United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

U.S. Federation of UNESCO
Clubs, Centers and Associations
New York - State Chapter

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION (UNESCO) Background Guide 2015

Committee History

UNESCO was originally conceived during World War Two at the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education (CAME) in 1942. The original aim of the Conference was to devise a plan to reconstruct the systems of education of the Allied European countries once peace was restored. The project quickly gained momentum and eventually came to include new functions and new governments. Since the establishment of UNESCO in 1945, the committee has been based in Paris, France. With over 50 offices worldwide, it is charged with the mission of promoting peace, social justice, human rights and international security through cooperation on educational, science and cultural programs.

UNESCO has two governing bodies, the General Conference and the Executive Board. The General Conference meets every two years and consists of the member states of UNESCO. Note that the representative states of UNESCO differ from those of the UN General Assembly, although there is understandably a very large amount of overlap. The Executive Board carries out tasks as directed by the General Conference, and consists of a very diverse group of people from around the world who have dedicated their lives to UNESCO's various missions (UNESCO).

The official slogan of UNESCO is "Building peace in the minds of men and women" (UNESCO). In keeping with this mission, UNESCO operates under a set of themes in its activities. Some of the seven total themes, and the ones this simulation will focus on, include "Education for the 21st Century", "Protecting our Heritage and Fostering Creativity", and "Building Knowledge Societies" (UNESCO). UNESCO has a very wide range of activities, all of which converge on the common goal of making the world smaller and safer for the next generation. These goals make UNESCO one of the largest and most active international organizations in the world.

Committee Simulation

This simulation is designed to represent reality as best as possible within the confines of the committee room. Model UN simulations and other conferences delegates might attend in the future are based on Parliamentary Procedure, just as are actual UN and other governmental meetings across the democratic world. Delegates are expected to actively participate in debate, negotiate with others, and contribute to resolutions that are passed. Most importantly, delegates are expected to align with their respective nation's policies and politics throughout the simulation. The goal of this UNESCO committee is to pass at least one resolution on each of the two topics described in this background guide.

Delegates should extensively research their party's positions on each topic, as well as the history of each topic. The background guide is meant to serve as an introduction as well as give delegates direction in their research. The Dais, which consists of the Director and Administrative Directors, will be looking for delegates who are very knowledgeable in the topic, their country's position, and who use strategy and effective communication to spread their ideas to the rest of the committee. That being said, delegates are not allowed to use electronic devices in the committee room or while committee is in session. All research must be done before the session begins. A delegate who would like to reference their research and notes must have it available in a hard copy form

I. Protecting Cultural Heritage Sites in War Zones

Introduction

Locations of current UNESCO World Heritage Sites: http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/

Heritage is our legacy from the past, what we live with today, and what we pass on to future generations. Our cultural and natural heritage are both irreplaceable sources of life and inspiration. Places as unique and diverse as the wilds of East Africa's Serengeti, the Pyramids of Egypt, the Great Barrier Reef in Australia and the Baroque cathedrals of Latin America make up our world's heritage. What makes the concept of World Heritage exceptional is its universal application. World Heritage sites belong to all the peoples of the world, irrespective of the territory on which they are located (UNESCO).

World heritage Sites (WHS) are natural or cultural areas distinguished by UNESCO as being of utmost importance or significance to the global community and therefore in need of protection and preservation for future generations (UNESCO, Meskell 483). There are currently 981 WHS spread among the 160 States Parties to The Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (World Heritage Convention) (UNESCO). The World Heritage

Convention in 1972 established the official documentation of WHS, criteria for addition to the list of WHS and guidelines for how World Heritage Fund money should be utilized. The selection criteria for inclusion in the WHS list is as follows:

i. to represent a masterpiece of human creative genius;

ii. to exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town- planning or landscape design;

iii. to bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilization which is living or which has disappeared;

iv. to be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history;

v. to be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement, land-use, or sea-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), or human interaction with the environment especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change;

vi. to be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance. (The Committee considers that this criterion should preferably be used in conjunction with other criteria);

vii. to contain superlative natural phenomena or areas of exceptional natural beauty and aesthetic importance;

viii. to be outstanding examples representing major stages of earth's history, including the record of life, significant on-going geological processes in the development of landforms, or significant geomorphic or physiographic features;

ix.   to be outstanding examples representing significant on-going ecological and biological processes in the evolution and development of terrestrial, fresh water, coastal and marine ecosystems and communities of plants and animals;

x.   to contain the most important and significant natural habitats for in-situ conservation of biological diversity, including those containing threatened species of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science or conservation.

