either infrared (IR) satellite detection capabilities (which only a few Member States have) or an infrasound monitoring system—such as the IAEA’s International Monitoring System. It should be noted, however, that IR detection is much more effective. Verification of functionality and capabilities of space objects once they have entered space would be a great challenge and would require a highly advanced SSA system (more advanced than anything currently deployed) but the technology exists. Although it would pose a significant technological challenge, verification of actions taken in space, opposed to the verification of capabilities, would be more reliable.

Conclusion

Delegates should not be dismayed by what might appear to be a highly technical or niche subject matter. Humanitarians can use this topic as a vehicle to explore ways in which space-based systems can better serve the fight against hunger or the distribution of medical supplies; legalists can revel in the burgeoning field of space law or examine ways in which data from space can be used in courts; environmentalists can investigate how space-based technologies might be employed in the fight against global warming, and the peace and security experts have an essential role to play in preventing the opening of the fourth terrain of combat. The last time warfare took on a new dimension, when it first took to the skies completely in World War II, the result was unprecedented levels of death and destruction. However, we must remember that beginning over a century ago, at the 1899 Hague Convention, there was a clear recognition amongst the international community of the destructive potential of air flight. While serious attempts were made to ban the aerial bombardment of civilians, once militaries began developing bombing squadrons the spiraling and unpredictable logic of an arms race took over. If we are to claim that the international system, with the UN as its center, is stronger than it was a century ago, then we must not repeat past mistakes and dismiss the possibility of space weapons as a problem of tomorrow; we must eliminate the possibility of an arms race before it even begins.
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Moving forward, delegates should consider questions like: What exactly constitutes a space weapon? As the ASAT launchings show, a weapon does not need to be physically located in space to pose a threat to space-based capabilities; would these land-based ASATs be covered under a space weapons ban? If we are to effectively regulate outer space, does international law need a clear definition of where outer space begins? What hitherto unutilized forums of the UN apparatus might be useful in addressing these problems? How can the UN further promote and incentivize technology sharing or international SSA data exchange? What role do private companies and other non-governmental actors have to play in addressing this topic? By grappling with these, and the many other questions implicitly posed here, delegates should formulate specific, detailed, original, and forward-looking solutions to promote the peaceful use of outer space and prevent an arms race.
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*This paper details all of the international mechanisms, forums, and efforts to address the challenges posed by outer space. This article will be beneficial to all delegates as it provides in depth analysis and review of the international apparatuses relevant to topic. Because it addresses many of their short comings as well, this article will be ideal for any delegate wishing to reform the UN system and its effort to address the use of outer space.*


*This academic background paper provides a thorough overview of many of the conflicts in outer space law and policy. This will be an excellent place for delegates to begin their research. The paper defines important concepts in the field, discusses historical developments in the uses of outer space and the subsequent legal and policy responses, and does a good job of framing many of the conflicts and debates surrounding the militarization of outer space.*


*This is the annual publication of a think-tank dedicated to the analysis of trends in the uses of outer space. This will be an excellent reference guide for delegates as they begin their research. It is well organized by area of interest and wide-ranging in its coverage, discussing technological capabilities, legal and policy developments, and the civil, commercial, and military uses of outer space.*


*This is a very thorough examination of TCBMs, both in a general sense and in their specific application to outer space. It outlines previous bilateral, multilateral, and international TCBM agreements, assesses lessons learned, and then applies them to the challenges of outer space. It also addresses many of the persistent challenges outlines above, and discusses how TCBMs could be used to address them. This document will be invaluable to any delegate interested in developing TCBMs in their approach to the topic.*


*This is a recent and complete report by the Committee on the Peaceful uses of Outer Space (COPUOS). As the most relevant UN body on the topic, delegates will gain substantially from familiarizing themselves with COPUOS’s work, concerns, areas of focus, and plans for the future—all of which are present and discernible from this report.*


*This is one of the most recent UN generated reports on the topic, written by COPUOS’s legal subcommittee. This report will be invaluable to delegates that wish to examine the legalistic avenues of addressing the topic. It discusses current UN approaches to international space law, identifies problems, the concerns of different member states, and plans for the future.*

This document contains all five international space treaties and all six UN space principles. As such, this document will be an essential reference for every delegate pursuing this topic. The five UN resolutions that constitute the space principals are: The Declaration of Legal Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Uses of Outer Space (General Assembly resolution 1962 (XVIII) of December, 13 1963); The Principles Governing the Use by States of Artificial Earth Satellites for International Direct Television Broadcasting (resolution 37/92 of December, 10 1982); The Principles Relating to Remote Sensing of the Earth from Outer Space (resolution 41/65 of December, 3 1986); The Principles Relevant to the Use of Nuclear Power Sources in Outer Space (resolution 47/68 of December, 14 1992); and The Declaration on International Cooperation in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space for the Benefit and in the Interest of All States, Taking into Particular Account the Needs of Developing Countries (resolution 51/122 of December, 13 1996). As the foundation of international space law, the eleven separate treaties and resolutions contained here will vital to any proposed solution to the challenges outlined above.


This is a relevant and timely conference report where a diverse set of opinions, topics, and issues are addressed. As a UN conference that brought together many prominent speakers to share their views, this report will be very helpful for delegates as they try to identify and formulate their own responses. The report summarizes presentations and panel discussions on topics from current and emerging threats to the challenges of verification.


While brief, this paper gives a very technical, yet easily understandable overview of the fundamental issues concerning outer space sustainability. Besides an overview of many of the issues, it also reviews international regulatory regimes and many of the UN bodies that are relevant to ensuring the sustainable use of outer space. This document will be very helpful to delegates wishing to address these issues, as it will provide both a detailed overview and a list of further references to begin one’s research.


