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TOPIC AREA A
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Following the terrorist attack on the Twin Towers on September 11th, the USA and the UK adopted measures included in the “war on terrorism,” passing laws that limited free-speech protection in situations that could be characterized as involving incitement to terrorism, and seeking the deportation of one prominent Islamic cleric accused of promoting attacks. According to publications made by Washington Press and the Guardian and reports given to the Human Rights Commission by the organization Human Rights Watch, it has been proved that the C.I.A sends terrorist suspects to countries such as Egypt and areas in the Middle East where they are imprisoned and tortured and human rights are seriously violated. In addition, European countries such as the UK and Germany, based on the same sources (particularly the International Amnesty Report of June 14th 2006) have violated terrorist suspects’ human rights either by inappropriate methods of arrest or they have cooperated with the C.I.A in order to transfer terrorist suspects to Middle East countries.

How do we define rendition and torture?

The practice of transferring terrorist suspects to countries that routinely practice torture and other ill-treatment is of growing international concern and has been defined as rendition. A number of governments around the world – in particular in Europe, Middle East and North America – have transferred or attempted to transfer terrorist suspects to places where they are at risk of being subjected to torture or ill-treatment. Even if a person is a terrorist suspect, it is illegal according to key international law treaties such as: The Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment 1984 (CAT), International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights 1966 (ICCPR), The Convention relating to the Status of Refugees 1951 (1951 Refugee Convention) and its Protocol; and the Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War 1949 (Geneva III), and the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War 1949 (Geneva IV) to send him to a state where it is possible to be tortured. The term that has been used to describe this procedure is the principle of nonrefoulement and it is used in numerous international treaties including the Convention against Torture. The methods of transfer and treatment of the terrorist suspects is the main point under discussion. It is debatable though, what the definition of a terrorist is, and how we define torture. Definitions that have been used in order to define terrorism are similar to this one: “seeking to further political objectives through the threat or use of violence usually in opposition to state governments” (Kegley and Wittkopf) It is also controversial how we should define torture in order to include any possible case. However, the Convention Against Torture makes a distinction between torture (‘any act by which severe pain or suffering, whether physical or mental, is intentionally inflicted on a person for such purposes of obtaining from him or a third person information or a confession...’) and other acts of cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment which do not amount to torture. Both are illegal prohibited, with no exceptional circumstances; a state of war or any other public emergency may not be used as a justification for torture.

Focus on Torture.

- The prohibition against torture under international law applies to many measures—e.g. beating on the soles of the feet; electric shock applied to genitals and nipples; rape; near drowning through submersion in water; near suffocation by plastic bags tied around the head; burning; whipping; needles inserted under fingernails; mutilation; hanging by feet or hands for prolonged periods.
- Examples of mistreatment that are not included in the definition of torture which International Law also prohibits include: being forced to stand spread eagled against the wall; being subjected to bright lights or blindfolding; being subjected to continuous loud noise; being deprived of sleep; food or drink; being subjected to forced constant standing or crouching; or violent shaking.
- What laws prohibit Torture?

Torture is universally condemned, and whatever its actual practice, no country publicly supports torture or opposes its eradication. The prohibition against torture is well established under customary international law as jus cogens; that is, it has the highest standing in customary law and is so fundamental as to supersede all other treaties and customary laws (except laws that are also jus cogens). Criminal acts that are jus cogens are subject to universal jurisdiction, meaning that any
state can exercise its jurisdiction, regardless of where the crime took place, the nationality of the perpetrator or the nationality of the victim.

In 1948, following the horrific abuses of World War II, the General Assembly of the United Nations inserted the prohibition against torture in the landmark Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Article 5 states: "No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment." This ban on torture and other ill-treatment has subsequently been incorporated into the extensive network of international and regional human rights treaties. It is contained in Article 7 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), ratified by 153 countries, including the United States in 1992, and in the Convention against Torture or Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (the Convention against Torture), ratified by 136 countries, including the United States in 1994. It is also codified in the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, the African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights, and the American Convention on Human Rights.

