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Dear ACMUN Delegates,

The Directors of this year’s Anatolia College Model United Nations have worked extensively in order to prepare the following study guides on the topics which you will discuss in February. These study guides offer the basic knowledge of the topic you should have, so please refer to them not only prior to but also during the conference. Understandably, these study guides should not be the entire basis of your work for ACMUN, but you should also look for further reading sources and ways to expand your knowledge on the topic.

All delegates should have prepared an informal working paper by the conference. The working paper is an unofficial document which consists of basic solutions and suggestions which reflect each delegate’s country’s policy. Please refer to the section “Questions a Resolution Must Answer” of the study guides – the most important section – in order to author efficient working papers and resolutions. Your chairs can be contacted at the email addresses under their introductory paragraph. Feel free to email them for any questions you might have, as they are the experts on the topics of each committee.

Hopefully you will benefit greatly from these study guides. I am looking forward to meeting you all in February.

Sincerely,

Panagiotis F. Progios
Secretary-General

jellenen1606@gmail.com

Hello everyone
Dear Delegates,

My name is Cilia Kanellopoulou and I will be the Director of the Disarmament Committee in ACMUN. The DSAMUN was my first MUN Conference three years ago and since then I have been very passionate with the MUN. This will be my second time as a student officer and I have to admit that I am really looking forward to it because every time is a challenge and a new experience and I would love to get an insight into the Harvard style of MUN.

The reason I began to participate in the Conferences was that I wanted to get involved with international affairs and to learn how the United Nations work. It was really exciting for me to be in the role of a delegate and I can’t wait to fulfill my duties as a Director.

I want to gather as many experiences as possible as a Student Officers and I also want to encourage the delegates to become more active in the debate. I have never before participated in the Disarmament Committee, so this is one more reason why I can’t wait for the Conference to begin.

The question of Narcoterrorism is a topic that I find very interesting because it poses a significant threat the international community is forced to deal with and I believe that it will lead to a fruitful debate.

If you have any questions do not hesitate to contact me.

Cilia Kanellopoulou
ciliaki@hotmail.com

---

Dear delegates,

I salute you and I wholeheartedly wish you a fruitful debate. My name is Konstantinos Primerakis, I attend the second year of the International Baccalaureate program and I am the deputy director of the Disarmament Committee and writer of the study guide on the issue of the anti-missile shield over Europe.

I have participated in regional and international conferences. This is my first time as a chair of a committee but I hope to succeed in providing help and material so as to facilitate discussion. I would only like to remind the delegates that the Disarmament Committee proposes resolutions to be confirmed by the General Assembly. Thus, we are not able to impose, but only to suggest solutions. Sanctioning is out of order.

The issue of the anti-missile shield is multi-faceted for it directly concerns many countries with conflicting policies on the matter. Provided that the delegates are active, we will have the chance to have not only productive, but also intense debate.

Participation in MUN entails delving into international issues and becoming aware of global problems. Even though we may passively accept the atrocities occurring around the world, we are informed, no less, which may urge the international community to face them effectively sometime in the future (hopefully).

Those who are willing to contact me before the beginning of the conference to discuss issues of the guides, please; do not hesitate to do so.

Konstantinos Primerakis,
prim.oh.me@gmail.com
Disarmament Committee
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Statement of the Problem

Narcoterrorism was first defined by former President Terry of Peru in 1983, describing the attacks against his nation’s anti-narcotics police which had the typical terrorist signature. Originally narco-terrorism is meant to describe the attempts of drug traffickers to influence the government through the use of violence and intimidation and to obstruct law enforcement and justice. One of the most popular examples in history is Pablo Escobar’s ruthless violence aimed at the Columbian government.

Nowadays, Narcoterrorism has a two-way meaning. On the one hand it refers to a form of revolutionary terrorism that is actively involved in the production, taxation or distribution of narcotic drugs in order to finance their terrorist operations such as bombings, assassinations, hijackings.

The second meaning has to do with drug traffickers that use terrorism to impede the Government or Law Enforcement in interfering with their activities.