This is an extremely wide-ranging and detailed—if somewhat biased—investigation of international law and its applications in terms of space security. While this document takes strong stands that not all member states will agree with, it represents one of the strongest arguments for comprehensive and specific space weapons bans and legal mechanisms against the weaponization of space. While technically legalistic to the extreme at times, any delegate concerned with weapons bans and the institution of legal regimes—either for or against—will gain from reckoning with the arguments contained here.
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III. The United Nations and 21st Century Information Governance

Introduction

21st century information governance is one of the most vital subjects of debate on the docket for many multilateral organizations. The evolving nature of telecommunications—and more recently the advent of the digital era—has forever changed international relations and revolutionized the roles and capacities of citizens across the globe. The United Nations has pursued the issue of information governance for several years by developing plans of action around information and communication technologies for development (ICT4D). For this year’s General Assembly Fourth (GA Fourth) committee agenda, this topic stands to be a transformative issue. Being the committee for special political and decolonization related affairs, information governance can and should be viewed as a longstanding pillar to sustainable development, a vehicle for the advancement of human rights, and a catalyst for pluralism in settings where social, political, and economic inequalities challenge diplomacy. These imperatives are not only outlined within GA Fourth specific documents, but also within the general charter of the United Nations as a whole.

In order to address the vitality of information governance, the GA Fourth has adopted a subsidiary body specifically related to public information, known as the Committee on Information (COI). The mandate of the COI was stated in A/34/182 of the General Assembly in 1979. While this committee facilitates information sharing within the United Nations system on an internal scale, it is not specifically tasked with regulating or deploying ICT for public and private sector applications within the sovereign affairs of specific Member States. Moreover, this committee should be viewed as the policy vehicle for the GA Fourth to address the issue of information governance as a whole, as it pertains to both Member States’ internal distribution of these resources, as well as how the United Nations utilizes access to information. The committee has 113 Member States and every Member State that is not a member of the COI can request membership. In its annual general debate the committee works on the adoption of a draft resolution, which offers offer new insights based on existing evidence of the need to proliferate information accessibility, and address the concerns that currently stifle equitable, progressive, and human-oriented approaches to information governance.

In order to move forward with debate and resolution on this topic in 2013, delegations in the GA Fourth committee should study information governance through several lenses, many of which will be explored in this background guide. First, a background of the existing regime should be examined. This includes the foundation of information governance and its evolution as 21st century communication paradigms have changed the rules of the game in a global “digital” sphere. Second, understanding the paradigm shifts that have occurred in the last 30 years is vital for preparing to move forward on this delicate issue. In order to fully grasp these shifts, it is imperative to evaluate the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) as it has developed in two phases in Geneva and Tunis, and in several different forms throughout reviews of WSIS outcomes and future plans for meeting goals outlined at the WSIS. The prerogative of this summit, its supporting agencies, collaborative bodies, and specific action lines are the most vital pieces of information governance logistics. Finally, this brief will offer an introduction to the realm of supporting agencies, compatible initiatives, opportunities, and threats to progressive solutions for 21st century information governance.
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According to the Secretary-General Ban-Ki Moon, information governance is:

“The principles and processes associated with ICT decision-making and its underlying organizational structures come together under the broad concept of ICT governance. The ICT management framework clarifies how decisions are made, who provides inputs for the decisions, who is accountable and how ICT activities are coordinated within the Secretariat and ensures that key stakeholders take on the appropriate roles and responsibilities to clearly and effectively guide the management of the Organization’s ICT activities and resources.”

Prior to the formation of a United Nations body dedicated to ICTs for development, it was clear that due to the prevalence of information governance challenges, the issue demanded a great deal of international attention. During the late 1970’s and into the early 1980’s the United Nations Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) facilitated transformative debates known as the New World Information and Communication Order (NWICO) debates—which revolved around the issue of information distribution globally. As mass communication technologies became more prevalent—parallel efforts to mainstream radio, broadcast, satellites, and printing infrastructures, governments began to reveal just how central information governance was as a means to serve as a vehicle for mass communication—and consequently—manipulation of foreign attitudes.

NWICO grew out of the New International Economic Order of 1974. During the course of these debates, several working papers were submitted to the MacBride Commission, also known as the International Commission for the Study of Communication Problems, which was created and named after Nobel scholar Séan MacBride.

The MacBride Commission was a special committee created within UNESCO to raise awareness about the role of media technologies for states, non-governmental organizations, and citizens. The proposals submitted after NWICO debates unfolded in 1978 were titled the ‘Mass Media Declaration’. The MacBride Commission was a 16-member panel dedicated to assessing the impact of a market-centric distribution model for ICTs on a global scale. Most importantly, the MacBride Commission published a document in 1980 called The MacBride Report, which is more commonly referred to as Many Voices One World. Among the many challenges that the report identified, three central obstacles were highlighted: “The concentration of the media, commercialization of the media, and unequal access to information and communication.” The Commission called for democratization of communication and the “strengthening of national media to avoid dependence on external sources,” and other issues related to global digital division and fragmented accessibility due to the lack of ICT infrastructures in developing countries.

While traditional media industries were a large proponent of the NWICO debates, the debates were heightened by the early emergence of Internet technologies as they began to be developed on an exclusive basis during the 1980s. As a result of the rapid emergence of Internet technologies, the initial vision and inspiration for the MacBride Commission only became more vital as the 21st century grew.

---
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 nearer. During the 1990s, NWICO debates began changing into debates around digital division as wireless communication networks started becoming more prevalent in the international community.