The prohibition against torture is also fundamental to humanitarian law (also known as the laws of war), which governs the conduct of parties during armed conflict. An important element of international humanitarian law is the duty to protect the life, health and safety of civilians and other non-combatants, including soldiers who are captured or who have laid down their arms. Torture of such protected persons is absolutely forbidden. Common Article 3 to the Geneva Conventions, for example, bans "violence of life and person, in particular murder of all kinds, mutilation, cruel treatment and torture" as well as "outrages upon personal dignity, in particular humiliating and degrading treatment." The use of force to obtain information is specifically prohibited in Article 31 of the Fourth Geneva Convention: "No physical or moral coercion shall be exercised against protected persons, in particular to obtain information from them or from third parties."

According to the 1999 Initial Report of the United States to the U.N. Committee against Torture, (http://www.state.gov/www/global/human_rights/torture_index.html) in the United States, the use of torture "is categorically denounced as a matter of policy and as a tool of state authority...No official of the government, federal, state or local, civilian or military, is authorized to commit or to instruct anyone else to commit torture. Nor may any official condone or tolerate torture in any form...Every act of torture within the meaning of the [Convention against Torture] is illegal under existing federal and state law, and any individual who commits such an act is subject to penal sanctions as specified in criminal statutes."

Although no single provision of the U.S. Constitution expressly prohibits torture as a means to extract information, secure a confession, punish for an act committed, intimidate or coerce, or for any reason based on discrimination, there is no question that torture violates rights established by the Bill of Rights. The U.S. courts have located constitutional protections against interrogations under torture in the Fourth Amendment’s right to be free of unreasonable search or seizure (which encompasses the right not be abused by the police), the Fifth Amendment’s right against self-incrimination (which encompasses the right to remain silent during interrogations), the Fifth and the Fourteenth Amendments’ guarantees of due process (ensuring fundamental fairness in criminal justice system), and the Eighth Amendment’s right to be free of cruel or unusual punishment. In numerous cases, the U.S. Supreme Court has condemned the use of force amounting to torture or other forms of ill treatment during interrogations, including such practices as whipping, slapping, depriving a victim of food, water, or sleep, keeping him naked or in a small cell for prolonged periods, holding a gun to his head, or threatening him with mob violence. Torture would also violate state constitutions, whose provisions generally parallel the protections set forth in the federal Bill of Rights.

Article 4 of the Convention against Torture obligates state parties to ensure that all acts of torture are criminal offences under domestic legislation. Although there is no single federal law specifically criminalizing torture, the United States has insisted that existing federal and state laws render illegal any act falling with the Convention against Torture’s definition of torture. In the United States, most criminal laws are state rather than federal. Although a few states have laws addressing torture as such, each state has laws that criminalize violence against persons (e.g. assault, rape), regardless of whether committed by public officials or private individuals. In addition, states typically have specific laws that criminalize acts by public officials that constitute abuses of authority, "official oppression," or the unlawful infliction of bodily injury. The principal federal law that would apply to torture against detainees is 18 U.S.C. 242, which makes it a criminal offense for any public official to
wilfully to deprive a person of any right protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

**Examples of rendition**

- Egyptian-born Hassan Osama Nasr (a.k.a. Abu Omar) disappeared from his city of residence, Milan, in February 2003. He briefly surfaced 15 months later, when he called his family in Italy claiming to have been kidnapped by U.S. and Italian forces, taken to Egypt and tortured. Based on the latest available information, Abu Omar is being held in the Tora prison on the edge of the Egyptian capital Cairo. Italian authorities are currently conducting an inquiry into Nasr’s purported kidnapping. On June 23, 2005, an Italian judge issued arrest warrants for 13 alleged C.I.A agents in connection with Abu Omar’s kidnapping. On the same day, another Italian judge issued an indictment against Abu Omar for crimes relating to terrorism. In July 2005, the Italian government issued warrants for 6 more alleged C.I.A. agents accused of helping plan the kidnapping. In November 2005, prosecutors requested that the Italy’s Justice Ministry seek the extradition of the C.I.A. agents from the U.S.