As a matter of fact, terrorism and drug trafficking are often linked and there is no clear distinction between terrorist organizations and drug traffickers since their goals have become more similar and their ties are close. But the funds derived from drug trafficking for either illegal group is used to sustain and expand their networks and operations. The maintenance of a network of operatives and cells requires significant amounts of cash. In order to purchase weapons, afford travels, and provide living expenses for terrorists and their families, excessive amounts of money are needed. Without the money certain terrorist organizations would not be able to arm themselves and to secure their large amounts of territory. Because of the fact that state sponsorship has been increasingly condemned by the international community, the illicit drug traffickers and terrorist groups are forced to turn to alternative methods of funding, the main one being drug trafficking.

History of the Problem

The term of narco-terrorism appeared for the first time on the international stage in 1983, when Peru’s former president intended to describe attacks against his nation’s anti-narcotics police which were similar to terrorist attacks. Narcoterrorism then started to spread and became a major issue in the early 90’s with the fight of the United States against the Columbian cocaine cartel. At that time Pablo Escobar, the leader of a major drug trafficking group known as the Medellin Cartel was suspected to be behind a terrorism campaign that led to hundreds of deaths and injuries amongst the Columbian people. Eventually, he was caught.

Nevertheless, the initial step was the assassination of Justice Minister Rodrigo Lara Bonilla in 1984 in a campaign which aimed at intimidating the political and judicial system of Colombia. In 1987 then, narco-terrorism began to spread around the world beginning with the attempt by the cartel to kill the Colombian Ambassador to Hungary in Budapest. Throughout the eighties the Medellin cartel reached drastic measures and brutal behaviour through several kidnappings, car bombings and assassinations just to manage to rescind the extradition treaty. Yet the government’s determination to defeat the traffickers remained unshaken and stable and several former Presidents kept a firm opposed stand to the demands of the traffickers. Due to the fact that narco-terrorism from now on was a severe national threat, the Colombian security police achieved eminent success in three ways. It managed to disrupt the trafficker’s operations and infrastructure while keeping the head of the drug traffickers constantly on the move and to eliminate key individuals once in a while.

Now that narco-terrorism has developed into an international threat, more and more terrorist organizations get involved in drug trafficking as an alternative source of revenue.

Current Situation

In the Western Hemisphere and especially in Latin America it is known that the connections between terrorism and drug trafficking have intensified.

From the 1980’s to the mid 1990’s the Shining Path’s activities have been funded mainly through cocaine trafficking in the State of Peru. The Andean region is also the source of most of the world’s cocaine. The primary producers of cocaine are Colombia, Peru and Bolivia and it is a fact that terrorist organizations are present in Colombia and
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Peru. Throughout the southern part of Colombia the FARC are reported to be involved in the production of cocaine and its distribution. In 2001, the FARC was even indicated to have relations with the Irish Republican Army. On the other hand, the ELN operates mainly along the northeast border between Colombia and Venezuela and in the Central and Northwestern Colombia. It appears to be less dependent on cocaine profits, yet its territorial influence includes cannabis and opium poppy growing areas. This terrorist group also belongs to the one’s that despise illegal drugs, although they gain a lot of money from them. The Sendero Luminoso, Shining path, operates mainly in remote areas of Peru since the central government authority is least prevalent there, an aspect very supportive of drug trafficking. Although the SL’s interference in the drug trade diminished in the 90’s, it seems that in 2001 it resurfaced.

Yet only the AUC, the United Self – Defense groups of Colombia, have officially stated that 70 per cent of their operational funding is derived from the drug trade. But there is also international activity in the Latin American region. Members of Islamic groups have been active in Paraguay, and along the loosely controlled region bordering with Brazil and Argentina.

In South Asia and the former Soviet Union the cultivation and production of drugs and the beneficial relationship between terrorist groups and drug traffickers is extremely well. Afghanistan’s opium production which supplies about 70 per cent of the world’s demand is a main financial method for al Qaeda since it is involved in the taxation of Afghanistan’s opium. Furthermore, the Liberation tigers of Tamil Eelam in Sri Lanka are likely to have connections to drug trafficking networks in Burma and are probably involved in the drug transportation from Burma, Pakistan and Afghanistan in order to receive training in exchange, although there is no official evidence that the LTTE is financed through the drug trade. The Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan is also active in this area. It has profited from Afghanistan’s drugs and takes also part in the trafficking through Central Asia to Russia and Europe.