Both NWICO and digital division debates revolved around the central thesis that information should not circulate on a commercial model, but rather, a model of development due to the central democratic nature of communication. In other words, mass media technologies began to emerge not exclusively as a market offering, but instead, a tool to educate, engage, and organize civic behavior for social and political development. The problem with media technology, however, is that since its foundation it has primarily circulated through countries who have developed market infrastructures and been ignored in less developed societies were markets are not as developed. The main argument of NWICO and digital division advocates, thus, is that media technologies should not proliferate exclusively by market opportunities, but rather, in instances of social, political, and cultural efforts to strengthen development. Most importantly, these factors expedited the creation of the ICT Governance Task force—formally recognizing the inseparable link between access to information and sustainable development.

Digital division began emerging as a core issue as soon as the Internet began being distributed to different regions around the world. This division is evident within many different groups, including but not limited to: young and old, rich and poor, urban and rural, west and east, as well as gender, race, and political affiliations. While the emergence of digital technologies became prevalent for some during the 1990s, it immediately became a divisive tool for some developing societies. The notion of digital division has thus become one of the most prominent subjects of modern information governance, as access to information has clear and present links to sustainable development, human rights advancement, democratic inclusiveness, and other vital instruments outlined in the United Nations Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Both debates, NWICO and digital division, are rightful pursuits of the international community to shed light on the vitality of ICTs not as a privilege to be offered exclusively in a market scenario, but rather as a philanthropic initiative to effectively manage and refine pursuits for peace and democratic development around the world.

Many scholars have documented the importance of bridging digital division, given its relationship to democratic inclusion. Among this documentation is the claim that the ideological ascendancy of neo-liberalism and globalization trends in the late 20th century has driven bottom-up civic associations and empowered grassroots activism that have enabled identity formation and proliferation of minority rights in areas where colonialism has fragmented indigenous culture. These groups, and identity formations within them, are the direct by-products of having access to next-generation information networks. This is what has driven a notion of ‘globalization from below’ according to many communication theorists. Further, other scholars have noted that next-generation wireless networks have risen to become one of the most central agents in unifying societies. “The media are often seen as a central tool for creating a common culture, constructing a national identity, or a shared arena for public debate…the emphasis on diversity and pluralism runs against the imaginary presuppositions of democracy itself and that there is an inherent tension between pluralism and ‘publicness’—which is currently regarded as the Democratic Paradox.”

This paradox, as it is referred to, can be summarized by the diverging notions of what ICTs offer the individual while balanced with an assessment of how they are regulated. For example,
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The exercise of freedoms of speech and press carry with it duties and responsibilities which may be subject to formalities, conditions, restrictions, or penalties as they are prescribed by law and are necessary for the democratic society, in the interests of national security, territorial integrity or public safety, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health and morals, for the protection of reputation of rights of others, for preventing the disclosure of information received in confidence, or for maintaining the authority and impartiality of the judiciary in many instances.\footnote{Ward, \textit{The European Union Democratic Deficit and the Public Sphere: An Evaluation of EU Media Policy}, 2002.}

More specifically, the ‘democratic paradox’ can be understood as a conflict between the natural tendencies of ICTs’ ability to affect the rights of the citizen, versus the way they are governed by the imperatives of states. Understanding this paradox will be pivotal for moving towards solutions that both protect the rights of citizens in their civic associations, while allowing state’s to preserve national security.

In many instances, especially in developing countries, the prerogatives of the state overshadow the rights of citizens to access, distribute, and utilize ICTs in the way that they are intended.\footnote{Calingaert, \textit{Authoritarianism vs. the Internet}, 2010, pp. 69.} Extremely noteworthy examples of this can be seen in the Egyptian Internet blackouts of 2011, in addition to the consistent issue of Chinese censorship on next generation media networks.\footnote{Calingaert, \textit{Authoritarianism vs. the Internet}, 2010, pp. 69.} While these examples do not exclusively embody the struggle for equitable ICT distribution, they are noteworthy examples of how information governance inherits regionally specific problems throughout the General Assembly Member base. The delineation between state and civil prerogatives for ICTs can be further explained by Atkins when he states, “within regional governments—most notably Indonesia, Malaysia, and Thailand—there were conflicting policy positions relating to the new media. Those ministries and departments on the ‘information’ side sought to maintain state-based structures and those on the ‘telecommunications’ side took advantage of the commercial opportunities in the increasingly deregulated, internationalized market place.”\footnote{Atkins, \textit{Brand Power and State Power: the rise of new media networks in East Asia}, 2003, pp 465-487.} The democratic paradox of wireless next-generation networks still holds true for today, given every Member State of the United Nations chooses to embrace ICT for development in a different light. It should be noted that current regime for information governance on a global scale does not recognize any universal mandate for state’s to uphold in order to protect ICT for development on a state-to-state basis in the international community.\footnote{United Nations Group on the Information Society, \textit{Template for countries: 10-year country reporting templates}, 2012.} This inconsistency is what has led to the emergence of the WSIS, the United Nations Joint Unit on ICT governance, and the ICD4D Task Force—which are the current primary United Nations bodies dedicated to this subject.\footnote{United Nations Joint Inspection Unite, \textit{Information and Communication Technology (ICT) Governance in the United Nations System Organizations}, pp. 43, 2011.}

\textbf{Role of the General Assembly Fourth}

In conjunction with the WSIS, the United Nations General Assembly Fourth Committee has dedicated its committee on public information around the following 3 cornerstones:

\begin{itemize}
  \item “1: To continue to examine United Nations public information policies and activities, in the light of the evolution of international relations, particularly during the past two decades, and of the imperatives of the establishment of the new international economic order and of a new world information and communication order;  
  \item 2: To evaluate and follow up the efforts made and the progress achieved by the United Nations system in the field of information and communications; and  
  \item 3: To promote the establishment of a new, more just and more effective world information and communication order intended to strengthen peace and international understanding and based on the free circulation and wider and better-balanced dissemination of information and to make recommendations thereon to the General Assembly.”\footnote{United Nations Committee on Information, \textit{About the Committee}, 2012.}
\end{itemize}

In addition to the General Assembly Fourth Committee’s mandate on public information listed above, the General Assembly works in conjunction with the World Summit on the Information Society and the ICT for Development task force to oversee and implement refined efforts to strengthen access to information in areas of the world where it
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is most needed. These efforts have clearly been outlined and reviewed by the working bodies of WSIS in 2 different meetings in Geneva and Tunis in 2003 and 2005 respectively. The action lines the WSIS has outlined provide valuable insight for the general issue of information governance—as it is has been summarized and discussed within the General Assembly Fourth Committee’s framework on the topic.