- In October 2001, Jamil Qasim Aseed Mohammed, a Yemeni microbiology student, was allegedly flown from Pakistan to Jordan on a U.S. registered Gulfstream jet after Pakistan’s intelligence agency reportedly surrendered him to U.S. authorities at the Karachi airport. U.S. officials alleged that Aseed Mohammed was an Al Qaeda operative who played a role in the bombing of the USS Cole. The handover of the shackled and blindfolded Aseed Mohammed reportedly took place in the middle of the night in a remote corner of the airport, without the benefit of extradition or deportation procedures.

**History of the Problem**

Rendition violates Conventions concerning human rights such as the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment 1984 (CAT) that was signed after a forum for debate on the topic of torture provided by the United Nations, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights 1966 (ICCPR), Convention relating to the Status of Refugees 1951 (1951 Refugee Convention) and its Protocol and Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War 1949 (Geneva III), Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War 1949 (Geneva IV). In short, these treaties oblige all the states to prohibit torture, to prohibit any transfer of an individual to another State where that individual faces the risk of torture and require the prevention, the investigation and the punishment of acts of torture. The major Convention concerning Human Rights is of course the Declaration of Human Rights signed in 1948, in which it is stated that ‘No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment’ (Article 5) Some cases like the debate of the appropriate treatment of al Qaeda and Taliban combatants detained by the Northern Alliance forces allied in the United States during the 2001 campaign in Afghanistan, have caused a debate over whether or not the Geneva Convention should be expanded in order to include terms for the protection of terrorist suspects as well. The Geneva Convention has been signed by more than 190 states. In 1987 the European Convention for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment was signed.

There have been numerous multilateral treaties covering specific types of terrorist acts, such as the the Maritime Convention of 1988 and the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts signed in Montreal in 1971. However, these types of Conventions do not oblige the signatory parties to search for suspects believed to be present in the territory of the state. So states are free to arrest suspects for reasons which are ‘political’ rather than for reasons supported by evidence.

As far as the treaties that have been signed and concern torture of any citizen, which means that terrorists are included in the legal framework that these treaties provide, we should be aware of the fact that treaties such as the Geneva Protocol belong to the International Humanitarian Law that apply specifically during situations of armed conflicts. These kinds of treaties do not apply when terrorist actions are committed during peacetime. In addition, there are some limitations concerning the protection of terrorists who act under a situation of armed conflict because it is debatable how it is defined whether a nation is in wartime or in peacetime.
**CURRENT SITUATION**

American C.I.A agents are highly involved in the illegal transferring of terrorist suspects and other prisoners to countries where torture takes place. Agreements with European countries such as Germany over the facilitation of flights carrying terrorist suspects in exchange for a German citizen kept in American prisons in Morocco is only an example of the rendition cases in which the C.I.A is engaged. In addition, there are also data of the UN Committee against Torture that incriminate, apart from United States, Canada, Britain, the Netherlands, Germany, Austria and Sweden for sending terrorist suspects to states such as Syria, Egypt and Uzbekistan that are considered to be among the most abusive, based on diplomatic assurances. In addition, Amnesty International’s reports of 2005 highlighted countries such as Bosnia and Herzegovina, Germany, Italy, Macedonia, UK and Turkey, where according to data and verified information actions of rendition were committed, or the countries had given access to airplanes transferring prisoners that would be tested. The European Parliament of the European Union (EU) set up a Temporary Committee in order to investigate the possible relation of these European States with the CIA’s acts of transport and illegal detention of prisoners. The reporter of that Committee in his report of April 2006 condemned the practice of rendition and violation of human rights.

According to Amnesty International there is strong evidence (consisting of photos and videos) that prove the use of torture by U.S. officials over Iraqis as part of the United States’ war on terror. Photographs of Iraqi prisoners at Abu Ghrabl prison in Baghdad, hooded, naked, attached to wires, attacked by dogs, forced to simulate sex acts and assume humiliating and painful positions, and presided over by smiling U.S. military personnel have shocked the world. Other incidents of abuse and even murder have come to light and received new attention. Long before the Abu Ghrabl scandal, newspapers such as the New York Times and the Washington Post published credible reports, based on interviews with former detainees and unnamed U.S. officials, alleging that U.S. agents abused terrorist suspects or handed them over to foreign governments with documented records of torture. None of the reported allegations suggest the United States has utilized such horrific techniques as electric shock or burning. They do, however, suggest that the United States has been willing to inflict other forms of physical or mental pain in an effort to obtain intelligence from captured terrorist suspects.