In the Middle East we only have the Hezbollah as a terrorist organization that is involved in cocaine smuggling from Latin America to Europe and the Middle East. In Europe the Kurdistan’s worker Party (PKK), the IRA and the Basque fatherland and Liberty (ETA) are evidently involved in some kind of drug trafficking.

Whereas in the past terrorist organizations were financed through wealthy economic elites such as cattle ranchers and emerald miners in Latin America, or state sponsorship in the Middle East, nowadays they have become increasingly reliant on indirect or direct drug trafficking in form of cultivation, manufacture, transportation or distribution. Now drug trafficking has developed a two-fold purpose for terrorists. Not only can they obtain the necessary funds for their operations, but also believe to weaken the governments by flooding their societies with addictive drugs. What facilitates the work of terrorist groups or drug traffickers are similar factors such as the official corruption that hinders law enforcement or the incomplete or weak legislation. In addition to that, mostly in Latin American countries the poorly guarded national borders and the lack of political will to establish the law just makes it easier for every illegal group to develop its illicit activities.

The UN estimates that through the illicit drug trade traffickers have an income of $322 billion worldwide per year, whereas the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia alone win about $500 million to $1 billion annually. Worldwide the money funds from the FARC in Colombia and the Shining Path in Peru to Maoist rebels in India and Al Qaeda in Afghanistan.

According to the UNODC’s World Drug report 2007 the total potential value of Afghanistan’s opium reached about $ 3.1 billion. It has also been suggested to pay Afghan farmers for their poppy crop and then to confiscate it. Yet this is very difficult because an estimated $755 million were given to farmers for the dry opium. This makes the opium economy a financial power beyond the control of the state and the harvest is even expected to rise in 2007. Now, Afghanistan has begun attending international forums with the UNODC help in order to develop the situation.

Moreover, the UN has been active in the struggle against cutting of the fund for terrorist groups and their activities. Relevant UN Security Council resolutions included a series of UN Resolutions imposing sanctions – such as freezing assets, a travel ban and an arms embargo, on members of the Taliban, Al Qaeda and their associates. There are currently 124 entities and 226 individual on this list.
Furthermore, INTERPOL has developed a drug-control plan which role it is to identify new drug trafficking trends and criminal organizations operating at international level and to assist international law enforcement bodies concerned with countering the illicit production, trafficking and abuse of cannabis, cocaine and synthetic drugs. The UN Counter-Terrorism Committee has adopted an approach in three stages which basically involves the establishment of a legal framework to facilitate the prosecution of terrorist. In addition to that, it concentrates on establishing the procedures that are needed to implement the legislation and at last it monitors the best practices and shares them with all states in order to achieve an adequate level of performance.

The bottom line is that terrorist groups and drug traffickers will resort to any method or means to fund and facilitate their agendas and the international community has to improve its methods of prosecution and its legal system in order to follow the flows of illegal funds and to fill the gap in border security that assist terrorists and drug traffickers in their goals.

**Bloc Positions**

Generally most nations condemn the acts of terrorist organizations worldwide. Developing countries mainly tend to provide financial aid to the government for counter terrorist operations, especially to neighboring countries that are directly affected by this threat.

In central Asia the countries are more concerned of stopping the drug trade within their territories. Russia and China increasingly try to influence the Central Asian countries. Further territories such as Kirgizstan, Azerbaijan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan aim at combating the narco-terrorist threat in order to preserve their power. Southeast Asia is dominated by Indonesia and Malaysia and therefore support independence movements abroad while they continue to struggle with their own domestic movements, which flourish on drug trafficking. Their goal is to stop the drug trade and transportation to bordering countries such as China, Vietnam and Australia and stop this threat to their stability.

Pakistan, which is still plagued by the Kashmir conflict, the narcotics trade is a main source to support the Kashmiri independence.

Afghanistan also poses a threat, since the drug abuse is the third more serious threat destabilizing the country. The terrorist cells funded through the drug trade there are not hesitant to fulfil their own social and political goals. In Africa the main countries that are threatened are Morocco and Tanzania. Both regions put their efforts into stopping the drug trade and the transit of illicit narcotics to the European population and to neighbouring countries, Somalia and Algeria.

In South America the drug trade is obvious as well as the terrorist organizations that are funded through it. The states in this region assist Colombia in their fight against the drug cartels and provide the necessary financial aid.