**WSIS: embracing paradigm shifts in 21st century information governance—Action Lines**

Entering the 21st century, NWICO and digital division has introduced a staunch vision for information governance. As the Internet began spearheading even more robust and powerful capabilities than television, radio, and print, wireless next-generation networks became the focal point of multilateral ICT4D dialogue.\(^{249}\) This was made official in the creation of the WSIS—which began its first phase in Geneva in 2003, and went into a second phase in Tunis in 2005.\(^{250}\) The first phase of WSIS in Geneva outlined several principles and a plan of action, which introduced for the first time, 11 action lines around strengthening 21st century information governance.\(^{251}\) Phase one was a monumental asset in outlining the specific courses of action that Member States needed to pursue in order to bridge digital division and strengthen a more inclusive approach to access to wireless next-generation networks; moreover, phase one of the WSIS was the highest level gathering of states to discuss action lines for information governance to date.\(^{252}\) Phase two that took place in Tunis was dedicated to identifying key stakeholders for information governance.\(^{253}\) Together, each of these phases created an informal charter for the summit which was dedicated to transforming the basis of 21st century information governance, which centered around the fact that

“We are collectively entering a new era of enormous potential, that of the Information Society and expanded human communication. In this emerging society, information and knowledge can be produced, exchanged, shared, and communicated through all the networks of the world. All individuals can soon, if we take the necessary actions, together build a new Information Society based on shared knowledge and founded on global solidarity and a better mutual understanding between peoples and nations. We trust that these measures will open the way to the future development of a true knowledge society.”\(^{254}\)

In the last 2 years, there have been several meetings throughout the United Nations system related to information governance, and in particular, the societal impacts and government regulation of ICT4D applications.\(^{255}\) Along with these specific ICT applications outlined in the WSIS, the ITU and the UN Group on the Information Society have highlighted 11 specific action lines for advancing information governance for both the state and the citizen. It should be noted that understanding these 11 action lines is the roadmap to identifying needs and priorities for information accessibility reform. Furthermore, these 11 action lines embody the extent to which digital media access shapes the rights and roles of citizens around the world.\(^{256}\)

- **Action line 1:** The role of Governments and all stakeholders in the promotion of ICT4D.\(^{257}\)
- **Action line 2:** ICT infrastructure.\(^{258}\)
- **Action line 3:** access to information and knowledge.\(^{259}\)
- **Action line 4:** capacity building.\(^{260}\)
- **Action line 5:** confidence and security.\(^{261}\)

---
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Regional Public and Private Cooperation in constructing a vision beyond 2015

In light of these 11 action lines for progress on information governance, and the background evidence for the history of importance this subject encompasses, the United Nations and information governance could not be more intertwined as we delve deeper into the digital world. In order to make the future more sustainable and accountable—it must remain the priority of United Nations bodies to secure safe, fair, and universal access to information. In order to accomplish this, there is a plethora of regional public and private actors that should be seen as ideal partners for the United Nations to effectively carry out their goal of strengthening information governance.

There are a multitude of relevant agencies that are involved with carrying out the logistics for a more refined and progressive approach to 21st century information governance. Among them, both private and public institutions play a vital role in making the WSIS action lines more feasible for developing societies. In order to make these action lines effective for all Member States, several collaborative bodies should be mentioned for their efforts in bridging digital division, and strengthening for inclusive access to wireless next-generation networks. Among them, Information Management and Mine Action Programs (iMMAP) is a great example of a NGO that “enables the sharing of a common picture of the problems that exist and those striving to address them. Everything is connected by information. By crossing organizational boundaries, iMMAP makes information sharing and coordination of effort possible and effective.”

In another example, the Society for International Development (SID) is a global network of individuals and institutions concerned with development. “In its pursuit for social justice and institutional change, SID plays an important mediating and facilitating role among progressive civil society groups, connecting activists, intellectuals, academics and policy-makers working at community, national and international level. All of SID’s activities, which provide opportunities for the exchange of knowledge and information, are informed by the belief that such changes can only be achieved through dialogue and constructive engagement.” Institutions like the SID are vital partners for forums such as the Global Forum for Media Development (GFMD) is a “practitioner-led process open to all sides of the community involved in media development around the world.”

Conclusion

These examples of NGO’s involved with 21st century information governance are noteworthy case studies for how the civilian world is interacting with the institutional realm on this subject. These organizations, forums, and entities are vital partners for United Nations bodies such as UNESCO, the Committee on Science and Technology Development (CSTD), the International Telecommunications Union (ITU), the United Nations ICT4D Task Force, and the WSIS as all of these entities are exploring ways to centralize a multilateral effort to make access to information a human right—not a privilege. As the General Assembly Fourth Committee aims to contribute to

---
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improved information governance it is vital that it remains committed *not only* to it’s department of public information within the UN framework, but the broader realm of information governance as it is outlined in the WSIS action lines. The fusion of internal and external reform for ICT distribution stands to redefine international communication amidst the advent of the digital era forever.
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The purpose of the present review is to identify areas where progress has been made and where progress has been slow since 2005. It further identifies obstacles and constraints encountered as well as actions and initiatives to overcome them and important measures for further implementation of WSIS outcomes. It concludes with a discussion of new developments since 2005 as well as findings and suggestions in the lead up to the 2015 comprehensive review of WSIS outcomes. The report draws on existing reports and open consultation with all stakeholders, in particular the International Telecommunications Union and other UN and intergovernmental agencies, Governments, ICT sector associations and agencies, and private sector and civil society actors. The principal issues in this consultation were set out in a questionnaire sent out in September 2010.


