



# **STUDY GUIDE:**

# **UNGA**

(UNITED NATIONS  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY)

**HFSMUN 2023**



# INDEX

<u>Topic:</u>	<u>Pg no.:</u>
1. LETTER FROM THE EXECUTIVE BOARD	1
2. ABOUT THE COMMITTEE (UNGA)	3
AGENDA I: AGENDA I- RELEVANCE OF THE NPT AND ITS REINFORCEMENT IN RECENT DECADES	
3. HISTORY OF THE AGENDA	5
4. NUCLEAR TERRORISM	8
5. THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY (IAEA)	10
6. GLOBAL NUCLEAR STRATEGY	11
7. SITUATION IN DPRK	14
9. GUIDING QUESTIONS	17
AGENDA II- DELIBERATION ON PALESTINIAN STATEHOOD	
10. INTRODUCTION TO THE AGENDA	19
11. HISTORY OF THE AGENDA	20
12. IMPORTANCE OF THE QUESTION OF STATEHOOD FOR PALESTINE	22
13. UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTIONS	23
14. UN SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTIONS	24
15. UN SPECIAL COMMITTEES AND AGENCIES	25
16. INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES AND INITIATIVES	26
17. MEDIATION AND DIPLOMATIC EFFORTS	27
18. UNITED NATIONS CHARTER	28
19. ROME STATUTE OF THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT (ICC)	29
20. STANCES OF STATES AND INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEES	31



# LETTER FROM THE EB

Dear delegates,

It is our distinct pleasure to welcome you to the United Nations General Assembly at HFSMUN.

Every conference we have attended has been a unique blend of information and interaction, but more importantly, it has always taught us something new and left us with memories to cherish. MUNs have instilled in us a sense of responsibility to unconditionally pass on the privilege and knowledge we received from them.

As your EB, we hope you find us dedicated, approachable, and unbiased but equally passionate and driven. We expect all delegates to be well-researched and holistically informed about this multifaceted agenda at hand. We would like to encourage each of you participate enthusiastically and strive to put your best foot forward regardless of the situation you find yourself in during the committee.

Use your platform to fearlessly voice your opinion, but at the same time, let it help you to open yourself up to new ideas and experiences, because Albert Einstein once said-

**“We cannot solve our problems with the same thinking we used when we created them.”**

Lastly, we hope we can make this MUN an unforgettable experience for all of you, regardless of whether you are inexperienced or a well-seasoned delegate. If you have any queries, please do not hesitate to approach us on our email ID. Good Luck!

Regards,  
The Executive Board of UNGA



Aryaveer Singh : Director, UNGA  
Vihaan Purohit : Director, UNGA  
Arsh Dhar : Assistant Director, UNGA  
(hfsmununga23@gmail.com)



## ABOUT THE COMMITTEE

The United Nations is an international organization founded in 1945. It is currently made up of 193 Member States. The mission and work of the United Nations are guided by the purposes and principles contained in its founding Charter. The UN also provides a forum for its members to express their views in the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, and other bodies and committees. The General Assembly is the main deliberative, policymaking and representative organ of the UN.

All 193 Member States of the UN are represented in the General Assembly, making it the only UN body with universal representation. Each year, in September, the full UN membership meets in the General Assembly Hall in New York for the annual General Assembly session, and general debate, which many heads of state attend and address. Because of the great number of items on the agenda, the Assembly allocates to its six Main Committees items relevant to their work.

The 6 Main Committees are:

1. the Disarmament and International Security Committee (First Committee)
2. the Economic and Financial Committee (Second Committee)
3. the Social, Humanitarian and Cultural Committee (Third Committee)
4. the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee)
5. the Administrative and Budgetary Committee (Fifth Committee)
6. the Legal Committee (Sixth Committee)

*(Delegates should keep this mandate in mind as they discuss solutions to the issue of the illicit trade of small arms and light weapons)*



