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TOPIC AREA A

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Cultural property comprises:

- “real property” — the land, the bones, ceremonial burial items of the ancestors, and other artifacts recovered in the exploration of past civilizations,
- “intellectual property” — the ideas and practices, the languages, the music and the writings.

Through the ages, many civilizations have passed over the same places, destroying, stealing, or claiming the cultural property of the indigenous people, and then creating their own, only to be stolen and claimed by the future conquerors. Today, during a period of long-kept global peace (with exceptions, of course), the issue of reclaiming the lost cultural property has arisen. Should cultural property be returned to the countries of origin? Discussions among European, African, American and Asian countries have been going on but no solution has been found yet. On the one hand, the countries hosting the artifacts or writings claim that either the countries of origin are not yet in a condition to protect their belongings, or that they should be grateful that they get known worldwide because of the exposition of their civilization in different places around the globe. On the other hand, the countries demanding the return of their cultural property claim that other countries take advantage of foreign cultural property to increase tourism, and that the artifacts need to be in their own country to be fully accentuated and valued. The questions to be answered are multiple:

If returned to the countries of origin, can cultural property be protected and accentuated as it is now? For example, can Asian, African or Latin American countries protect their treasures in their museums, as well as Europe does today?

Is it ethical for foreign civilizations to take advantage of the cultural treasures that don’t belong to them, because their ancestors once pillaged foreign places? Since wartime is over, and cultural property is an irreplaceable testimony to the culture and identity of a people, an increasing number of countries request the return of their treasures.

How can an agreement satisfying all stakeholders be reached, when there is an increase in pillaging theft and illicit export of cultural property going on in our days?

Legislation seems to be insufficient to stop the illegal trade of works.

Which is the country of origin? Does an object belong to the civilization that created it or to the place where it was used and found? For example, does a Greek vase made for elite consumers in Italy during the sixth century B.C. belong to the cultural property of Greece, where it was made, or of Italy, where it was used and found? Should a Trojan artifact be returned to Greece, or to ancient Troy, that now belongs to the Turks?

HISTORY OF THE PROBLEM

In Africa, in ancient times, Babylons or Assyrians plundered the Egyptian tombs and built museums to expose the stolen treasures. In Asia, Genghis Khan pillaged China and Central Asia. Much later, during the colonial age, Europeans, without the vindication of war or anything, gathered many African and Asian treasures, as well as South American ones, to enrich their own collections.

In Europe, during Roman times, the Romans moved many cultural treasures to embellish Rome. Later, during the 5th century, Attila the Hun pillaged most of Western Europe. At the beginning of the 19th century, Napoleon Bonaparte shipped numerous artifacts to France, and Lord Elgin removed the Parthenon marbles and shipped them to England. Finally, during the 20th century, the famous Einsatzstab...
Reichsleiter Rosenberg, and the Nazis, gathered a huge number of cultural goods, including many art objects.

During the last decades, many efforts have been made for the return of cultural treasures to their origins, some of which have been quite successful:

- A number of the Benin Bronzes, a collection of brass plaques from the royal palace of the kingdom of Benin, most of them hosted in the British Museum, have been sold to Nigeria, between 1950s and 1970s, which claims that it is their country of origin. Nigeria, however, wants the return of the rest of the Benin Bronzes, as well.
- In 1981, South Africa returned two sculpted birds to Zimbabwe.
- In 1982, the United States returned two portraits painted by Albrecht Dorer to Germany.
- In 1982, the United States returned about 600 pieces to Iraq, yet about another 1000 pieces remain to be returned.
- In 1983, Italy returned a collection of pre-Colombian ceramics to Ecuador, which had been illegally exported.
- In 1986, the United States of America and Jordan exchanged parts of the “Roundel with Bust of Atargatis-Tyche and Zodiac”.
- In 1987, Germany returned over 7000 cuneiform tablets to Turkey.
- In 1993, the Untied States returned the Lydian Hoard to Turkey.
- In 1994, Canada returned ancient textiles from Corona to Bolivia.
- In 1996, Italy returned 87 archaeological pieces to Ecuador.
- In 1996, the United States returned the Aidonia Treasure to Greece.
- In 1998, France returned four pre-Colombian statues that had been stolen to Colombia.
- In 1999, Ta Mok, a former Khmer Rouge chief, returned 67 pieces of the ancient Khmer Rouge fortress of Anlong Veng to Cambodia.
- In 2000, Canada returned 59 pre-Colombian objects to Peru.
- In 2001, Austria returned a sculpture of the Evangelist Mark to the Czech Republic.
- In 2002, the United States returned a head of Bayon style and a head from the Angkor Wat period to Cambodia.