The protection, management, authenticity and integrity of properties are also important considerations. Since 1992 significant interactions between people and the natural environment have been recognized as cultural landscapes (UNESCO).

Today, some of these eternally important sites across the world are being threatened on a daily basis by political violence and armed conflict. The task of our committee will be to build upon previously existing methods of protecting WHS and develop new methods to replace those that have failed thus far. Extensive research should be done with a particular focus on the Middle East region, where WHS have been threatened and/or destroyed most recently.

History and Description of the Issue

In 1899 and again in 1907, international peace conventions were held at The Hague in the Netherlands. Along with the Geneva Conventions, the Hague Conventions were among the first formal statements of the laws of war and war crimes in the body of secular international law (Avalon Project). The two conventions, along with the Roerich Pact of 1935 set the basis which would eventually guide the United Nations in its endeavor to establish a method for the protection of cultural property during armed conflict (UNESCO) Article 27 of the 1907 Hague Convention states how this would happen:

In sieges and bombardments all necessary steps must be taken to spare, as far as possible, buildings dedicated to religion, art, science, or charitable purposes, historic monuments, hospitals, and places where the sick and wounded are collected, provided they are not being used at the time for military purposes.It is the duty of the besieged to indicate the presence of such buildings or places by distinctive and visible signs, which shall be notified to the enemy beforehand (International Committee of the Red Cross).

The Convention generally worked during the First World War, but this can be mostly attributed to the lack of movement along the Front Line throughout most of the war. During the Second World War however, bombing campaigns indiscriminately destroyed structures that had previously stood for hundreds of years in major cities across Britain and Central and Eastern Europe. Cities including London and Berlin were almost totally destroyed. In Japan, entire cities were levelled, leaving none of their thousands of years-old history behind (UNESCO). The 1954 Convention would later be passed to specifically address the need to protect any surviving structures. The Convention mentions the Second World War by name as an event during which most European cultural sites were destroyed (UNESCO). Just one example is St Peter's Church in Bristol, UK, included structures which dated back to the 12th century AD, but was destroyed by the Bristol Blitz in 1940. While houses of worship were generally avoided by bombers, the bombing methods used at the time were very inaccurate. At times a bomb may miss an intended military target and explode on ancient civilian structures. At other times, bombing campaigns were indiscriminate, although special care was often taken to avoid churches when they could be identified. Without any standardized method of identifying and protecting WHS, no individual structure could be guaranteed safety.

The widespread destruction of cultural heritage during the war led to UNESCO taking on the task of figuring out how to protect heritage sites for future generations. The first United Nations document that addressed the threat to cultural sites during times of armed conflict was on May 14, 1954, when the first protocol of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict was signed. It sought primarily to provide a practical solution that could theoretically be utilized in the event of another destructive war. 126 countries are party to the treaty, while 4 more have signed but not ratified: Andorra, Ireland, Philippines and the UK (UNESCO).

The convention outlines a method in which cultural property is labeled with a special emblem that can be easily recognized by both defender and occupier in any conflict,

> The distinctive emblem of the Convention shall take the form of a shield, pointed below, persaltire blue and white (a shield consisting of a royal-blue square, one of the angles of which forms the point of the shield, and of a royal-blue triangle above the square, the space on either side being taken up by a white triangle). (UNESCO).

Any property bearing this emblem should be protected from pillaging and theft, and should not be used as a defensive barrier in battle. In special circumstances, refugees may use the marked sites as shelter, since the safety of the sites are assumed. The Convention also established an international registry by which heritages sites could be pre-marked for protection. Moveable items within the sites can also be registered, and aggressors in a conflict must facilitate the transportation of any such objects to a location where it will be removed from any harm associated with the armed conflict. Such objects are also immune from seizure or capture as spoils of war ('looting'), and as a result remain the property of the proper governing authority. If land is captured by another country, the sites rightfully become that country's property, at which time it becomes their responsibility to care for the preservation of the area.