This report has been prepared in response to the request by the Economic and Social Council to the United Nations Secretary-General to inform the Commission on Science and Technology for Development (CSTD) concerning the implementation of the outcomes of the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS). It reviews progress in implementation of WSIS outcomes and identifies obstacles and constraints encountered. The report has been prepared by the UNCTAD secretariat based on information provided by entities in the United Nations system and elsewhere on their efforts in 2011 to implement the WSIS outcomes, with a view to sharing effective practices and lessons learned.


The 2012 WSIS welcomed 1300 WSIS Stakeholders from more than 140 countries. This report summarizes the key contributions from several high-level representatives of the wider WSIS Stakeholder community graced the Forum with more than 30 ministers, 44 deputies, 30 ambassadors, 17 CEOs and Civil Society leaders contributing passionately towards the program of the Forum. This document outlines feasibility and scope for strengthening information governance according to the action lines produced by phase 1 and 2 of the WSIS.


The MacBride Report is a pillar document for understanding the foundations to information governance as the debate initially unfolded within the context of a new world information and communication order. This
report identifies the key political, cultural, and social considerations that orbit the issue of information governance on a global scale.


In the first two phases of the WSIS in Geneva and Tunis, many goals and objectives were set forth for different actors in the field of information production, distribution, and governance. This document assess the overall effectiveness of how these goals have been pursued, and what ground has been made for each of the 11 action lines set forth by WSIS over the course of the first two working phases. This document would be a good resource for delegates who aim to stay updated and engaged with the implementation of WSIS and information governance goals.


In any instance, the ability for countries in different regions to implement similar reforms across their different infrastructures remains a major challenge. In order to stay informed about the conditions that different Member-States face in development, this document outlined a country-reporting template in order to strengthen the sharing of information and reports across a multilateral environment.


ECOSOC council has had a unique outlook on the subject of information governance for many decades—dating back to the NWICO debates in the 1960’s and 70’s. More recently, though, they have entered the political arena with a set of visions and offerings that stand to strengthen international dialogue around information governance in vital ways. This document is the ECOSOC council’s assessment of the effectiveness of WSIS—going into strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats to information governance at large.


The action lines developed by WSIS are an all encompassing realm of subjects that dramatically effect the way we view, use, and are affected by information governance. It is vital that delegates become very familiar with these action lines, and understand the efforts of Member-States as they are offered through these specific channels of action. From media, to accessibility, to cultural sensitivity in the information market, each of the 11 action lines developed by WSIS


In order to gain a strong understanding of the political events that founded information governance, and the modern obstacles that are associated with it—This resource is a great starting point. It goes into detail about how NWICO (the new world information and communication order) debates transformed the global perception of media technologies, and the ways in which it should rightfully be utilized in an international context. For key background, ideological, and political precursors, delegates should consult this document.
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Rules of Procedure
General Assembly Fourth Committee (GA 4th)

Introduction
1. These rules shall be the only rules which apply to the General Assembly Fourth Committee (hereinafter referred to as “the Committee”) and shall be considered adopted by the Committee prior to its first meeting.
2. For purposes of these rules, the Plenary Director, the Assistant Director(s), the Under-Secretaries-General, and the Assistant Secretaries-General, are designates and agents of the Secretary-General and Director-General, and are collectively referred to as the “Secretariat.”
3. Interpretation of the rules shall be reserved exclusively to the Director-General or her or his designate. Such interpretation shall be in accordance with the philosophy and principles of the National Model United Nations and in furtherance of the educational mission of that organization.
4. For the purposes of these rules, “President” shall refer to the chairperson or acting chairperson of the Committee, which can be any Member of the Secretariat or their designate.

I. SESSIONS

Rule 1 - Dates of convening and adjournment
The Committee shall meet every year in regular session, commencing and closing on the dates designated by the Secretary-General.

Rule 2 - Place of sessions
The Committee shall meet at a location designated by the Secretary-General.

II. AGENDA

Rule 3 - Provisional agenda
The provisional agenda shall be drawn up by the Director-General and communicated to the Members of the Committee at least sixty days before the opening of the session.

Rule 4 - Adoption of the agenda
The agenda provided by the Director-General shall be considered adopted as of the beginning of the session. The order of the agenda items shall be determined by a majority vote of those present and voting.

The vote described in this rule is a procedural vote and, as such, observers are permitted to cast a vote. For purposes of this rule, those present and voting means those Member States and observers, in attendance at the meeting during which this motion comes to a vote. Should the Committee not reach a decision by conclusion of the first night’s meeting, the agenda will be automatically set in the order in which it was first communicated.

Rule 5 - Revision of the agenda
During a session, the Committee may revise the agenda by adding, deleting, deferring or amending items. Only important and urgent items shall be added to the agenda during a session. Debate on the inclusion of an item in the agenda shall be limited to three speakers in favor of, and three against, the inclusion. Additional items of an important and urgent character, proposed for inclusion in the agenda less than thirty days before the opening of a session, may be placed on the agenda if the Committee so decides by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting. No additional item may, unless the Committee decides otherwise by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting, be considered until a committee has reported on the question concerned.

For purposes of this rule, the determination of an item of an important and urgent character is subject to the discretion of the Director-General, or his or her designate, and any such determination is final. If an item is determined to be of such a character, then it requires a two-thirds vote of the Committee to be placed on the agenda. The votes described in this rule are substantive votes, and, as such, observers are not permitted to cast a vote. For purposes of this rule, the members present and voting means members (not including observers) in attendance at the session during which this motion comes to vote.
Rule 6 - Explanatory memorandum
Any item proposed for inclusion in the agenda shall be accompanied by an explanatory memorandum and, if possible, by basic documents.