**Current Situation**

Today many international bodies such as UNESCO, IFAR (International Foundation on Art Research), and ICOM (International Council of Museums) are trying to tackle the problem. There are some conventions that have been signed, such as the “Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict”, (Hague, 1954), or the UNESCO “Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property” (1970), that has been signed by
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During the last decades, many efforts have been made for the return of cultural treasures to their origins, some of which have been quite successful:

- A number of the Benin Bronzes, a collection of brass plaques from the royal palace of the kingdom of Benin, most of them hosted in the British Museum, have been sold to Nigeria, between 1950s and 1970s, which claims that it is their country of origin. Nigeria, however, wants the return of the rest of the Benin Bronzes, as well.
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more than 100 countries. Up till now, there have been some successful returns of cultural treasures to their countries of origins, such as the ones mentioned above, but many are still under discussion.

Greece has asked for the return of the Parthenon Marbles, which are currently hosted in the British Museum. The request exists since 1830, when Greece became independent. Melina Merkouri in 1982, as Greek Minister of Culture, and many others since then, have tried hard for the return of the marbles. In 2002, Evangelos Venizelos, Greek Minister of Culture, met Sir Jon Boyd, the Chairman of the Trustees of the British Museum and proposed that the marbles should be removed to Athens, to a new museum, near the Acropolis. The museum is almost finished, yet the marbles are still in England. However, despite the dispute, there has been some collaboration between the British Museum and Greek colleagues in Athens. The British Museum has repeatedly supplied casts to Athens: of the Caryatid, of the sculptures of the Parthenon, etc. Facilities have been provided for Greek technicians to make moulds of the whole west frieze of the Parthenon for the production of cement casts to go on the building. Yet this does not satisfy the Greeks. Nowadays, apart from Greek officials, we can even find individuals, like Mr. Lazaros Fillipidis who lives in the UK, that try hard for the return of the marbles in a number of ways.

The question of the Elgin Marbles is the most widely known and a major one since it has lasted for over 150 years. However, other treasures have preoccupied UNESCO and other international organizations. An example is Priam’s Treasure, a cache of gold and other artifacts. It was found in Troy, by Schliemann, in the 1870s, and part of it was acquired by the Imperial Museum in Berlin, in 1880. However, it disappeared in 1945. The treasure had been removed by the Red Army, and was taken to the Soviet Union, but the government denied any knowledge concerning the treasure. In 1993, the treasure turned up at the Pushkin Museum in Moscow. Germany is currently trying to take the treasure back, because it was illegally taken by the Russians. Another example is the Hittite Sphinx, a treasure that has been requested to be returned to its origins, that is Turkey, but is currently kept at the Staatliche Museum in Berlin. Questions concerning cultural treasures of South America or of Africa and Asia also exist.

It is also important to note that a number of the “great museums of the world” in 2002 signed a “Declaration on the importance and value of universal museums”, which states their opinion concerning the cultural treasures they have in their collections. The main points of the declaration are:

- Illegal traffic in archaeological objects must be discouraged.
- Objects acquired and installed in museums throughout Europe and America in earlier times were acquired under conditions that are not comparable with current ones.
- Over time, objects have become part of the museums, and by extension, of the heritage of the nations which house them.
- Museums provide a valid and valuable context for objects that were long ago displaced.
- There is recognition of the importance of the ancient cultures from which the objects come.
- Museums do not serve only one nation, but the people of every nation. They are agents in the development of culture.