According to a December 26, 2002 story in the Washington Post, “U.S. Decries Abuse but Defends Interrogations” (http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn?pagename=article&node=&contentId=A37943-2002Dec25&notFound= true) captured al-Qaeda operatives and Taliban commanders held at the U.S.-occupied Bagram air base in Afghanistan are subjected to physical and psychological "stress and duress" techniques, including being held blindfolded or hooded, bound in awkward painful positions, and deprived of sleep for prolonged periods. Prior to interrogation, some captives have been beaten. One unnamed U.S. official quoted in the Washington Post stated, “If you don’t violate someone’s human rights some of the time, you probably aren’t doing your job.”

Although cases of rendition do not become publicly announced, it has been reported that the CIA practices rendition by sending captured terrorist suspects to other countries for interrogation. In countries like Egypt, Jordan or other Middle Eastern countries prisoners are tortured, and some of the suspect terrorists who have been sent there have reported tortures, leading to a debate upon both rendition and torture.

The United Nations has established the Counter-Terrorism Committee for the prevention, combat and elimination of terrorism. In addition, on September 2006 The member states of the UN adopted the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy. Among these adopted measures, there are measures that particularly concern the protection of human rights, such as the promotion of Support of the Special Rapporteurs that provide the UN with evidence of rendition and torture cases and the strengthening of the Human Rights Council and the High Commissioner’s Human Rights role.

**BLOC POSITIONS**

Although there are no clear blocs of countries involved in this problem since there are numerous states that have been accused of the use of torture or cooperation with other states for the transfer of terrorist suspects and other mainly political prisoners, there are some Conventions that can make the situation clearer.

• The U.S.A. is the number one accused country for sending terrorist suspects to prisons in Syria, Egypt and Uzbekistan.

• As far as the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment is concerned, the following details are particularly significant:
  - The USA, the UK and Uzbekistan have all signed and ratified the Convention.
  - Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Russian Federation, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, Uruguay, Venezuela and Yugoslavia (Former Republic of Yugoslavia) have also made a declaration under Article 22 recognizing the competence of the Committee against Torture to consider individual complaints.
  - Afghanistan, China, Israel, Kuwait, Morocco, Poland, Saudi Arabia, and Ukraine by making a reservation under Article 28 of the Convention do not recognize the competence of the Committee against Torture to undertake confidential inquiries into allegations of systematic torture if warranted. (this simply means that they do not recognize the Committee as capable of conducting secret investigation into possible cases of torture.)

QUESTIONS A RESOLUTION MUST ANSWER

1) Who is considered to be a terrorist? Which actions of a person or a group should put him or them in the category of terrorists?

2) When does a person qualify to be named a terrorist suspect? Should it be determined by a specific Convention?

3) Should these suspects have any legal rights and what kind of rights should they have?

4) What methods of ‘punishment’ should be included in the definition of torture and what methods should the nations use in order to eliminate any violation of Human Rights?

5) By what methods could rendition be reduced and which should be the appropriate methods of punishment of terrorist suspects? Should the methods be identical for all nations or not?

6) In countries where rendition or torture of terrorist suspects has been committed, should any sanctions be imposed or not, and which legal body should be responsible for that?

7) Who should determine if the accusations towards a country are valid, and how?

8) What is the role of the United Nations over the terrorist suspects? Should it have the right to interfere in states that are suspected of committing torture of terrorist suspects?

9) How can which states practice such illegal actions over the suspects be found? Should any UN body be responsible for the investigation and determination of the actual terrorist suspects or should Governments be responsible for that?

10) Should the transfer of terrorist suspects between the states be allowed or not? Should the conditions of transfer be prescribed by international law and any specific Convention?

11) Delegates should necessarily include clauses in the resolution that will concern their countries as well. You should also take into consideration any Treaties or Conventions concerning terrorism that your country has ratified.