III. SECRETARIAT

Rule 7 - Duties of the Secretary-General
1. The Secretary-General or her/his designate shall act in this capacity in all meetings of the Committee.
2. The Secretary-General, in cooperation with the Director-General, shall provide and direct the staff required by the Committee and be responsible for all the arrangements that may be necessary for its meetings.

Rule 8 - Duties of the Secretariat
The Secretariat shall receive, print, and distribute documents, reports, and resolutions of the Committee, and shall distribute documents of the Committee to the Members, and generally perform all other work which the Committee may require.

Rule 9 - Statements by the Secretariat
The Secretary-General, or her/his representative, may make oral as well as written statements to the Committee concerning any question under consideration.

Rule 10 - Selection of the President
The Secretary-General or her/his designate shall appoint, from applications received by the Secretariat, a President who shall hold office and, inter alia, chair the Committee for the duration of the session, unless otherwise decided by the Secretary-General.

Rule 11 - Replacement of the President
If the President is unable to perform her/his functions, a new President shall be appointed for the unexpired term at the discretion of the Secretary-General.

IV. LANGUAGE

Rule 12 - Official and working language
English shall be the official and working language of the Committee.

Rule 13 - Interpretation (oral) or translation (written)
Any representative wishing to address any body or submit a document in a language other than English shall provide interpretation or translation into English.

This rule does not affect the total speaking time allotted to those representatives wishing to address the body in a language other than English. As such, both the speech and the interpretation must be within the set time limit.

V. CONDUCT OF BUSINESS

Rule 14 – Quorum
The President may declare a meeting open and permit debate to proceed when representatives of at least one third of the members of the Committee are present. The presence of representatives of a majority of the members of the Committee shall be required for any decision to be taken.

For purposes of this rule, members of the Committee means the total number of members (not including observers) in attendance at the first night’s meeting.

Rule 15 - General powers of the President
In addition to exercising the powers conferred upon him or her elsewhere by these rules, the President shall declare
the opening and closing of each meeting of the Committee, direct the discussions, ensure observance of these rules, accord the right to speak, put questions to the vote and announce decisions. The President, subject to these rules, shall have complete control of the proceedings of the Committee and over the maintenance of order at its meetings. He or she shall rule on points of order. He or she may propose to the Committee the closure of the list of speakers, a limitation on the time to be allowed to speakers and on the number of times the representative of each member may speak on an item, the adjournment or closure of the debate, and the suspension or adjournment of a meeting.

Included in these enumerated powers is the President's power to assign speaking times for all speeches incidental to motions and amendment. Further, the President is to use her/his discretion, upon the advice and at the consent of the Secretariat, to determine whether to entertain a particular motion based on the philosophy and principles of the NMUN. Such discretion should be used on a limited basis and only under circumstances where it is necessary to advance the educational mission of the Conference and is limited to entertaining motions.

Rule 16 – Authority of the Committee
The President, in the exercise of her or his functions, remains under the authority of the Committee.

Rule 17 – Voting rights on procedural matters
Unless otherwise stated, all votes pertaining to the conduct of business shall require a majority of the members present and voting in order to pass.

For purposes of this rule, the members present and voting mean those members (including observers) in attendance at the meeting during which this rule is applied. Note that observers may vote on all procedural votes; they may, however, not vote on substantive matters (see Chapter VI). There is no possibility to abstain on procedural votes.

Rule 18 - Points of order
During the discussion of any matter, a representative may rise to a point of order, and the point of order shall be immediately decided by the President in accordance with the rules of procedure. A representative may appeal against the ruling of the President. The appeal shall be immediately put to the vote, and the President's ruling shall stand unless overruled by a majority of the members present and voting. A representative rising to a point of order may not speak on the substance of the matter under discussion.

Such points of order should not under any circumstances interrupt the speech of a fellow representative. They should be used exclusively to correct an error in procedure. Any questions on order arising during a speech made by a representative should be raised at the conclusion of the speech, or can be addressed by the President, sua sponte, during the speech. For purposes of this rule, the members present and voting mean those members (including observers) in attendance at the meeting during which this motion comes to vote.

Rule 19 - Speeches
No representative may address the Committee without having previously obtained the permission of the President. The President shall call upon speakers in the order in which they signify their desire to speak. The President may call a speaker to order if his remarks are not relevant to the subject under discussion.

In line with the philosophy and principles of the NMUN, in furtherance of its educational mission, and for the purpose of facilitating debate, the Secretariat will set a time limit for all speeches which may be amended by the President at his/her discretion. Consequently, motions to alter the speaker’s time will not be entertained by the President.

Rule 20 - Closing of list of speakers
Members may only be on the list of speakers once but may be added again after having spoken. During the course of a debate, the President may announce the list of speakers and, with the consent of the Committee, declare the list closed. When there are no more speakers, the President shall declare the debate closed. Such closure shall have the same effect as closure by decision of the Committee.

The decision to announce the list of speakers is within the discretion of the President and should not be the subject of a motion by the Committee. A motion to close the speakers list is within the purview of the Committee and the President should not act on her/his own motion.
Rule 21 - Right of reply
If a remark impugns the integrity of a representative’s State, the President may permit that representative to exercise her/his right of reply following the conclusion of the controversial speech, and shall determine an appropriate time limit for the reply. No ruling on this question shall be subject to appeal.

For purposes of this rule, a remark that impugns the integrity of a representative’s State is one directed at the governing authority of that State and/or one that puts into question that State’s sovereignty or a portion thereof. All interventions in the exercise of the right of reply shall be addressed in writing to the Secretariat and shall not be raised as a point of order or motion. The reply shall be read to the Committee by the representative only upon approval of the Secretariat, and in no case after voting has concluded on all matters relating to the agenda topic, during the discussion of which, the right arose.