The Middle East shows a more complex situation in reference to narcoterrorism. Primarily, there can be seen a rift between the Western Arab States and the Eastern. The Western Arabs led by Egypt compete for power within the Arab League against the Eastern Arabs led by Saudi Arabia.

The Iranians prefer to limit the drug trade though they do not hesitate to use the funds derived from the drug trade to supply militant arms in Iraq and Lebanon. Turkey is under pressure because of their plan to become a member of the European Union. Since their drug trade is going through their territory to the European market, they put a lot of effort in diminishing this threat.

Nevertheless, you should each focus on your country’s position and how extensive their internal damage is.

**Questions a Resolution Must Answer:**

- In which way can the international community assist the UN and its programs in order to cut the funding of illegal activities?
- How can the governmental corruption be fought?
- How is it possible to compensate the Afghan farmers in case of confiscation?
- Besides asset freezing, how can the United Nations deal with the problem of narco-terrorism, meaning the funding of terrorist groups?
- Through which options can the recruitment of the youth be eliminated?
- How will each government come up with the funds to equip and train its police adequately for the prosecution of drug traffickers and terrorists?
- In order to counter drug trafficking and the funding of terrorism the distribution and
sale of drugs has to be stopped. Is this possible and how?

- Is crop monitoring a possible solution for the problem with the Afghan crops?

**Conclusion**

Narcoterrorism, a recently coined term, the concept poses a significant threat to nations worldwide, especially in places where democracy is still nascent and fragile. In our committee simulation, we will all cooperate in order to successfully tackle the threat of narcokleptocracy, and hopefully after productive debating we can produce a resolution worthy of the topic.

**Bibliography**

- [http://www.narcoterror.org/background.htm](http://www.narcoterror.org/background.htm)
- [http://www.state.gov/p/inl/rls/rls/rm/21129.htm](http://www.state.gov/p/inl/rls/rls/rm/21129.htm)

**Suggestions for Further Research**

First and foremost you could try to find more information on the website of the UNODC ([www.unodc.org](http://www.unodc.org)) and of course the UN website. The press releases of certain conferences are extremely useful since the opinion of each country is explicitly stated.

Furthermore, Google can come in handy since certain aspects of narcoterrorism are described clearly and analyzed very well. But you mustn’t forget that many sites are not impartial but based on certain country positions.

**Useful Links:**


*Authored by Cilia Kanellopoulou*
Statement of the Problem

The potential presence of an anti-missile shield over Europe has long been an issue. The idea is routed to the years of the cold war, but it was not in prevalence until recently, when the United States of America decided to establish a radar facility along with a basis for anti-missile missiles in Eastern Europe, stating that they will provide a defensive shield against potential threat from countries such as Iran or North Korea.

The governments of many European countries and Russia have been reacting, the latter stating that the establishment of a missile basis so close to Russia’s borders is an act of aggression. The USA officials, on the other hand, postulate that cold war is over and are trying to consolidate with the Russian government.

It has been said that the anti-missile shield could pose an important hindrance to the international efforts for nuclear weapons disarmaments. Important nuclear disarmament pacts such as Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty are now being questioned.

The goal of the general assembly is not to impose a solution, but to suggest ways in which the opposing blocs can come to agreement.

Putin said that Iranian missiles currently have a maximum range of 1,100 miles and while the range may reach 1,500 miles by 2012, too short to justify a missile shield.

History of the Problem

Cold war and mutual assured distraction:

During the cold war, the most widely accepted doctrine concerning the successful avoidance of armed conflict was this of mutual assured destruction. According to this doctrine, potential nuclear war would inflict great human and material loss to both conflicting powers and thus no power would initiate war in order to avoid the worst outcome. Therefore nuclear weapons were not to be used as an offensive tool but as a potentially destructive device which would hinder the launch of nuclear missiles from the opposite camp.

The mutual assured destruction, which rendered war efficiently destructive and therefore inhibited it, was based on the premise that neither of the opposing camps would have the means to stop an attack by nuclear weapons, since this would allow a camp to launch a war without the fear of mutual destruction.

Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty:

For this reason new methods of nuclear heads delivery were developed, but treaties were also signed. The Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty was signed in 1972 and aimed the limitation of anti-ballistic missiles, which could neutralise the missiles that carried nuclear heads to their targets. The signatories were then subjected to mutual assured destruction since they were not able to develop sufficient anti-missile shields to protect their territories from an attack with ballistic missiles.

Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty:

In 1984 the USA started deploying intermediate-range missiles in countries of Western Europe such as Italy, UK and Western Germany. The Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty (INF) signed in 1987 requested the destruction of intermediate range missiles, therefore radically limiting the presence of USA nuclear weapons in Europe. The anti-missile shield over Europe is the first attempt of the USA to materialise a large-scale nuclear project in European territories.

First anti-missile shield initiatives:

Efforts to develop anti-ballistic systems in USA started in 1983 after the proposal of the president Ronald Reagan. The Strategic Defence Initiative Organisation launched in 1984 a program, which was named “Star Wars” by the media, whose goal was to prevent the USA from attack with nuclear weapons. The initiative was criticised for it violated treaties the USA had ratified, but also because it disturbed the equilibrium of fear caused by the mutual assured destruction.

In this context, in 1988, the German minister of foreign affairs proposed for the first time that an anti-missile shield is established over Europe. This idea was abandoned after the USSR collapsed and the cold war ended.

After the cold war:

Due to the end of the cold war, the idea of a missile shield over Europe was not brought to discussion for many years. It was not until 1999 that the United Kingdom and Italy signed a pan-European missile security pact. In 2000 president Clinton offered to share US technology with “civilised nations” so that they could defence
themselves against a missile attack from “rogue states” but also going further and setting the idea of a defence shield over Europe. While Britain was satisfied with the initiative of the USA, Germany and small European states warned that this may trigger a new arms race. Putin formed an alternative "non-strategic" missile defence proposal in June 2000 which would protect Europe from "rogue states" threat without undermining existing anti-ballistic pacts.

By March of 2001, the Russian minister of foreign affairs Ygor Sergeyev had proposed a full plan to the US government, but it was not thoroughly considered as the US and UK was then focused on the development of RAF radar on the Fylingdales islands, Britain.

In the meanwhile, on December 13, 2001, USA president George Bush announced that the USA would withdraw from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty within six months. Therefore the USA government was able to develop new defensive projects and establish defensive bases in America and Europe.

At that point, Germany and France had already assumed an aggressive position against USA nuclear weapons policy, since they believed that USA actions can lead to yet another nuclear weapons proliferation race.

It was not until 2006 that President Bush proposed a new program concerning the establishment of an anti-missile shield over Europe for its protection against rogue states that have nuclear programs under development, such as Iraq and Korea.

On March 28, 2007 the Czech government announced the initiation of formal negotiations with the US to host part of the shield facilities even as opposition was increasing in the rest of Europe. The German minister of foreign affairs noted that US should include European Union nations in the dialogue and the German government warned for renewed arms race.

The US plan for the shield involved 10 interceptors in Poland and a radar system in the Czech Republic. This caused the reaction of the Russian government on the 5th of June, which stated that Russian missiles would be turned against European targets if the plan was not cancelled. Even though

In June, the Russian President Vladimir Putin offered Russia’s radar basis in Azerbaijan to be a constituent in the planned missile shield. It was suggested that it would be an economically sound decision, as the construction of a facility on the Czech Republic would pose unnecessary costs. Putin stated that he was willing to withdraw threats of reorientation of Russian missiles at European targets in case that the US accepted his proposal. However, the proposal was not discussed further, since USA insisted that the proposal is not able to replace the anti-missile shield.

**Current Situation**

Currently, the USA government is still making efforts to materialise their plan, while the Russian government under president Putin threatens to re-orientate missiles against targets in Europe in case USA do not stop their efforts and fears for new arms race are prevalent.

The Russian officials are using cold-war terminology when referring to the current situation, accusing USA of imperialistic attitudes. It still remains to be seen what the reaction of the Russian government will be to the further continuation of the USA plan. An anti-missile shield has already been established above Moscow and new nuclear weapons tests have been performed in Kazakhstan. The fears may therefore be justifiable.

European governments, such as these of France and Germany, are widely supporting that the anti-missile shield over Europe should be a matter of concern for NATO instead of the USA, since NATO is the major organisation responsible for the defence of Europe.