In Paris on November 16, 1972, the General Conference of UNESCO adopted a resolution drafted by the World Heritage Committee at the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. The treaty established the World Heritage Site (WHS) list that is commonly referred to today. Unlike the 1954 convention, this treaty focuses more on each individual nation's protection of property within their borders. The treaty defines the parameters by which WHS should be defined. From there it is up to each country to decide for which sites to submit applications for WHS status. The World Heritage Committee (WHC) was set up under this treaty to review applications and maintain a list of WHS.

Article 11 of this resolution allows the WHC to maintain a separate list of "World Heritage in Danger" for Sites that are threatened with severe deterioration of destruction (UNESCO). The first site to be added to this list was the "Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls" in 1982, and it remains on the list to this day. Since countries must apply for sites to be added to the list, not all sites that have historic cultural value are on the list.

The 1972 treaty has certain flaws. First, the WHC does not maintain a list of unofficial WHS, that is, sites that it feels should be on the list, but for which the country controlling the territory it stands on has not submitted an application. As a result, an unknown number of ancient structures and natural sites receive neither widespread attention nor protection, and when they do, little can be done by the international community. The Buddhas of Bamiyan in Afghanistan serve as a prime example of the grave importance of protecting cultural heritage. Composed of two huge statues which are carved into the Bamiyan mountains, they were destroyed in 2001 by the Taliban government then ruling the country (UNESCO). The location was not declared an official Heritage site until 2003. Leading up to the demolition, virtually every UNESCO GA member condemned the plan.

The Taliban carried out this demolition for religious reasons. Islam bans worship of idols.

The Taliban take on an extremely strict interpretation of Sharia Law, which compelled the organization to condemn the statues. This went ahead despite fierce opposition by the rest of the Muslim world, who claimed that since the region was completely devoid of worshippers of the Buddhist religion, the statues were not idols but rather relics, so demolition was both unnecessary and destructive. Even though the Taliban was an internationally recognized terrorist organization and its government was almost unanimously considered illegitimate by the international community, no direct action on the part of the international community was taken to protect the statues.

The destruction of the Buddhas represented a catastrophic failure on the part of the international community, which unanimously opposed the action, from stopping it. It also proved to the world that not all countries can be trusted to protect their own heritage sites. The intended purpose of protecting cultural heritage according to the WHC is to preserve them for future generations.

One of the ongoing problems is that countries are not registering their cultural sites, and therefore they are not being protected. The Bamiyan site in Afghanistan became an official WHS in 2003, two full years after their destruction. In 2002, the Ajyad Fortress, a 17th century Ottoman relic just feet away from the Masjid al Haram, was destroyed to make way for the Mecca Royal Hotel Clock Tower. Many more historical sites stand today that are unregistered and thus face grave threats, especially during conflict. One of the questions to consider is how countries can be encouraged to register their cultural heritage sites, so that current methods can be utilized to protect them. Considering the threats to sites today, it should also be considered what new methods could be employed.

Current Status

The wars in Afghanistan and Iraq waged by the United States and NATO forces have resulted in insurmountable destruction of cultural property during and in their aftermath. The shock from such destruction has rippled through the international community as well as the archaeological community, who despair over the destruction of sites which had not been fully explored (Rowlands and Butler).

At the end of 2013, there were 44 listed Heritage sites in danger. Eight of these sites were added during the year 2013, and six of those eight are in the Syrian Arab Republic. The territory on which the modern state of Syria is located is home to remains of some of the world's first civilizations that developed along the Tigris and Euphrates rivers as early as 4000 BCE. Among these sites are the Ancient city of Aleppo, which has been a major site of conflict as a rebel stronghold. The modern city has been nearly obliterated, and many ancient structures have been damaged. Every day, additional bombing campaigns by the Syrian Army threaten the total destruction of these WHS. Generally, the existing methods of marking WHS has been ignored. UNESCO has sent emergency observers to assess the current damage and help to prevent further damage.

One example of destruction that has already occurred in Syria is in the ancient Umayyad Mosque, where some of the earliest protests against the Assad Regime occurred in 2011.

First image: Mosque interior before 2011

Source: http://risalafurniture.ae/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/Umayyad- mosque-carpet.jpg

Second image: Mosque following Assad bombing campaign in 2012.