Rule 22 - Suspension of the meeting
During the discussion of any matter, a representative may move the suspension of the meeting, specifying a time for reconvening. Such motions shall not be debated but shall be put to a vote immediately, requiring the support of a majority of the members present and voting to pass.

Rule 23 - Adjournment of the meeting
During the discussion of any matter, a representative may move to the adjournment of the meeting. Such motions shall not be debated but shall be put to the vote immediately, requiring the support of a majority of the members present and voting to pass. After adjournment, the Committee shall reconvene at its next regularly scheduled meeting time.

As this motion, if successful, would end the meeting until the Committee’s next regularly scheduled session the following year, and in accordance with the philosophy and principles of the NMUN and in furtherance of its educational mission, the President will not entertain such a motion until the end of the last meeting of the Committee.

Rule 24 - Adjournment of debate
During the discussion of any matter, a representative may move the adjournment of the debate on the item under discussion. Two representatives may speak in favor of, and two against, the motion, after which the motion shall be immediately put to the vote. The President may limit the time to be allowed to speakers under this rule.

Rule 25 - Closure of debate
A representative may at any time move the closure of debate on the item under discussion, whether or not any other representative has signified her/his wish to speak. Permission to speak on the motion shall be accorded only to two representatives opposing the closure, after which the motion shall be put to the vote immediately. Closure of debate shall require a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting. If the Committee favors the closure of debate, the Committee shall immediately move to vote on all proposals introduced under that agenda item.

Rule 26 - Order of motions
Subject to rule 18, the motions indicated below shall have precedence in the following order over all proposals or other motions before the meeting:
   a) To suspend the meeting;
   b) To adjourn the meeting;
   c) To adjourn the debate on the item under discussion;
   d) To close the debate on the item under discussion.

Rule 27 - Proposals and amendments
Proposals and amendments shall normally be submitted in writing to the Secretariat. Any proposal or amendment that relates to the substance of any matter under discussion shall require the signature of twenty percent of the members of the Committee [sponsors]. The Secretariat may, at its discretion, approve the proposal or amendment for circulation among the delegations. As a general rule, no proposal shall be put to the vote at any meeting of the Committee unless copies of it have been circulated to all delegations. The President may, however, permit the discussion and consideration of amendments or of motions as to procedure, even though such amendments and
motions have not been circulated. If the sponsors agree to the adoption of a proposed amendment, the proposal shall be modified accordingly and no vote shall be taken on the proposed amendment. A document modified in this manner shall be considered as the proposal pending before the Committee for all purposes, including subsequent amendments.

For purposes of this rule, all proposals shall be in the form of working papers prior to their approval by the Secretariat. Working papers will not be copied, or in any other way distributed, to the Committee by the Secretariat. The distribution of such working papers is solely the responsibility of the sponsors of the working papers. Along these lines, and in furtherance of the philosophy and principles of the NMUN and for the purpose of advancing its educational mission, representatives should not directly refer to the substance of a working paper that has not yet been accepted as a draft resolution during formal speeches. After approval of a working paper, the proposal becomes a draft resolution and will be copied by the Secretariat for distribution to the Committee. These draft resolutions are the collective property of the Committee and, as such, the names of the original sponsors will be removed. The copying and distribution of amendments is at the discretion of the Secretariat, but the substance of all such amendments will be made available to all representatives in some form.

**Rule 28 - Withdrawal of motions**
A motion may be withdrawn by its proposer at any time before voting has commenced, provided that the motion has not been amended. A motion thus withdrawn may be reintroduced by any member.

**Rule 29 - Reconsideration of a topic**
When a topic has been adjourned, it may not be reconsidered at the same session unless the Committee, by a two-thirds majority of those present and voting, so decides. Reconsideration can only be moved by a representative who voted on the prevailing side of the original motion to adjourn. Permission to speak on a motion to reconsider shall be accorded only to two speakers opposing the motion, after which it shall be put to the vote immediately.

**VI. VOTING**

**Rule 30 - Voting rights**
Each member of the Committee shall have one vote.

This rule applies to substantive voting on amendments, draft resolutions, and portions of draft resolutions divided out by motion. As such, all references to member(s) do not include observers, who are not permitted to cast votes on substantive matters.

**Rule 31 - Request for a vote**
A proposal or motion before the Committee for decision shall be voted upon if any member so requests. Where no member requests a vote, the Committee may adopt proposals or motions without a vote.

For purposes of this rule, proposal means any draft resolution, an amendment thereto, or a portion of a draft resolution divided out by motion. Just prior to a vote on a particular proposal or motion, the President may ask if there are any objections to passing the proposal or motion by acclamation, or a member may move to accept the proposal or motion by acclamation. If there are no objections to the proposal or motion, then it is adopted without a vote.

**Rule 32 - Majority required**
1. Unless specified otherwise in these rules, decisions of the Committee shall be made by a majority of the members present and voting.
2. For the purpose of tabulation, the phrase “members present and voting” means members casting an affirmative or negative vote. Members which abstain from voting are considered as not voting.

All members declaring their representative States as “present and voting” during the attendance roll call for the meeting during which the substantive voting occurs, must cast an affirmative or negative vote, and cannot abstain on substantive votes.

**Rule 33 - Method of voting**
1. The Committee shall normally vote by a show of placards, except that a representative may request a roll call, which shall be taken in the English alphabetical order of the names of the members, beginning with the member whose name is randomly selected by the President. The name of each member shall be called in any roll call, and one of its representatives shall reply “yes,” “no,” “abstention,” or “pass.”