The development of the US anti-missile bases seems to be in accordance with NATO plans, which involve the establishment of defence stations all across Europe. The combination of the two systems would mean that even South-Eastern parts of Europe and Italy are under anti-missile protection.

NATO could also - according to many European governments - be replaced by the European Union, which is also in position to guarantee European security. Germany makes new efforts to create a united European defence force and will try to implement the first steps to this goal by 2009.

**Bloc Positions**

**Blocs in favour of the shield:**

The major supporter of the anti-missile shield over Europe is the government of the US, as president Bush was the first to announce the
initiative of establishing the shield. The shield is to be financed by the US congress.

The US officials are dismissing the fears of opposing parties stating that the shield is not aimed at Russia. The anti-missile plan is currently facing the restriction of funding from the senate but President Bush continues his meetings in order to materialize the plan, which is met with dismay by the Russian officials. To appease the Russian government, the US has requested that Russians cooperate and send army officials and scientists to evaluate the situation in the sites where the shield is located.

Poland and Czech Republic governments have accepted the US proposal with little popular support. The Polish government sees the creation of the shield as an opportunity, while the Czech Prime Minister Mirek Topolánek said in one speech that the creation of the base in Czech territory would complete the liberation of Czechoslovakia that started on June 30, 1991, with the depart of the last Soviet troops.

UK is one of the main supporters of the US plan, and its government is already promoting the National Defence Plan by establishing a radar base in its territory. The plan of the anti-missile shield was given unconditional support and UK officials have been lobbying for parts of the system to be located in the UK.

Denmark has also taken a favourable position and radar sites in Greenland have already been updated.

 blocs against the shield:

The main opposition comes from the Russian government which feels threatened by the proximity of the anti-missile base to its territory. It has warned that in case the plans are materialised, Russian missiles will re-target European cities. There are also fears that besides newly developed defensive technologies, Russia may now wish to develop novel offensive nuclear weapons as a reaction to the location of a defensive shield so close to its borders.

Even though there have been assurances that the anti-missile shield is not offensive, it is still being argued that where nuclear weapons are concerned, defensive systems are offensive, according to the mutual assured distraction cold-war dogma.

The ex-members of USSR, Ukraine, Belarus and Baltic states have also expressed concerns about the plan.

Even though for reasons different to those that lead to Russia’s reaction to the shield, EU members are also generally against the plan.

The government of Germany has declared its opposition to the plan under the premise that it may precipitate a new arms race. Another pole of criticism lies on the fact that a non-European power is in control of European defence. The German defence minister proposed that the anti-missile system is incorporated in NATO defences. The chancellor Angela Merkel stressed that discussion with Russia is also very important.

France has been sceptical of the plan since the government was under President Chirac. Under president Sarkozy the situation has not yet changed and France seems to hold positions similar to these of Germany, but in a much more conciliatory spirit.

Italy and Spain are two other big European countries who have expressed their concern about the American plan. Overall, many members of the EU seem to believe that a USA initiative to establish an anti-missile shield in Europe is hindering the development of a united pan-European defence initiative.

Small European countries have also expressed their concern about the proposed plan. Luxemburg’s foreign minister said that the shield is a waste of money and that the stance of the Polish and Czech governments does not comply with the common European policy. Greece is sceptical about the shield too, since the proposed plan leaves its territories unprotected. Slovakia is concerned that the anti-missile shield may cause further problems with Russia and the Slovakian government has expressed the wish for the EU and NATO to discuss with Russia.

Iran’s chief nuclear negotiator said that the shield is the “joke of the year” since Iranian missiles are not capable of reaching Europe. Still, Iran is not affected by the presence of the shield.

There are also states that do not have a clear position, but are concerned about details of the plan.

Bulgaria, for instance, does not seem to have a clear position either in favour or against the shield. However, Bulgarian officials have expressed their concern that the shield is not in position to protect much of South-Eastern Europe, while problems caused to Bulgarian-Russian relationships are also a subject of great concern for the Bulgarian government.
Finally, after considering the formal positions of the different states, there is also the negative public acceptance of the US plan. European citizens seem to despise military presence of the USA in Europe.

Even though the states of Poland and Czech Republic have agreed on the establishment of the basis, the popular support is very low. For instance, the Czech press expressed concerns that the anti-missile shield may attract terrorist attention.