12) What should happen if these people being accused of terrorism are proved to be innocent but they have already suffered torture or rendition? Should they be compensated or not?

CONCLUSION

Although there are treaties that protect civilians from torture like the UN Convention Against Torture and the UN Declaration of Human Rights, there are thirteen major Conventions that particularly concern terrorism.

- Convention on Offences and Certain Other Acts Committed On Board Aircraft (Aircraft Convention)
- Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft (Unlawful Seizure Convention)
- Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Civil Aviation (Civil Aviation Convention)
- Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents (Diplomatic Agents Convention)
So there are still many things to be done in order to eliminate terrorism by following 'human' methods and practices within the borders of the countries where any terrorists have acted. Torture is indeed a cruel way of treating any human being and there are variable methods of making someone confess his guilt and then punish him.

**SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH**

Since this is just a guide to help you with your research on the topic of Torture and Rendition over Terrorist Suspects there are further details that you need to find out about your country’s policy in order to represent it successfully. You can use the next links:

- www.amnesty.org
- www.un.org/terrorism/strategy-counter-terrorism

where you can find specific examples of use of torture by other countries than the ones that have been mentioned here as well as reports and Conventions listing the countries’ names that have signed or ratified them. In addition in http://www.un.org/sc/ctc/intlcooperation you can find all the Conventions concerning Terrorism that have been signed so far. It would be useful to make some detailed study on the Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy that has been adopted by all U.N member states since September 2006 and make some further research in all U.N documents concerning terrorism. (http://www.un.org/issues/docs/d-terror.html)

Enjoy!
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TOPIC AREA B

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

When threats of using bacteria, fungi or toxins from living organisms in order to induce death or cause disease are made to intimidate governments, societies or certain groups, in order to cause physical, psychological or economic damage, a phenomenon appears that is defined as bioterrorism. Bioterrorism is a manifestation of biological warfare, whose aim is purely to spread mayhem and turbulence and to satisfy political, financial or personal benefits, a goal that is identified as terrorism. In official documents bioterrorism is defined as one of the most important issues. Disease has long been the deadliest enemy of mankind. We have fought the causes and consequences of disease throughout history and must continue to do so with every available means. All civilized nations reject the use of disease and biological weapons as instruments of war and terror. We must not overlook to mention that the United Office at Geneva claims that advances in biotechnology will increase the threat of bioterrorism. This is the topic that shall be examined in the Special Conference on Terrorism, being a significant contemporary issue that has been plaguing global society and the UN. The reason why terrorists are in favor of bioterrorism is because biological weapons are cheaper than conventional, nuclear or chemical weapons.

HISTORY OF THE PROBLEM

The use of bioterrorism, as a means of acquiring power, wealth and succeeding in certain goals set, is by no means recent. The first recorded bioterrorist occasion was in 600 BC. This considerable period of time, during which an abundance of events of bioterrorism were recorded, is evidence of the fact that bioterrorism was as widely spread in the past as it is now. A characteristic instance of bioterrorism was the use of poison gas in the First World War.

Nevertheless, the particular uptake of bioterrorism in the latest three centuries, when major events of bioterrorism have been recorded virtually year by year, is rather alarming. The first attempt to deal with the major issue of bioterrorism was recorded in 1972, when the BCW (Biological Weapons Convention) banned the entire category of bioterrorism. More specifically, it was the first multilateral disarmament treaty that attempted to cope with that issue. It was signed by over 100 countries and a key point is that it was supplementary to the Geneva protocol. The BCW is also of stupendous importance, as it is still the main force which monitors bioterrorism globally.