The Museums that signed this Declaration are alphabetically the following:

- The Art Institute of Chicago
- Bavarian State Museum, Munich
- The British Museum, London
- Cleveland Museum of Art
- J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles
- Los Angeles County Museum of Art
- Louvre Museum, Paris
- The Metropolitan Museum of Art New York
- The Museum of Fine Arts, Boston
- The Museum of Modern Art, New York
- Opificio delle Pietre Dure, Florence
- Philadelphia Museum of Art
- Prado Museum, Madrid
BLOC POSITIONS

Great Britain vs Greece:
Greece’s main request is the return of the Parthenon Marbles. Greece claims that the marbles were illegally acquired, by bribing officials to ignore their carrying away. The British Museum claims that the continuing destruction of classical sculptures in Athens led Elgin to try to save what sculptures he could. He was granted a firman (license) to embark the antiquities. The 1816 Select Committee of the House of Commons claimed that Elgin had the permission of the Turkish authorities to take the treasures.

Concerning the bribery, the British Museum claims that the money spent by Elgin was on the salaries of his team, on transport and on the recover of a shipment that sank off Kythera. The presents given to the Turkish officials were small and were given according to the custom of the times. In 1983, Melina Mercouri had claimed that the Marbles were more damaged when transferred to London than during the previous 2200 years. The British Museum claims that the Turks had damaged the Parthenon significantly, turning it into a ruin. Also, that there has been significant deterioration of the sculptures left in Athens due to the pollution and traffic that has increased immensely since the early 19th century.

Russia vs Germany:
Priam’s Gold Collection is another treasure “away from home”. It was initially taken from Troy, in Turkey, and moved to Berlin. In 1945, the Red Army took it to the Soviet Union, where it has stayed ever since. Its return to Germany was arranged by a treaty in Germany, but from June 2004, it was blocked by museum directors in Russia, who claim that they are keeping it, as compensation for the destruction of Russian cities by the Nazis, in WW II.

France vs South Korea:
South Korea wants the return of a collection of royal texts that were taken by France, about 140 years ago. The collection comprises 297 documents, which were originally kept in the Choson Kingdom’s archive, known as “Oekyujanggak”. Now, they are stored at the French National Library in Paris. The Prime Minister of South Korea, Han Myeong-sook, agreed with Dominique de Villepin to regularly exhibit the texts in South Korea. However, Korean scholars worry that these exhibitions may weaken the chance of recovering the documents permanently. South Korea still tries to reclaim the stolen documents, but France refuses to return them, saying that it would have to conduct an overhaul of its policies concerning other cultural assets it has, from other foreign countries, as well.

Other cases in Europe:
France and Germany, in general, keep many treasures from WWII, that do not belong to them, but were looted by the Nazis. So, if they accept to return some of them, they’ll have to change their policies concerning many cultural assets they currently exhibit in their museums.