**AGENDA I- RELEVANCE OF**  
**THE NPT AND ITS**  
**REINFORCEMENT IN RECENT**  
**DECADES**



## HISTORY OF THE AGENDA

The actual non proliferation regime was introduced to the international community by the agreement on the creation of a legal binding document, in the context of the commitments on non proliferation. The Nuclear Proliferation Treaty (NPT) was initiated by the United Kingdom, the United States, the Soviet Union and was opened for signature in 1968 by 59 other States. It entered into force in 1970. The three countries that ratified the convention pledged not to contribute to the production or supply of other nuclear countries. It is referred to as the main pillar of the efforts of aiming disarmament. The NPT defined the so-called Nuclear Weapon States (NWS) and the non nuclear weapon States. Furthermore it stimulated obligations for member states proportionately, in order for them to abstain from the proliferation of their nuclear technology. Nowadays, there are 189 plus Taiwan Member States as parties of the Treaty. Although the NPT may have been liable for the slow progress that was noted in the fields of bilateral negotiations of Member States, it is generally accepted that it has been the main legal document that assures security and stability in its parties, the majority of which are developing or under developing countries. The greatest risk comes from countries that have not joined the NPT regime, as they remain uncontrolled, despite the fact that they are countries with existing (or not officially registered) nuclear programmes (India, Pakistan, Israel). The aspects of this unmonitored regime will be examined below (Discussion on the Topic) According to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), as far as African States are concerned, there are 33 African States out of 189 of the Parties of the Treaty. The NPT represents the only binding commitment in a multilateral treaty to the goal of disarmament by the nuclear-weapon States and constitutes the most widely ratified arms limitation agreement in history with 191 State Parties. The Treaty establishes a safeguards system under the responsibility of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) that works as a “watchdog” of the Treaty. While the treaty is a major step towards nuclear disarmament, it holds certain constraints. This treaty was opened for signature on 1 July 1968 and entered into force in March 1970. It recognizes five “nuclear-weapons states”: The United States, The Russian Federation, United Kingdom, France, and China.



## The NPT operates on three core concepts:

1. Non-proliferation: This concept states that signatory nations will take measures to prevent and stop the spread of nuclear weapons and technology from parties that have nuclear capabilities to parties that do not. This agreement goes both ways: signatory parties that do not have nuclear capabilities may not obtain nuclear weapon capabilities
2. Disarmament: The success of the NPT can be seen in countries that have had nuclear technology or nuclear weapons and have since disarmed themselves willingly.
3. Peaceful use of nuclear energy: Countries that wish to pursue peaceful nuclear energy and nuclear technology should be permitted to do so under their sovereign rights. However, some nations have used this mantra as a curtain under which to hide the development of nuclear weapons for non-peaceful purposes.

The Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons is the latest Treaty, which was conducted from the negotiations of 130 countries and underlined their commitments for preserving the status quo on the use, development, possession, acquisition and proliferation of nuclear weapons . Additionally, the creation of the African Union in 2002 was decisive for the contribution of the majority of African States<sup>34</sup> in the non proliferation regime and the development of regional security and stability.

For instance, the African Union Peace and Security Council<sup>35</sup> held in April of 2019 a specific session on promoting the idea of disarmament in the context of the UN Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, not only on a theoretical basis, but also, in a practical way. The African Regional Cooperative Agreement for Research, Development and Training related to Nuclear Science and Technology<sup>36</sup> (AFRA), which entered into force in 1990, enlightens the importance of the sustainable use and development of nuclear science and its contribution to the socioeconomic development of African Countries. It underlines that the African Member States can refer to this intergovernmental agreement to enhance in their operational projects that could boost the civil use of nuclear technological applications. Taking into consideration the importance of the existing legal framework, it is fruitful to note and underline the key factors of the current situation of the non proliferation efforts in Africa. The Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) , which was first presented in June 1996. It has not entered into force yet, as a result of the non achievement of 44 prerequisite ratifications.





In other words, the Treaty needed 44 countries to ratify<sup>29</sup> it. It is crucial to mention that for its entry into force, in the aspect of examining Africa, it needs the ratification of Egypt. The Treaty was constructed by an Ad hoc Committee, which in fact turned out as the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO)<sup>30</sup>. The role of the African States in those efforts is more than active, since the very first chairperson of it originated from South Africa, and furthermore, between 1995 and 2015, with the participation of chairpersons from Algeria, Namibia, Nigeria. Africa has an active contribution on maintaining and promoting international security and denuclearization through the CTBTO's activities. The CTBT Organization has already launched an accurate map<sup>31</sup> of the counties' current status on the implementation of the CNTB Treaty, which is actually helpful for its evaluation process.



## NUCLEAR TERRORISM

In December 1982, four explosions occurred at the African nuclear power plant, Koeberg. Located in Cape Town, it could have spread radioactive material to a very large residential area. The attack was attributed to a terrorist Muslim organization. As a result, the South African government has suffered a humiliating political and economic blow . Nuclear and other radiological materials and instruments have provided valuable assistance to society in the fields of medicine, agriculture, industry and energy supply. However, the risk of nuclear weapons being used for terrorism or other criminal activities is of high possibility. The use of an improvised nuclear device would have very serious consequences. It is certain that incidents of this kind will be disastrous for human health and the environment will create turmoil and adversely affect economic and political stability around the world<sup>38</sup> .