It is also important that “The Convention bans the development, production, stockpiling, acquisition and retention of microbial or other biological agents or toxins, in types and in quantities that have no justification for prophylactic protective or other peaceful purposes”. From the above quote it is evident that the Convention, albeit it prevented the acquisition or creation of biological agents, did not ban the usage of them, a key issue that ought to be addressed as it encompasses a very controversial element that ought to be tackled since almost every year we are called upon to face bio-attacks. Let me present you some of the attacks linked to bioterrorism:

i. December 31, 2001 people faced over 100 hits with anthrax letters in the United States of America after the events of the 9/11 in a two-month period

ii. November 30, 2001, people faced around 70 hits with anthrax letters

Other cases after 9/11:

- 22/9 New York Post
CURRENT SITUATION

The current situation regarding bioterrorism is very similar to the previous situation in the past, as far as resolutions, actions and treaties are concerned. To begin with, bioterrorism can be divided into three main categories according to the gravity of each case. The categories are the following:

i. Category A is considered to be the most significant one, as the materials used in this category are highly lethal and it is extremely hard to regulate the dissemination of it. With precariously high mortality percentages, the usage of these viruses, toxins or bacteria is highly detrimental. Examples are anthrax, Ebola, smallpox and plague. For many of the aforementioned agents there is no cure available, and in the few cases where there is, it is considered unsuitable for general usage, due to its many side effects and multiple doses required. In the first category lie the majority of the cases that have triggered/precipitated international crises.

ii. Category B is much less lethal and easily regulated. In this category lie the less significant ones, such as food diseases (salmonella, shigella) and other toxin-induced illnesses. These cases are usually disregarded as the immediate threats derive from category A.

iii. Category C can potentially be equally dangerous to the first one. However, the potential is much less and they are less easy to be administered by terrorists, as it is hard to manipulate their infection rate. Mainly pathogens comprise this category. Pathogens can be separated into two categories. Viruses and bacteria. As far as the first category is concerned it is of importance to note that viruses are ultramicroscopic organisms many times smaller than bacteria and amongst the smallest organisms known. They have a very high mutation rate which allows them to rapidly evolve into new forms which prevents their hosts from developing immunity. Viruses can only replicate inside host cells. Common virus pathogens include: flu, cold, measles, chicken pox, tetanus, HIV/AIDS and many more. As for the second category it is important to note that bacteria are microscopic organisms which come in many shapes and sizes. They are living in cells and in favorable conditions they can multiply rapidly and release poison or toxins. Diseases from bacteria include gonorrhoea, typhoid, cholera and food diseases such as salmonella.

The differentiation of biological warfare is important, as it enables to judge between the various cases of bioterrorism and correspondingly form decisions and blocs. It also can be directly used in the debate, as arguments can be either substantiated or invalidated through this differentiation.

Another aspect that should be examined is the use of biological agents in other benign forms as well. It is crucial that the use of biological agents has so far solely been correlated to the concept of bioterrorism. Several alternative ideas, however, would be easily implemented, in order to use the agents in a non-harmful manner, such as in order to examine diseases and other cases, where the biological agents can provide crucial insight.

As it has been mentioned before, the BCW is still the predominant multilateral force regarding bioterrorism. The issues and notions that the BCW primarily encompasses are the following:

i. The prohibition of the acquisition of biological weapons

ii. The destruction or conversion of already existing biological weapons

iii. The discouragement of
any act of bioterrorism

iv. The implementation of the resolutions of the BCW at a national level by all means necessary

v. To resort to the BCW in order to confront with any problems that might arise

vi. To assist states in need in order to overcome predicaments.

The fact that the BCW still does not advocate the prevention of the usage of the biological agents is a major issue as well.

Another alarming incident is the rapid rate of occurrence of bioterrorist attacks. There were over 15 significant cases of bioterrorism reported after 2000 annually. That is also one of the reasons why biological substance identification has been a prime theme for many nations. Disease surveillance has also been developing rapidly after several disease outbreaks such as the "mad-cow" disease and the avian flu, which aims at monitoring the situation as well as determining the origins of the various diseases.

What is more, a crucial issue that is hindering the overall situation is the definition of bioterrorism, and how countries cope with it through biodefence. Biodefence should also be tackled as a prime issue in this committee, due to the fact that the way countries adhere to treaties or implement internal measures in order to eradicate bioterrorism can be interpreted, as the reluctance or willingness of each individual country to produce results.