In general:
The great museums of the world that have signed the “Declaration on the importance and value of universal museums” state their position through the declaration, which is that the artifacts obtained in earlier times should remain in the museums because it cannot be proven that they were illegally taken, and the conditions in the past differed significantly from the ones today. Of course, this is the position expressed by the museums. The governments hesitate to express a clear opinion, yet they seem to support their museums. However, we do know for sure that the following countries have signed the Hague “Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict” in 1954:
Egypt  Nigeria  Czech Republic
San Marino  Norway  Slovakia
Myanmar  Luxembourg  Bosnia and Herzegovina
Mexico  Cameroon  Armenia
Hungary  Madagascar  Azerbaijan
Poland  Gabon  Finland
Bulgaria  Cambodia  Estonia
Ecuador  Switzerland  Kyrgyzstan
Russian Federation  Panama  Uzbekistan
Ukraine  Austria  Kazakhstan
Belarus  Cyprus  The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
France  Mongolia  Costa Rica
Jordan  Turkey  Zimbabwe
Israel  Indonesia  Colombia
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya  Germany  Lithuania
Cuba  Iraq  Canada
Monaco  Morocco  Uruguay
Holy See  Kuwait  Republic of Moldova
Syrian Arab Republic  Burkina Faso  China
Romania  Yemen  Portugal
Thailand  Sudan  Rwanda
Italy  Saudi Arabia  El Salvador
India  United Republic of Tanzania  Serbia
Brazil  Qatar  Botswana
Netherlands  Niger  Barbados
Pakistan  Oman  Honduras
Iran (Islamic Republic of)  Côte d'Ivoire  Denmark
Nicaragua  Tunisia  Seychelles
Dominican Republic  Greece  Equatorial Guinea
Liechtenstein  Australia  South Africa
Lebanon  Sweden  Latvia
Spain  Guatemala  Sri Lanka
Ghana  Senegal  Eritrea
Belgium  Argentina  Paraguay
Guinea  Peru  Bolivia
Malaysia  Croatia  Venezuela
Albania  Tajikistan  Bangladesh
Democratic Republic of the Congo  Georgia  Mauritius
Mali  Slovenia

Also, the following countries signed the 'Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property', in 1970:

Albania  Ecuador  Nicaragua
Algeria  Egypt  Niger
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Angola Argentina Armenia Australia Azerbaijan Bahamas Bangladesh Barbados Belarus Belize Bhutan Bolivia Bosnia-Herzegovina Brazil Bulgaria Burkina Faso Cambodia Cameroon Canada Central African Republic China Colombia Costa Rica Cote D’Ivoire Croatia Cuba Cyprus Czech Republic Democratic People’s Republic Of Korea Democratic Republic Of Congo Denmark Dominican Republic


QUESTIONS A RESOLUTION MUST ANSWER

Use the following list of questions as a guide to create your resolution. These questions cover the main issues of the problem, yet you are welcome to identify and research on more issues. However, keep in mind that the following issues will be mainly discussed in the council; therefore try to focus primarily on them.

1. Definition of cultural property and identification of the cultural property under discussion; is there a difference between spoils of war, treasures acquired through theft or illicit trade, treasures acquired due to the expansion of a country’s borders, or treasures acquired through legitimate transactions? Is there a specific time frame in which we should limit our discussion? For example in the last 3 centuries?

2. Should all cultural treasures be treated equally or each case should be discussed separately? For example:
   a. The Hittite Sphinx
   b. Priam’s Gold Collection
   c. The Oekyujanggak documents
   d. The Parthenon Marbles

Picture 6: The Priam’s Gold Collection, currently at the Pushkin Museum in Moscow.
3. Definition of the country of origin: does a cultural treasure belong to the civilization that created it, to the one that used it, or to the place it was found?

4. Is it better for a country to have a small part of its civilization spread around the world for people to learn about it, or to have everything gathered where it belongs?

5. How important is access to the works of art? Is it better for people and scholars to be able to access them in the great museums of the world and to compare them with a vast number of exhibits that come from different civilizations, or is the context in which the works are exposed more important? Can art be better understood at the place of its origin?

6. Are artifacts more important to the museums and to the people that view them, or they are more important for the people to whose culture they belong?

7. Will history be much affected by such an action as returning the cultural treasures to their origins? What will happen to the history and collections of currently great museums, such as the British Museum or the Louvre, if they were to be deprived of their greatest treasures?

8. How can illicit traffic be prevented so as not to create problems in the discussions of returning cultural property to its origins?

9. How can the countries of origin guarantee the safe preservation of the cultural treasures? What if the countries of origin are not in a condition to protect their own treasures? Should there be some conditions that the countries of origin must perform concerning the method of transportation, the conditions of preservation, and the conditions of exposition to the public?