Source: http://informationng.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/Umayyad-   mosque-destroyed.jpg

The International community has thus far its back on the cultural heritage sites, and has chosen not to directly intervene in the Syria conflict. Votes in Britain and the USA to take direct military action have failed, and China and Russia have continually supported the opposing side to other western powers. Arms are being continually sold to both the Assad regime and to various rebel factions (The Guardian). With politics getting in the way, the protection of cultural sites has unfortunately been thrown by the wayside. However, the threatened cultural heritage across the Middle East has always been of concern to all parties.

Other factors have limited action towards protecting WHS in recent years. In wake of the recent economic crisis,

> UNESCO moved swiftly to launch a global media response to the US withdrawal [of funding]. Director-General Bokova (2011) claimed that the "withholding of U.S. dues and other financial contributions— required by U.S. law—will weaken UNESCO's effectiveness and undermine its ability to build free and open societies (Meskell 490).

When the U.S. invaded Iraq in 2003, the military acquired a multitude of portable items of importance to cultural heritage that the Hussein regime's intelligence agency had collected and stored for many years, and promptly had them transported to the mainland U.S. for protection purposes. The significance of this find was that some of the artifacts included Jewish manuscripts. Hussein was a publicly known enemy of Israel and of the Jewish people. Although the artifacts were kept in sub-standard conditions, the fact that the regime was interested in holding on to them rather than destroying them is significant in that it shows that few regimes in recent history have tended to actively seek to destroy cultural heritage (Al-Monitor). As in the case of Syria where rebels sometimes use ancient structures as defensive positions, sometimes conflict makes damage to

cultural sites nearly impossible to avoid. In the past year, the United States has agreed to return the collection to Iraq, whose government has promised to take better care of its preservation (Haaretz).

China, a country that has actively destroyed its cultural heritage, including relocating ancient communities into major cities to construct the Three Gorges Dam, has also been partial to protecting the core of its cultural heritage. In response Taliban's destruction of the Buddhas of Bamiyan, China, which has been ruled by the atheist Communist Party since 1948, announced the construction of the Spring Temple Buddha (Indiatimes). Completed in 2002 at a total cost of $55 million USD, the statue is the tallest in the world, and contains a massive Buddhist monastery beneath it which is in active use today (BBC).

When researching bloc positions, do not focus on whether or not countries are interested in protecting cultural heritage, whether their own or another country's. Instead, look into the cultural interests of those countries. Saudi Arabia, for example, destroyed multiple buildings, including some mosques, that are directly connected to the prophet Mohammed, but they did so in order to expand the Masjid Al-Haram to accommodate more worshippers so that all Muslims would have greater opportunity to worship at Islams holiest and most ancient site. The Taliban government received fierce and unanimous opposition from the entire international community, but no country was willing to put their own soldiers' lives on the line to overthrow a radical government, especially in a country that has been dubbed the site of the Soviet Union's Vietnam, and where thousands of U.S. and international soldiers have lost their lives since.

Committee Mission and Questions to Consider

This committee has been tasked with constructing a method to protect cultural heritage sites in conflict zones, with debate centering specifically around those in the Middle East region, although any resolution passed should generally address sites across the world.

those sites that are being threatened by current conflicts. Debate topics may include motivation for destruction, perils involved in protecting cultural heritage.

1. What new passive or active methods can be employed to mark heritage sites and ensure their protection?
2. What level of obligation does the international community have to protect the heritage sites of other countries?
3. Should the lives of international forces be put at risk to protect cultural heritage sites?

4. How can religiously motivated destruction of Heritage sites be stopped?

II. The Effects of Economic Sanctions on the Education and Scientific Progress of Nations

Introduction

For a long time, it has been commonly believed that sanctions were a humane alternative to war. Without needless slaughter or collateral damage, Sanctions were thought of the best peaceful diplomatic alternative to war. More recently, however, scholars have begun debating whether sanctions have been effective for their stated purpose, and if the usefulness of sanctions as a means of diplomatic compulsion on a state outweighs the humanitarian effects on the affected state's citizens. The debate often focuses on health and living conditions. In North Korea, food aid has sometimes been withheld by many countries as a means to put an end to the country's nuclear program. Since this country is also prone to flood-induced famines, the results

have been devastating, with estimates of starvation deaths reaching the millions (Noland et al 3).

This committee will be discussing the topic of sanctions with a particular focus, the effects of economic sanctions on the education and scientific progress of nations. This area has received far less debate because other humanitarian consequences of sanctions have often taken precedence.