Only those members who designate themselves as present or present and voting during the attendance roll call, or in some other manner communicate their attendance to the President and/or Secretariat, are permitted to vote and, as such, no others will be called during a roll-call vote. Any representatives replying pass must, on the second time through, respond with either a yes or no vote. A pass cannot be followed by a second pass for the same proposal or amendment, nor can it be followed by an abstention on that same proposal or amendment.

2. When the Committee votes by mechanical means, a non-recorded vote shall replace a vote by show of placards and a recorded vote shall replace a roll-call vote. A representative may request a recorded vote. In the case of a recorded vote, the Committee shall dispense with the procedure of calling out the names of the members.

3. The vote of each member participating in a roll call or a recorded vote shall be inserted in the record.

Rule 34 - Explanations of vote
Representatives may make brief statements consisting solely of explanation of their votes after the voting has been completed. The representatives of a member sponsoring a proposal or motion shall not speak in explanation of vote thereon, except if it has been amended, and the member has voted against the proposal or motion.

All explanations of vote must be submitted to the President in writing before debate on the topic is closed, except where the representative is of a member sponsoring the proposal, as described in the second clause, in which case the explanation of vote must be submitted to the President in writing immediately after voting on the topic ends.

Rule 35 - Conduct during voting
After the President has announced the commencement of voting, no representatives shall interrupt the voting except on a point of order in connection with the actual process of voting.

For purposes of this rule, there shall be no communication amongst delegates, and if any delegate leaves the Committee room during voting procedure, they will not be allowed back into the room until the Committee has convened voting procedure.

Rule 36 - Division of proposals and amendments
Immediately before a proposal or amendment comes to a vote, a representative may move that parts of a proposal or of an amendment should be voted on separately. If there are calls for multiple divisions, those shall be voted upon in an order to be set by the President where the most radical division will be voted upon first. If objection is made to the motion for division, the request for division shall be voted upon, requiring the support of a majority of those present and voting to pass. Permission to speak on the motion for division shall be given only to two speakers in favor and two speakers against. If the motion for division is carried, those parts of the proposal or of the amendment which are approved shall then be put to a vote. If all operative parts of the proposal or of the amendment have been rejected, the proposal or the amendment shall be considered to have been rejected as a whole.

For purposes of this rule, most radical division means the division that will remove the greatest substance from the draft resolution, but not necessarily the one that will remove the most words or clauses. The determination of which division is most radical is subject to the discretion of the Secretariat, and any such determination is final.

Rule 37 - Amendments
An amendment is a proposal that does no more than add to, delete from, or revise part of another proposal.

An amendment can add, amend, or delete operative clauses, but cannot in any manner add, amend, delete, or otherwise affect preambulatory clauses.

Rule 38 - Voting on amendments
When an amendment is moved to a proposal, the amendment shall be voted on first. When two or more amendments are moved to a proposal, the amendment furthest removed in substance from the original proposal shall be voted on first and then the amendment next furthest removed there from, and so on until all the amendments have been put to the vote. Where, however, the adoption of one amendment necessarily implies the rejection of another amendment, the latter shall not be put to the vote. If one or more amendments are adopted, the amended proposal shall then be voted on.

For purposes of this rule, furthest removed in substance means the amendment that will have the most significant impact on the draft resolution. The determination of which amendment is furthest removed in substance is subject to the discretion of the Secretariat, and any such determination is final.

Rule 39 - Order of voting on proposals
If two or more proposals, other than amendments, relate to the same question, they shall, unless the Committee decides otherwise, be voted on in the order in which they were submitted.

Rule 40 - The President shall not vote
The President shall not vote but may designate another member of her/his delegation to vote in her/his place.

VII. CREDENTIALS

Rule 41 - Credentials
The credentials of representatives and the names of members of a delegation shall be submitted to the Secretary-General prior to the opening of a session.

Rule 42 – Authority of the General Assembly
The Committee shall be bound by the actions of the General Assembly in all credentials matters and shall take no action regarding the credentials of any member.

VII. PARTICIPATION OF NON-MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

Rule 43 - Participation of non-Member States
The Committee shall invite any Member of the United Nations that is not a member of the Committee and any other State, to participate in its deliberations on any matter of particular concern to that State. A sub-committee or sessional body of the Committee shall invite any State that is not one of its own members to participate in its deliberations on any matter of particular concern to that State. A State thus invited shall not have the right to vote, but may submit proposals which may be put to the vote on request of any member of the body concerned.

If the Committee considers that the presence of a Member invited according to this rule is no longer necessary, it may withdraw the invitation. Delegates invited to the Committee according to this rule should also keep in mind their role and obligations in the committee that they were originally assigned to. For educational purposes of the NMUN Conference, the Secretariat may thus ask a delegate to return to his or her committee when his or her presence in the Committee is no longer required.

Rule 45 - Participation of national liberation movements
The Committee may invite any national liberation movement recognized by the General Assembly to participate, without the right to vote, in its deliberations on any matter of particular concern to that movement.

Rule 46 - Participation of and consultation with specialized agencies
In accordance with the agreements concluded between the United Nations and the specialized agencies, the specialized agencies shall be entitled: a) To be represented at meetings of the Committee and its subsidiary organs; b) To participate, without the right to vote, through their representatives, in deliberations with respect to items of concern to them and to submit proposals regarding such items, which may be put to the vote at the request of any member of the Committee or of the subsidiary organ concerned.

Rule 47 - Participation of non-governmental organization and intergovernmental organizations
Representatives of non-governmental organizations/intergovernmental organizations accorded consultative observer status by the Economic and Social Council and other non-governmental organizations/intergovernmental organizations designated on an ad hoc or a continuing basis by the Committee on the recommendation of the Bureau, may participate, with the procedural right to vote, but not the substantive right to vote, in the deliberations of the Committee on questions within the scope of the activities of the organizations.