The Counter Terrorism Research and Resource Centre (CTRRC) is highly concerned on the terrorist use of nuclear weaponry, bearing in mind its life-threatening consequences and the factor of the uncontrolled use of the captivating nuclear technology. Africa's rich uranium depository is appreciable, taking into consideration the further dominance of nuclear energy. This fact increases the risk of exploitation of the continent's nuclear materials from terrorist organizations. Africa is considered as a 'facilitating environment and target-rich environment for several terrorist networks, consequently it is crucial to inspect the most efficient ways to approach the control of those networks. Reportedly, bombing explosions have taken place in uranium mining sites, in Arlit (French-owned mine in Niger) by a terrorist organization known as the Movement for Oneness and Jihad in Western Africa (MUJAO), with unexpected consequences, such as the leak of radiation, the loss of human lives and the destruction of the mining infrastructure.



Africa's continental structure consists of ungoverned territories, where there are taking place various internal wars and armed conflicts, and of territories that are prone to terrorist attacks, such as Somalia, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, countries with major Muslim dominance and terrorist activities of Al Qaeda. Let us mention that Al Qaeda is not the only terrorist group with plenty of activities in the area. A Somali based militant group called Al Shabaab is noted for attacks in several territories of geostrategic importance. Their activity has included bombing attacks, such as the one that killed over 500 civilians in Kenya, in October 2017. The upcoming threats that are reflecting the use of nuclear materials from terrorists need immediate actions. In Africa occurs in addition to this factor, the fact that the majority of African States are claimed to lack transparency, sustainable governance and accountability. This is the turning point of the international community's initiatives. In what way could possibly the DISEC Committees, the UN Agencies and Funds help African Countries in a sustainable way of facing nuclear terrorism? In what way could Africa promote regional security?

### **The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)**

was established in 1957, and it is part of the UN family as the 'Atoms for Peace' Organization. The advancement of secure and manageable nuclear technologies was initiated in accordance to sustainable development and to the preservation of international peace. The organization's activities, as it is crystal clear through its Statute, tend to be compatible with the NPT's obligations. The IAEA's activities are relevant not only with nuclear based technology, but also, with the contentious applications of it. IAEA carries laboratories for scientific purposes on nuclear technology in Vienna, Seibersdorf and Monaco. In addition it raises technical programmes for the civil use of nuclear energy, such as the Peaceful Uses Initiative (PUI). Examining its projects in Africa, it is critical to mention the Regional Technical Cooperation Programme of the agency, as well as the International Project on Innovative Nuclear Reactors and Fuel Cycles (INPRO).

Several Countries of the African Continent, such as South Africa, have already implemented the so-called Good Practices for corporate standards to support the efforts of the International Community in the non proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, under the auspices of the Nuclear Suppliers Group and its principles.



## **THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY** **AGENCY (IAEA)**

The IAEA was established in 1957, and it is part of the UN family as the ‘Atoms for Peace’ Organization. The advancement of secure and manageable nuclear technologies was initiated in accordance to sustainable development and to the preservation of international peace. The organization’s activities, as it is crystal clear through its Statute, tend to be compatible with the NPT’s obligations. The IAEA’s activities are relevant not only with nuclear based technology, but also, with the contentious applications of it. IAEA carries laboratories for scientific purposes on nuclear technology in Vienna, Seibersdorf and Monaco. In addition it raises technical programmes for the civil use of nuclear energy, such as the Peaceful Uses Initiative (PUI). Examining its projects in Africa, it is critical to mention the Regional Technical Cooperation Programme of the agency, as well as the International Project on Innovative Nuclear Reactors and Fuel Cycles (INPRO).

Several Countries of the African Continent, such as South Africa, have already implemented the so-called Good Practices for corporate standards to support the efforts of the International Community in the non proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, under the auspices of the Nuclear Suppliers Group and its principles.



# GLOBAL NUCLEAR STRATEGY

During the passage of time, and especially after the Cold War, a lot of countries have developed nuclear doctrines / strategies in order to determine the future and the usage of nuclear weapons. There is no difference between nuclear and military strategies. More specifically, a nuclear strategy implemented by a Nuclear Weapon State (NWS) details how many nuclear weapons to deploy, what delivery systems to put them on, and also what kind of policies need to be adopted, while always taking into consideration the circumstances in which they would be used. Each member state has developed its own nuclear strategy in order to ensure the survival of its counterattack capability in the event of nuclear aggression. The United States has adopted a “minimal deterrence” policy, which focuses on the destruction of military targets. Russia has increasingly emphasized on the role of non-strategic nuclear weapons. Adoption of a doctrine of nuclear first-use illustrates this trend. Moreover, because of its ever-shrinking strategic nuclear force, Russia is opposed to a U.S. NMD program for fear that it will deteriorate further Russia's strategic deterrent. On the other hand, China promotes a strategy which emphasizes on damaging a handful of enemy cities and, until now, it is the only country that has not shown any kind of weapon reduction. The U.K and France are exploring the rationale for the maintenance of their nuclear forces. France once tried to give new significance to its nuclear force by advocating "Euro-deterrent." The initiative, however, did not bring about positive reactions in Europe. The British and French nuclear forces may continue to exist for the noble cause of an ultimate means for their security.