10. Can the moving of the cultural property be proven destructive for them?

**CONCLUSION**

Obviously, the question of “the return of cultural property to the countries of origin” is not of minor importance, and definitely not easy to answer. Both parties, the countries of origin that request the return of their cultural property, and the museums that currently host the artifacts have strong arguments to support their opinions. Try to get informed as much as possible on the subject, so that this Economic and Social Council will be able to produce a Resolution that will satisfy most, if not all, of the stakeholders, while safeguarding the preservation of the works of art and that it will work for the benefit of the world as a whole.

**SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH**

These are some sites where you can find information on the subject. Be sure that you are familiar with the position of your country, as well as of the position of some other major members of the council, so that you can engage in a strong and interesting debate.

- The British Museum view, concerning the Parthenon marbles: http://www.thebritishmuseum.ac.uk/gr/debate.html
Different cases of treasures of which the return is requested:
http://www.museum-security.org/03/013.html
http://www.american.edu/ted/mummy.htm

The University of Liverpool, Archeology and Contemporary Society:
http://pcwww.liv.ac.uk/~Sinclair/ALGY399_Site/return.html#intro

International Conventions:
http://exchanges.state.gov/culprop/intlaws.html

Other links:
http://www.pch.gc.ca/newsroom/index_e.cfm?useaction=displayDocument&DocIDc=7NR123
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Written by Ifigeneia Derekli, Director
**TOPIC AREA B**

**STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

To realize the meaning of the term “Brain Drain” is a vital step in the direction of understanding, and therefore more effectively resolving -or, at least, restricting- the problem. Brain Drain means the massive emigration of highly-educated people (such as students, academics, researchers and professionals) from the developing nations towards the First World countries. This alarming trend is a direct consequence of the unfavourable conditions (conflicts, epidemics or other health hazards) that new scientists, technologists and entrepreneurs find in their homelands, combined with the constantly increasing ease for foreign people to work in the developed countries. Unless the Economic and Social Council develops a solution, this harmful phenomenon is sure to continue with obviously devastating results for the developing world’s society and economy.

Think about the following commonly-emerging example: a doctor from a developing country leaves his homeland in order to work for a major hospital in an already developed country. With this choice some major problems arise: 1) General lack of doctors downgrades healthcare services in the developing country, 2) Devastating results for the developing country’s society and economy and 3) Spread of HIV/AIDS and other contagious diseases... From this example we realize that it is vital for all nations to compromise on an effective policy in order to provide incentives for natives to work in their homelands, as well as prevent Brain Waste by a fair distribution of Human Capital (HC) around the world and Brain Circulation.

**HISTORY OF THE PROBLEM**

The term “Brain Drain” appeared for the first time at least four decades ago to describe the phenomenon of people scientifically and technologically skilled from the United Kingdom to North America. Since then, the issue has become international and in 2002 a new definition was given to the term by the United Nations Economic Development Division to more accurately describe the global flow of specially talented, skilled and knowledgeable people. During the 1990s the stream of human capital mainly had its origins in Asia and Africa and ended up in First World countries (United States, United Kingdom, Australia, Canada), resulting in great losses for the former.

As laid out by the OECD in 1997, “Brain Circulation” is due to replace “Brain Drain” in the near future, as science, technology and culture in developing countries advance rapidly, closing the distance between them and the developed nations. A leading role in this course of things is played by students throughout the world, who follow the trend that has them move abroad to study and work for some years, before they return to their home countries to live permanently. What is more, apart from the existence of professional organizations and personal bonds between immigrants and their home countries that significantly supports “Brain Circulation”, an especially important factor is also the lack of economic and political stability.

However, what must be stressed is the fact that human capital shortage is not only a problem for developing countries, and as this becomes more and more obvious, strong competition amongst developed nations grows. For now though, the United States and the United Kingdom, taking advantage of their superior working and living conditions, deprive developing countries of the well-educated and highly-skilled human capital they try so hard to produce.