However, sanctions have proven to have a direct impact on a nation's scientific community, and strong correlations have been found in the area of education. For example, one major result of import/export related sanctions is that significant spectrums of staple goods are made unavailable to the affected states, impeding scientific progress in fields possibly unrelated to the intention of the sanctions. For example, nuclear proliferation sanctions against Iran include a ban on supercomputers, which are used in many other math and science fields unrelated government development of weapons and nuclear material (CRS Report 1997).

History and Description of the Issue

What are Sanctions?

The concept of sanctions as a diplomatic tool has existed for thousands of years. The first known record of sanctions from one government against another occurred in 432 B.C., when

19

Athens passed the Megarian Decree, a set of economic sanctions levied upon Megara in the form of a trade embargo. The strangled the Megarian economy. The goal was to force Megara into submission; the end result was the Peloponnesian war (Smart Sanctions: A Short History) (Yale).

Thus the first historical example of sanctions proved a failure, yet it set a precedent as a useful alternative to war.

Sanctions have evolved over the millennia, and into the modern international system. The word "sanction" in the legal context is defined as, The legal definition of "sanction" is best defined as "penalties or other means of enforcement used to provide incentives for obedience with the law, or with rules and regulations (Black's Law Dictionary)". Sanctions now exist as a codified legal diplomatic tool according to the United Nations Charter. The basis for UN sanctions under international law derives from Chapter VII of the UN Charter. Article 41 of the Charter covers enforcement measures not involving the use of armed force. The article does not specifically state the word "sanctions", but it does list what measures can be taken against another member state.

Today, these measures are categorically referred to as "sanctions". Additionally, it states that the list is not exhaustive, meaning that it is a list of some, but not all, acceptable measures.

> The Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and it may call upon the Members of the United Nations to apply such measures. These may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations. (United Nations)

The drafters of the UN Charter did their best to improve on its predecessor, the League of Nations. Perceived failures were noted and effort was made to improve on the previous document. Article 16 of the Covenant of the League of Nations had three weaknesses in particular that were

20

corrected in its successor, Article 41 of the UN Charter. According to a special research report on UN sanctions,

> Article 16 narrowly determined under what circumstances sanctions would be applied (i.e., interstate war), it specifically defined what form the sanctions would take (i.e., comprehensive diplomatic and economic), and it failed to centralise decision-making. In contrast, Article 41 does not delineate under which situations sanctions may be applied, and it merely provides guidelines as to the types of measures that may be implemented, while decision-making authority resides centrally within the Council (Charron 2011: 2-5). Article 41 has proven flexible with respect to the application of varying measures to address evolving threats to international peace and security. (UNSC SRP 2-3)

Since it is one of the purposes of the UN to decide what international law is, the UN charter mentions forms of peaceful diplomatic tools which are permissible. This means any single member state unilaterally, or international organization outside the UN bilaterally or multilaterally, can impose sanctions on another state or group of states, provided just cause is present. Bilateral or multilateral sanctions are also called "collective sanctions" (Kondoch 269). In addition to individual states or other international bodies imposing their own sanctions, the Security Council has the power to impose measures that are mandatory in accordance with Article 25 of the UN Charter, which requires that member states implement Security Council decisions. Individual organizations within the United Nations may also have their own forms of sanctions that exist within the confines of their jurisdiction. For example, on November 8, 2013 the United States lost its vote at UNESCO, two years after cutting off its financial contribution to the organization over the admission of Palestine as a full member (New York Times).* While not a conventional sanction, since losing their vote was an automatic consequence of not paying dues for two years, it does provide one example of how a country can be shut out from the global political process.

21

The extent to which states that are subject to sanctions have been negatively affected in the field of science has varied from situation to situation. Regulating the publication of scientific journals is only one part of the issue. Access to goods not available in a sanctioned state may also impede its scientific progress, and connections with education institutions are another major factor. When looking at many cases of sanctions, impeding scientific progress is sometimes the main goal of the sanction regime. Nuclear nonproliferation sanctions against Iran and North Korea, for example, are in place to prevent the development of a nuclear weapon. The purpose is to slow down scientific progress in a certain field.

Because the term sanction is so broadly used, sanctions encompass the vast majority of non- combat measures available for one state to take against another. While other situations have prevented war through means other than sanctions, for the purpose of this committee delegates should work of an initial assumption that sanctions are the only alternative to violent conflict for resolving the types of disputes that sanctions are commonly used for.