Nuclear weapons are a synonym to power and sovereignty. They definitely consist of a path to security and dominance, as they can help in the implementation of the will of the most influential countries. The fact that a state, such as North Korea, constitutes a powerful state which has nuclear weapons creates the idea to all other countries and member states of the UN that they are untouchable. This way, the destabilization of the region would be more likely to occur. Meanwhile, countries whose economy and political stability depend on Nuclear Weapon States are consequently obliged to comply with the current situation, in order to be protected as well. More specifically, they need to find ways of creation and construction of nuclear weapons in order to maintain their own security and ability to respond to a possible crisis or simply need to proceed to no acts that question the actions of Nuclear Weapon States. Thus, it is true that one of the most important causes of nuclear proliferation is the insecurity of states and the existing regime (mainly the NPT) does nothing to address this insecurity.



It only attempts to stop nuclear proliferation through supply-side measures, by preventing the transfer of nuclear technology to non-nuclear states. Countries also see that it is impossible to prevent proliferation and are therefore not deterred from seeking weapons. They see, For instance, countries like China and the Russian Federation will typically not endorse international efforts to deter countries from nuclear weapons. Therefore, a general belief that they will not be punished in any significant way for participating in proliferation activities is being created. Furthermore, it is true that the proliferation of nuclear weapons and technologies (also known as sensitive technologies) produces enormous profits for the countries, which export them and supply other states (France, USA). Proliferating to extort benefits is more than common for many powerful countries, as it constitutes a regime survival. The proliferation of nuclear technologies inevitably provokes a series of consequences that lead not only to political instability but also to a general and indefinite crisis. More specifically, nuclear explosions produce both immediate and delayed destructive effects. Blast, thermal radiation, and prompt ionizing radiation cause significant destruction within seconds or minutes of a nuclear detonation.

The delayed effects, such as radioactive fallout and other environmental effects, inflict damage over an extended period ranging from hours to years. Apart from the violation of human rights, the threat posed to humanity and the ethical problems that definitely arise from this situation, the relations between the member states are being endangered with a potential global destabilization waiting just around the corner. As a direct impact, most argue that nuclear proliferation will increase the risk of nuclear war, while others counter that the threat of nuclear war is enough to convince new nuclear nations to adopt prudent security policies. Deadly environmental effects stemming from nuclear war must be included as a primary consideration in the ongoing debate about the abolition of nuclear weapons. Massive absorption of warming sunlight by a global smoke layer would cause Ice Age temperatures on Earth. A large nuclear war would utterly devastate the environment and cause most people to starve to death. Already stressed ecosystems would collapse. Deadly climate change, radioactive fallout and toxic pollution would cause a mass extinction event, eliminating humans and most complex forms of life on Earth.

A failure to address the apocalyptic potential of existing nuclear arsenals will cause the abolition discussion to lack the necessary sense of urgency needed to facilitate the elimination of these true weapons of mass destruction.



It is indisputable that if a country proliferates, then other states will proliferate as well. Article 26 of the UN Charter mandates the UN Security Council to formulate a plan to promote the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources. The Security Council has entirely neglected this responsibility and its nuclear-armed permanent members have instead engaged in weapons profiteering and arms races, resulting in crises of international, national, and human security and undermining sustainable development.



## SITUATION IN THE DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF KOREA (DPRK)

*“The DPRK is the Juche-oriented socialist state which embodies the idea and leadership of Comrade Kim Il Sung, the founder of the Republic and the father of socialist Korea.”*