Statistics can also demonstrate the negative stance of the European citizen against the shield. According to a Forsa survey, forty-eight percent of Germans believe that the US is a danger to world peace, and, surprisingly, only 31 percent believe that Iran can pose a bigger threat. Different researches demonstrate that fifty-five percent of Poles oppose the shield, and seventy percent of Czechs don't want the radar site.

Finally, the low popular support in Europe could also be demonstrated by the declaration of 10 central European socialist parties that they condemn the establishment of the shield on the border of Russia on September 14, 2007.

Questions a Resolution Must Answer

The aim of the committee should be to pass a resolution that will be accepted by both USA and Russia, the two major conflicting states, but will also take into account the desires of other states that are being affected by the potential establishment of the anti-missile shield. The delegates should not forget that the General Assembly does not have the power to impose resolutions, but only to make suggestions and form auxiliary bodies.

There are no clearly separated blocs. All USA, Russia and European states that are affected by the shield do not object to the creation of a shield, but to its location, funding and means of materialisation of plans.

It is important that European nations are not urged to offer economic contribution for such an expensive project, its cost estimated up to 56 million US dollars. It is also essential that these nations express their opinions on the issue and discussions do not only involve two opinions. A third party during negotiations, as proposed by Russia, may be a step closer to the solution.

Finally, the lack of a legal framework of negotiations, after the withdrawal of USA from the Anti-Missile Treaty is also a great concern for the United Nations, since reconciliation is now only a matter of discussions between Russia and USA.

1. After the old anti-missile treaty was rendered obsolete, what should the United Nations do so as to ensure that there will not be a new arms race?
2. How will the United Nations assure the safety of Europe and avoid the targeting of European cities from Russian missiles?
3. How will the Russian government be reassured that the establishment of anti-missile shield over Europe is not a potential aggressive threat?
4. Should the United Nations form a body which would ensure the clarity of the procedures underlying the establishment of the anti-missile defence shield?
5. How could the United Nations develop a long-term monitor system that would ensure the clarity of these procedures in the long run?
6. How could the cost for the missile shields leave the economy of opposing economically weak nations intact? What measures can be taken so that states against the shield are unaffected in the advent of its potential establishment?
7. Should the United Nations encourage cooperation between states in the development of the anti-missile shield? How could the nations in favour of the establishment of the shield in Eastern European territory engage in discussion with the Russian government so that a compromising conclusion is reached? How could the offers from the Russian government be utilised?
8. Should the dialogue involve focus on the main opposing sides US, UK and Russia, or should other European Union and nearby states take part in the discussion? Should the US be involved in the materialisation of a European shield of protection in the first place?
9. How could the United Nations avoid a potential supersession of the opinions of smaller states that are influenced by the presence of the shield?
10. What should the role of NATO, the major security organisation in Europe, be?
11. How can the United Nations ensure that Europe will be protected from potential
missile threat even if opposing sides fail to reach a fruitful conclusion on the issue of the anti-missile shield?

Conclusion
It becomes apparent that the question of the anti-missile shield over Europe is very important, but the conflicting positions have the opportunity to compromise, considering the early movements on behalf of the Russian government aimed at the consolidation of the efforts of the opposing sides. A failure to find a satisfactory solution may precipitate a new arms race, while Europe may be left unprotected to threats from rogue nations in case incompliance dominates the discussions.

As far as the efficiency of the actual plan is concerned, one should take into account the small range of the anti-ballistic missiles that leaves Turkey and parts of Greece and Bulgaria unprotected against a potential Iranian threat.

As far as its usefulness is concerned, members of the opposing blocs have gone as far to propose that it is redundant. Putin said that Iranian missiles currently have a maximum range of 1,100 miles and while the range may reach 1,500 miles by 2012, too short to justify a missile shield, and according to Iran’s chief nuclear negotiator, the shield is “the joke of the year” since Iranian missiles are not able to harm Europe.

On the other hand, there is no doubt that the missiles used for the shield could never be used offensively against Russian targets. The warheads of the interceptor missiles have no explosives, while the silos in which they will reside are not designed to home conventional weapons.

The task of the General Assembly of the United Nations is to create a framework in which all these issues can be discussed.
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