Types of Sanctions

There are five different types of economic sanctions, four of which are authorized by the United Nations.

The first UN authorized method of sanction is an embargo, defined as a "legal prohibition by a government or group of governments restricting the departure of vessels or movement of goods from some or all locations to one or more countries" (Encyclopedia Britannica).

The second UN authorized sanction is called exclusion. According to Article 19 of the United Nations Charter, Member States that do not contribute to the United Nations "shall not vote in the General Assembly if the amount of its arrears equals or exceeds the amount of the contributions due from it for the preceding two full years (United Nations)."

The third type of sanctions is the suspension of membership at the United Nations.

According to Article 5 of the United Nations Charter, "A Member of the United Nations against which preventive or enforcement action has been taken by the Security Council may be suspended from the exercise of the rights and privileges of membership by the General Assembly" (United Nations).

The fourth form of sanctions, and the last that is authorized by the United Nations, is expulsion. This is when a Member State withdraws, or is disqualified, from the United Nations. According to Article 6 of the United Nations Charter, "A Member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the Principles contained in the present Charter may be expelled from the Organization," (United Nations). Since its inception, no member state has ever been expelled from the United Nations. The closest a member state has ever come to expulsion was with United Nations General Assembly Resolution 2758 on October 25, 1971, which allowed the People's Republic of China to take over the Republic of China's (a.k.a. "Taiwan" or "Chinese Taipei") membership. In this case, the previously recognized government was expelled and replaced with a new government over the same territory. Thus, "China" was never technically expelled from the United Nations (Resolution 2758). Other member states have additionally withdrawn their membership, but were replaced by successor states. For example, it was decided in 1991 that Russia was the successor state to the Soviet Union. This is why Russia was allowed to retain is permanent status on the Security Council, even though the seat was originally allotted to the then recently dissolved Soviet Union.

The fifth form of sanctions, and the only form not mentioned in the UN Charter, is the trade barrier. Member states still have the ability to impose their own trade barriers as is their sovereign right, but the Security Council cannot pass a trade-barrier resolution without it fitting into one of the other four types of sanctions.

23

The first and fifth types of sanctions listed above are economic sanctions and are the most commonly cited as having a humanitarian impact. However, any of the five types of sanctions listed above can have a direct or indirect impact on a member state's education and scientific progress. For example, cooperation between educational or scientific institutions from two different nations can be severed if one state's severance of diplomatic ties is extended to businesses' and institutions' cooperation with counterparts in the state being sanctioned. For the purposes of this committee, the type of sanction imposed is less important than the impact of the sanction on the affected state's education and scientific progress.

Case Study: Iraq

One major cause of the relatively recent rise of criticism concerning the education and scientific harm wrought by sanctions was the imposition of a lasting sanction regime against Iraq in 1990, following the state's invasion of Kuwait. Data collected on Iraq shows a drop in primary education during sanction regimes, which were distinct from enrollment drops that occurred during times of war (Farjo 1, 25). Sanctions in Iraq lasted for six years before the U.S. Oil-for-Food Program (OIP) began in 1996. The OIP was put into effect through the United Nations, and allowed Iraq to sell oil directly for food, medicine and other humanitarian needs. This way the crisis in Iraq was alleviated without allowing Iraq to boost its military capabilities. The program helped relieve the effects of the humanitarian crisis at least on education, but it never eliminated the humanitarian crisis. According to data collected by Farjo, there has been no significant drop in primary education enrollment following the start of the Iraq War in 2003 compared to the preceding few years (during which there was actually a small rise in enrollment). There was certainly no significant drop as there was from 1990-1996 when sanctions were in full effect. The data thus shows that "The regressions of primary school enrollment on sanctions, war, Oil-for-Food, and

GDP per capita strongly suggest that the presence of sanctions is the far greater burden to school enrollment than is war" (Farjo 22).