Another significant issue is the fact that not all countries have the capacity to protect themselves from bioterrorist attacks. This is where the UN comes in, in that its role as a peacekeeping organization is to find realistic and applicable ways of coping with this issue. This could be either through granting funds through the World Bank, or through other ways, such as via the establishment of a body that will have that specific focus but also through the establishment of its decisions expressed in the resolutions of the General Assembly. For instance, in the resolution A/59/565 in which the GA recommends to "take the initiative to rebuild global public health starting with building public health capacity at local and international levels throughout the world." We must emphasize the fact that "such an initiative would not only yield direct benefits for the prevention and treatment of diseases in the world but would also provide the basis for an effective global defence against bioterrorism and natural outbreaks of deadly infectious diseases.”

Furthermore, the resolution A/60/825 expresses its suggestions in order to have better biodefences. Another resolution mentions "the threat of bioterrorism should be addressed by establishing a single comprehensive database on biological incidents, focusing on improving a state’s public health systems and acknowledging the need to bring together major stakeholders to ensure that biotechnology’s advances are not used for terrorist or other criminal purposes but for the public good.” As far as more UN resolutions are concerned we ought to mention the 1925 Geneva Protocol, the UN’s Global Counterterrorism Strategy, the Security Council resolution 1373 and the resolution 1673. Last but not least the UN 1540 Committee. This committee was established pursuant to the Security Council’s Resolution (UNSCR 1540) which represents the international effort to contain the spread of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons. The committee provides assistance to the Member States and monitors them for the compliance to the resolution. Other initiatives are:

i. the Biological Toxin Weapon Convention (BTWC)

ii. the Bioweapons Prevention Project (BWPP). Monitor Database. Its aim is to track compliance of governments and other organizations with the 1972 Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention

iii. the Interpol’s Bioterrorism Project

iv. the Interpol’s Biocriminalization Project which was launched in September 2006. Its objectives are to:

   a. develop a thorough understanding of the legislative framework for the prevention and prohibition of bioterrorism and biocrimes

   b. identify legislative and regulatory gaps in this framework

   c. assist Interpol’s member states to draft and enact primary legislation.

From the aforementioned one can infer that the issue is a major one due to the general mobilization. Moreover, the stance of various countries and their actions towards the subject are some of the aspects that polarize the nations into blocs, something that shall be examined later on.
**BLOC POSITIONS**

The main blocs that are expected to develop are two. Firstly, the countries that have been reluctant to sign the treaty that the BCW has formed and that have significant reservations are the following:

- Andorra
- Angola
- Cameroon
- Chad
- Comoros
- Cook Islands
- Djibouti
- Eritrea
- Guinea
- Israel
- Kazakstani
- Kiribati
- Marshall Islands
- Mauritania
- Federated States of Micronesia
- Montenegro (membership by virtue of Serbia and Montenegro’s ratification pending clarification)
- Mozambique
- Namibia
- Nauru
- Niue
- Samoa
- Trinidad and Tobago
- Tuvalu
- Zambia

What is more, the countries that have not yet acceded are the following:

- Burundi
- Central African Republic
- Côte d’Ivoire
- Egypt
- Gabon
- Guyana
- Haiti
- Liberia
- Madagascar
- Malawi
- Myanmar
- Nepal
- Somalia
- Syrian Arab Republic
- United Arab Emirates
- Tanzania

Therefore, the countries that are included in those two groups are the ones that basically oppose the BCW, whereas the remaining (officially) 155 countries that have ratified the Treaty are supporters of the BCW. The main differences that could potentially arise are the prohibition of the usage of germ warfare, an issue that the BCW does not address or the reluctance of the 40 nations to accede to a multilateral organization in order to address the issue.

Bear in mind that the previous bloc is merely pointing you towards the right direction. The main blocs that are to be formed during the actual conference are going to be shaped at that time and are dependent upon a string of events, policies and decisions. These are merely a facilitation so as to track down approximately your country’s policy.