Where do Asian students study for their PhD?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chinese students</th>
<th>South Korean students</th>
<th>Taiwanese students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chinese universities</strong></td>
<td><strong>South Korean universities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Taiwanese universities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>US universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>US universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NSF Science & Engineering Indicators 2002, appendix table 2-41
CURRENT SITUATION

According to recent World Health Organization reports, almost 60 countries, mostly in Africa but also in south-east Asia, face devastating shortages in the health workforce. In particular, there is a huge global gap of over 4 million health workers and almost 2.5 million doctors and nurses that needs to be covered, conditions which demand that decisive action is taken swiftly in order to be effectively countered.

This most unfortunate situation is clearly a result of the “Brain Drain” phenomenon, the most recent victim of which is African healthcare. It is only imperative then that measures are taken in order to assist economic development of those countries, to safeguard human rights of the civilians and shield them against the threat of HIV/AIDS. By observation it becomes evident that First World countries care more for the prosperity of their own civilians than do for the lives of those who inhabit the less blessed regions of the world, and thus deploy various mechanisms to attract health care workers at the expense of developing nations. To address this problem a common decision must be taken in the context of international cooperation.

Fortunately, such steps have already been taken by many international organizations, especially those that have to do with health and inequality issues globally, which have shown great concern for all the harm developing nations have endured because of the loss of human capital to more advanced countries. The situation, however, remains critical in spite of the United Nations’ significant efforts that, for the moment, have brought little relief to those tired people.

Recently, a report has been released by the UN Population Fund on international migration that highlights the catastrophic effects of the “Brain Drain” and the health hazards it causes, most prominent of which is HIV/AIDS, and also the important benefits that can derive from “Brain Circulation”, such as acceleration of economic, social and cultural progress. Last September, the UN General Assembly organized a “High Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development”, in order to analyse all the aspects of international migration and come up with a proper plan of action to amplify its advantages and restrict its drawbacks.

BLOC POSITIONS

Even though all nations desire a timely solution to this major question some of these –mainly those with similar development levels– have common interests and therefore common goals. More particularly:

- United States, United Kingdom, Canada, Australia and other developed nations:

  Being in a delicate condition regarding their increasingly elderly populations, the majority of the developed western countries, including Australia, are in search of new, effective manpower to fill the shortages in their health systems and are keen on reinforcing their already strong bases of scientific and technological development, in a manner, however, that does not necessarily suggest an interest in global welfare. It is worth mentioning that especially the United Kingdom seeks and integrates nurses and health care workers directly from public institutions within developing countries, despite the numerous attempts made by international organizations to limit this trend. Nevertheless, the contribution of these countries’ high standards of living and significant steps in scientific and technological progress to global development should be acknowledged.

  What appears somehow peculiar is that the phenomenon characterising these nations resembles more a “brain circulation” than a brain drain, since they are all common professional destinations for people from other countries, rather than sources of manpower heading to other countries. Therefore, these nations have found an effective way of fulfilling their interests by both welcoming specialists from abroad, but also improving their somehow deficient health care systems, without recruiting manpower from Third World countries. So while they appear to be rather concerned about their own domestic needs and the welfare of the developing world, there are still steps to be done in order for them to also preserve the well-being of less advantaged nations at the same time.

- African Nations:

  These nations face an alarming health care crisis due to various grave diseases, widely spread around the African continent, but also the outflow of health care workers from this region to more developed areas of the world. The improvement of each country’s
national health care system is one of their most urgent domestic needs in order to prevent the outflow of disillusioned professionals in the field. Two suggestions that would prove to be fruitful solutions to this problem, though, are thought to be tapping into the diaspora community of Africans worldwide and seeking foreign aid for the support of these nations' endeavors.

- **Latin America:**
  The rise of political stability over the past 2 decades has brought a positive effect to the region, in the sense that a large percentage of its manpower has returned to work in their homelands. However, there are still the remaining effects of the prosecution of academics and open-minded thinkers in countries like Chile, which put an obstacle to the stable economic growth of the region.
  Being a developing region, Latin America has some common interests with Africa, as they both are in search of political and economic stability despite the increasing gap between them and the developed countries.