Prior to sanctions, Iraq had been investing oil revenue into vast public projects, including education. The Iraqi government was able to raise the standards of education across the country. A report released by UNESCO notes that "Prior to the period of the Gulf War and subsequent economic sanctions, the country had one of the best performing education systems in the region" (UNESCO iii). A CNN article from 1999 noted that "Before 1990, Iraq used to spend more than $2 billion a year on education. After nine years of U.N. economic sanctions, Iraq is spending less than 10 percent of that money to educate a new generation" (CNN). The economic toll of sanctions forced Iraq to cease allocating money to education, and even when funding was reinstated later it never reached previous levels. In both the case of Iraq sanctions and the more recent Iran sanctions, women felt the brunt of the effects. According to a report released by the International Civil Society Action Network (ICAN), "In Iraq sanctions and the ensuing poverty resulted in the withdrawal of girls from education and increases in child marriage" (Pg. 4). Women and girls were more likely to be withdrawn from education in order to help support their families, or to be married off in order to remove the burden of feeding them.

Case Study: Iran

The situation in Iran has many similarities to the previous conditions in Iraq. Since the beginning of the newest sanctions regime in 2011 Iranian education has been noticeably affected. According to the ICAN report, "Iranian students studying abroad have… been impacted seriously. Many are being forced to give up their education as their families can no longer afford the tuition" (ICAN 3). In some cases, Iranians cannot access their bank accounts abroad, making it impossible to pay tuition. It would also make it difficult for international corporations based in Iran to conduct business in other countries. This could lead to layoffs, which in turn could prevent more Iranians

25

from pursuing higher education. In addition, limitations placed on the transfer of funds have impeded the work of charity organizations active in Iran that are engaged in education efforts. According to the report, "Many of these organizations have ceased their activities" (Pg. 6).

The problems with education in Iran extend to the nation's scientific progress. In the modern era, much scientific advancement has been achieved in part by cooperation between nations, further facilitated by continued globalization. Sanctions, such as those implemented against Iran for nuclear proliferation, have affected some Iranian scientists' ability to collaborate with international partners or to publish their work. In 2013, the U.S. Treasury Department Office of Foreign Assets Control modified regulations, preventing any Iranian manuscripts originating from government settings to be handled by any U.S. citizen. (news.sciencemag.org). This has resulted in a number of manuscripts being prevented from publication in the United States and most other countries that have similar regulations in place. Only 96 UN member states have embassies in Iran, roughly half of the total UN membership. The United States and The United Kingdom, the top two earners of international scientific prizes by a large margin, have no official embassy in Iran, nor vice versa. This makes collaboration more difficult. Iran has persisted in some areas. Data from Thomson Reuters Web of Knowledge shows that Iran is 12th in world nanotech development (scientificamerican.com).

Current Status

The use of sanctions was minimal in the United Nations prior to the collapse of the Soviet Union, but in the post-Cold War era (1990-present) there has been an upsurge in the use of sanctions. During the 1990s, the UN imposed sanctions six times as often as in the prior 45 years (Andreas 335). Scholars have made a point of highlighting the issue:

> The Security Council has imposed sanctions a mere 14 times in 56 years. Prior to 1990, sanctions were only imposed on Southern Rhodesia and South Africa. Since the end of the

26

Cold War, the Security Council has imposed sanctions increasingly often, in the cases of Afghanistan, Angola, Ethiopia and Eritrea, the former Yugoslavia, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Haiti, Iraq, Libya, Liberia, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Somalia and Sudan. (Kondoch 270)

The use of sanctions in an increasing number of different situations came hand in hand with increased concern over the humanitarian impacts of sanctions. One plan devised by the Security Council to alleviate the effects of sanctions on the civilian population was the use of targeted sanctions, or "smart sanctions". Smart sanctions differed from previous sanction regimes in that smart sanctions were more specifically catered to the domestic political economy of the targeted state. The concept behind smart sanctions is specifically targeting the noncompliant party:

Smart sanctions are designed to raise the target regime's costs of noncompliance while avoiding the general suffering that comprehensive sanctions often create. Like precision-guided munitions, smart sanctions target responsible parties while minimizing collateral damage. Examples include asset freezes, travel bans, and arms embargoes measures that stand in stark contrast to the comprehensive trade ban against Iraq. (Drezner 107)

Smart sanctions have had limited success and there has been much debate over whether or not smart sanctions do in fact act as a viable alternative to comprehensive sanctions. Smart sanctions either have failed to act properly as economic coercion the way comprehensive sanctions do, or the targeted sanctions miss the source of the problem altogether. The idea of targeted sanctions is difficult to implement when considering the plethora of different factors involved in the operation of a country. Sanctions targeting one specific area of a country's economy can be offset by increased production in another area. During the Iraq sanctions regime, Iraq had to rely on oil exports through the Oil-For-Food program, which indirectly led to an increase in education enrollment in Iraq

during this period. The evidence gathered on Iraq's nuclear program showed that the sanctions may have failed to achieve its goal of harming the Iraqi government's military capabilities.