**QUESTIONS A RESOLUTION MUST ANSWER**

The foremost aspects that a resolution ought to address, in order to be well-rounded and ample are the following:

i. To what extent has the situation been handled successfully and what enhancements does one’s country suggest/not suggest.

ii. Make an assessment of the situation (its gravity, its potential ramifications, its frequency of occurrence)

iii. State the use of biological agents and assess their role and their usage (should it be prohibited, utilized for scientific purposes, etc.)

iv. Assess the role of the BCW in coping with bioterrorism and validate or invalidate its statements. Comment upon its efficiency/inefficiency. Further substantiate one’s nation’s endorsement/disapproval of the BCW.

v. Provide evidence about the current situation and the BCW’s role in current affairs.

vi. Suggest realistic solutions to the problem at hand.
vii. Offer important information about the implementation of the aforementioned suggestions such as financing, support and efficiency.

viii. Address as many aspects of the issue as possible in order to have a resolution sufficiently thorough. (such as monitoring and determination of origin)

Subsequently, the aforementioned issues generate the following questions:

i. What is bioterrorism and biodefence?

ii. Was the past successful?

iii. Why or why not?

iv. What is the significance of the situation?

v. What would be the effects, if not coped with efficiently?

vi. To what extent does the use of biological agents define bioterrorism?

vii. Why/why not, to what extent and if yes, by which means should their use be regulated?

viii. What was the contribution of previous organizations, and to what extent has this affected the current situation?

ix. What should the role of the BCW be in the contemporary world, according to its efficiency?

x. What are the main hindrances that are, if that is the case, hampering the limitation and regulation of bioterrorism?

xi. How can they be successfully dealt with, if necessary?

xii. If not necessary, state why.

xiii. If any improvements or establishments are proposed, how will they be monitored/financed/supported?

xiv. How will the problem be solved in that case?

xv. How does biodefence play a role in the overall situation?

xvi. To what extent was biodefence successful, regarding individual countries, and how should it be improved by multilateral as well as individual enhancements?

xvii. Should there be both multilateral as well as inner regulations? Why or why not? What are the limitations in the overall efficiency of coping with bioterrorism?

xviii. What would the culmination be, in that how would the overall situation end up, based on the measures or statements that you made?

xix. In countries that are unable to shelter themselves from the danger of bioterrorism, how should help be given?

xx. What would the role of other nations be, and how would it be implemented?

By addressing these aspects, a resolution will be highly accurate, up-to-date and strong enough to be characterized as a good resolution.

CONCLUSION

This issue is predominantly a major theme. Being around for millennia and having had a key role in many events of global importance, this issue that shall be contemplated by the special conference on terrorism is indubitably one that shapes entire policies. The gravity of the matter at hand is manifest through its lethal nature and potentially rapid dissemination. Since the contemporary situation is extremely fragile and no actual application of measurements for the prohibition of weapons has taken place, this conference shall try to address this issue from a multilateral perspective and a democratic manner, invariably in accordance with the UN spirit.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Understandably, in order to prepare for ACMUN, research is a requisite in order to familiarize yourselves with the process of it. A key element in doing so successfully is further research.
To begin with, the basics that you need to cover are the following:

Resources about bioterrorism, biological warfare, biodefence, biological agents, and pathogens can be found at:

- http://www.library.uthscsa.edu/internet/bioterror.cfm
- http://www.hs.state.az.us/phs/edc/edrp/es/bthistor1.htm

Definitions, though they should not be directly added to a resolution, are a key part of your study, in that they help you define the topic, which subsequently disencumbers the better comprehending of the topic at hand. Without a good definition that fully delineates the topic, a resolution will be of limited caliber.

Another issue that can add to the overall knowledge of a delegate and is crucial in that it helps understand the complexity of the situation is articles published by renowned and credible sites, such as http://news.bbc.co.uk/. These articles can help you keep up to date with the latest developments, as it is an ongoing issue that is constantly changing. Some articles that can be useful are the following:

- http://www.bbc.co.uk/science/hottopics/biochemicalweapons/
- http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/programmes/newsnight/archive/2892427.stm
- http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/1644462.stm
- http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/1592176.stm
- http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/837872.stm
- http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/asia-pacific/589409.stm

On the whole, online and credible resources are the best and fastest way to get informed about the latest developments. And staying up to date is of prime importance, in that events are fast-paced and rapidly taking place, so the more information one has and the better acquainted one with the topic is, the more successful will one be.
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