- **Asia-Pacific region:**
  The greater region of Asia and the nations of the Pacific Ocean are characterized more by a "brain circulation", rather than a "brain drain", as Asians have recently begun to migrate within the region (Singapore, Indonesia, Malaysia, Taiwan). The flourishing economy of certain nations, especially China, serves as a pole of attraction for many specialists from abroad, most of whom are involved in multinational corporations.
  This region mostly focuses on the promotion of the international mobility of specialized technologists, academics, and scientists in an effort to facilitate the global spread of knowledge and technological progress.

**QUESTIONS A RESOLUTION MUST ANSWER**

- Which motives should the state provide to its students/professionals so that they choose to study/work in their own country?
- Which measures should the states that suffer from the "Brain Drain" introduce, in order to improve the education offered by the local universities-colleges?
- Which measures should the above-mentioned states introduce in order to improve the work conditions in their country, especially for the highly-educated people?
- Should the state reconsider its legislation concerning education and labour so that the new educational system and labour proves to be more flexible and applies to as many citizens as possible?
- A. Should the states that face the "Brain Drain" problem include in the studies program lessons that exist only in foreign countries (e.g. Nuclear physics)?
  B. Shouldn’t the states that offer education of a lower standard than other countries incorporate certain aspects from other states’ educational system, which might be more solid and successful?
- Will financial compensation be sufficient and effective enough to relieve the current social problems faced by the nations who lack professions based on a higher level of education?
- Should immigration be encouraged by those nations who offer limited opportunities to their highly educated citizens, so that their knowledge and achievements become widespread and promoted worldwide?
- Does the inflow of human capital suggest an imperative need for those countries with a large number of foreign doctors, scientists, technologists, engineers and other professionals, and if so, can this inflow be sustained?
- How can we guarantee that the suggested solutions to the "brain drain" problem do not insult or violate civil liberties, free mobility and human rights? Can we really be certain that measures such as boundaries, migration restrictions or incentives proposed are ethical?

**CONCLUSION**

The Question of the "Brain Drain" is a topic, which is not considered important by many people in comparison to major political issues. All things considered, however, it is obvious how much this phenomenon can affect the economic and social life of a country, as well as its general advance and even the health of the residents. Every nation around the world pins its hopes on its inhabitants and needs their talents and skills in order to achieve development, while at the same time, each and every human being on this planet has the right to feel professional certainty and security in his homeland, and utilize his
knowledge there. Without doubt all nations desire the best solution, one though that will further their own interests. Surely, finding the golden section can be extremely difficult but nothing is impossible when nations are truly united. I do hope that the delegates of the Economic and Social Council will be truly united to form a committee of understanding and close-cooperation, in order for the solutions to be even more meaningful and drastic than those that have already been proposed and discussed.

**SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH**

This study guide’s aim is to introduce you the term “Brain Drain”, put you in the picture of it, and give you a general idea about what should occupy your mind, while you work on the topic. It is self-evident that you must have a further research upon this issue and not confine yourselves to the study guide, otherwise debate will not be interesting at all and the resolution will probably be inadequate and fruitless. Apart from the study guide and the bibliography that I am indicating below, you should definitely visit the United Nations Official Website (www.un.org), where you can search for further information, using the key-phrase “Brain Drain”. It would, also turn out extremely useful if you visit the website of the embassy—or the consulate—of the country you are going to represent at the conference. For example, you can write the key-phrase “Spanish Embassy” in various search tools, such as www.yahoo.com or www.google.com, and after finding the proper site, you can search for information relevant to your delegation’s policy on the topic. If you don’t find enough information, do not hesitate to e-mail the embassy, asking what policy the country follows concerning the question of “Brain Drain” (this is a great assistance for those of you who will hold the position of the ambassador, since you can find information on any topic you wish.
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