Today, the debate continues concerning how sanctions can be modified to have a lesser humanitarian impact on the targeted nation's civilian population.

Bloc Positions

In considering bloc positions for a committee topic as unique as this one, delegates should consider it in terms of states that have had sanctions imposed against them versus states that have not, or countries that are responsible for imposing sanctions. The topic of this committee however is not pro-sanctions versus anti-sanctions, which makes the debate more complicated. Among countries that have had sanctions imposed against them, there is a mix of successful and unsuccessful sanctions regimes. Among bodies that have imposed sanctions against other states, a variety of tactics has been used.

The United States is the world's largest contributor to sanctions regimes, but usually Western democracies are grouped together as being the perpetrators of sanctions. As a whole, this bloc, which includes the modern Asian democracies, the European Union, and other affiliated states, prefer to use sanctions as an alternative to war, but since this is the view of the U.N. as a whole, it is a moot point. Nevertheless, states responsible for imposing sanctions generally believe that economic compulsion is the best available diplomatic tool for resolving disputes that would otherwise lead to war. These states are, however, increasingly interested in learning how to use targeted sanctions as an alternative to more comprehensive embargoes and other trade barriers.

Within this bloc lies even more room for debate when the situation is viewed from a different lens. For example, sanctions have continually been in place against North Korea since the Korean War began in 1951, and have grown worse over time. On one hand these sanctions have had significant ramifications on the sciences in North Korea and have damaged the education

28

system, forcing some secular studies to be replaced with lectures on nationalism. On the other hand these sanctions have kept South Korea, and more indirectly Japan, safe from North Korean aggression. The cost of almost 25 million North Korean citizens living in a humanitarian disaster imposed on it by international sanctions keeps the 50 million citizens of South Korea and 127 million citizens of Japan safe (Google and World Bank).

Nations that have had sanctions imposed on them might argue that sanctions are a method for Western democracies to bully weaker nations. They may also argue that it fosters political instability and this might prevent a regime from making reforms.

Among developing nations, there is a mix of states that have had sanctions imposed against them and those that have not. In 2013, the United States imposed sanctions against Uganda over a radical anti-gay law (BBC). Other countries such as Rwanda, Myanmar and Sudan are also subject to sanctions while many other developing nations are not. Over a decade after its bloody civil war, the last UN sanctions against Sierra Leone were lifted in 2010 (BBC). Sierra Leone is now one of the world's top growing economies, with 15% GDP growth in 2012 (World Bank). The case of Sierra Leone can be said to be a success of international sanctions. The tough international response to rebel advances in Sierra Leone allowed the country to make major changes in a relatively short period of time. Meanwhile, Rwanda is still in recovery stages twenty years after a civil war tore the country apart in 1994, and sanctions related to the conflict and later troubles still remain in effect. In 2013 the U.S. opted to impose new sanctions over Rwanda's use of child soldiers (Reuters). Those same sanctions also apply to Central African Republic, Myanmar, Sudan and Syria. Developed nations thus have mixed stories when it comes to sanctions. Sierra Leone may have a positive outlook in terms of its educational and scientific outlook, but other states such as Rwanda continue to regress under continued sanctions.

Committee Mission and Questions to Consider

29

This committee is tasked with conducting extensive research on sanctions since the formation of the United Nations, and particularly in the post-Cold War era. Just as this background guide focuses on education and scientific progress, so should research by committee members. On a broader scale, the humanitarian impacts of sanctions should also be researched. At committee, delegates will debate on the humanitarian effects of sanctions on the education and scientific progress of nations. The debate should not be about whether sanctions are good or bad, and it is not a concrete black and white debate. Questions to consider in research, in writing your position paper, and especially in debate itself, include:

1. What are the humanitarian impacts of economic sanctions?

2. Is it possible for sanctions to be better targeted so as not to negatively affect education? How?
3. Is it possible for sanctions to be better targeted so as to allow scientific progress to continue unimpeded? How?
4. Are the humanitarian consequences of sanctions worth achieving the sanctions' goals? Have examples ready!