The aforementioned is the presentation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in the country's official webpage. For decades, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has been one of the most secretive societies in the world. The DPRK is one of the few countries under communist rule and one of the nine countries in the world which possess nuclear weapons. Kim Jong-un is currently the leader of the country. North Korea's nuclear ambitions have isolated the country from the western world, as the current events have highlighted more than ever before. The Security Council has addressed the issue of DPRK and has imposed every kind of sanctions on the country, mainly financial. But up to now, there are no signs that North Korea is willing to abstain from nuclear and ballistic missile related activities. The history concerning nuclear weapons and the DPRK dates back to 1993, when the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the DPRK expressed the will of his country to withdraw from the NonProliferation Treaty (NPT). The Security Council responded with the Resolution 825/1993 in which the Council called upon the DPRK to reaffirm its commitment to the Treaty and to reconsider the previous statement. 13 years later, in October 2006, the DPRK conducted its first nuclear test. It is unclear how North Korea was able to have access to nuclear technology. The device was plutonium-fueled, while the estimated yield was 0.2-1 kiloton. It is likely that the test failed to achieve the expected yield, which reportedly was 4 kilotons. The response of the Security Council was once again immediate. With the Resolution 1718/2006 39 the Council condemned the test and focused on how to prevent North Korea from acquiring equipment that would help it expand its nuclear program or military. During May 2009, North Korea conducted its second nuclear test, which was also carried out underground. The United Nations imposed tighter sanctions on North Korea — now almost all arm cargoes were banned — while it also called for intensified weapons inspections.

In addition, the Council demanded the return of the DPRK to the NPT through another Resolution (S/RES/1874/2009). The sequel took place in February 2013 when Kim Jong-un, then newly-risen in power, conducted his first nuclear test as leader — this was the third nuclear test of the DPRK.





The test was far larger than earlier experiments, with officials estimating that the bomb was between six and seven kilotons. In response to these actions, the United States moved some missile defense equipment and nuclear-capable stealth bombers to South Korea. John F. Kerry, then Secretary of State, warned that North Korea would have no chance in a military showdown with the United States. In the wake of the test, the Security Council once again moved to tighten sanctions, extending an asset freeze to individuals and organizations helping Kim. Luxury goods were also put under sanctions once again through a Security Council Resolution (S/RES/2094/2013).

What should be underlined at this point is that by that time there were few sanctions left to deploy. The fourth North Korean nuclear test came in January 2016. Kim said the explosion came from a miniaturized hydrogen bomb and called it a “spectacular success.” The Security Council bounced back with one more unanimously adopted strict Resolution (S/RES/2270/2016). All Member States were obliged to suspend scientific and technical cooperation involving persons or groups officially sponsored by or representing the DPRK except for medical exchanges. The Council also decided that all Member States should take steps to restrict the entrance to their territory of members of the DPRK’s government, while sanctions imposed through previous resolutions were once again highlighted. Despite the reaction of the international community, though, North Korea was not willing to conform. Pyongyang conducted its fifth nuclear test in September 2016 – a test which was ten times stronger than a test that the country would have been able to conduct a decade before. United States’ President at that time, Barack Obama, convinced the United Nations to ban countries from importing North Korean coal, while the Security Council passed one more Resolution 43 in which the Council strongly condemned the missile launch in general. The last – up to November 2017 – nuclear test – sixth North Korean test – took place on the 3<sup>rd</sup> of September 2017, when Pyongyang stated it had tested a thermonuclear weapon (hydrogen bomb). The United Nations Security Council met in an open emergency meeting on the 4<sup>th</sup> of September 2017, at the request of the United States of America, South Korea, Japan, France and the United Kingdom.

The result of this meeting was S/RES/2375/2017. This resolution has a part concerning the Maritime Interdiction of Cargo Vessels that may transfer goods in the DPRK. Furthermore, all joint ventures with DPRK entities or individuals are prohibited unless they are allowed by the UNSC.



The last part of this Resolution is the political one, in which the Security Council underscored the fact that all measures taken are not targeting the welfare of North Korean people and that the Council is prepared to strengthen the sanctions providing that DPRK does not comply with the objective of denuclearization. As regards, now, the relations of the DPRK and the USA, tensions between these states have intensified after the election of Donald Trump as the US president in November 2016



## GUIDING QUESTIONS

- 1- What further steps can the IAEA take to further guarantee that nuclear facilities are only being used for peaceful purposes?
- 2- What systems does your country currently employ to actively discourage non-state parties from obtaining nuclear technology or weaponry?
- 3- How can the international community enforce the NPT on non-signatory nations?
- 4- What effect has the NPT had on your country?
- 5- Is the existing legal framework efficient or is it necessary to further enhance it in order to effectively address the issue?
- 6- What measures should be taken in order to prevent the further proliferation of nuclear weapons?
- 7- How can the situation in the DPRK be efficiently dealt with?



**AGENDA II- DELIBERATION**  
**ON PALESTINIAN**  
**STATEHOOD**



## INTRODUCTION TO THE AGENDA

The question of statehood for Palestine has been a central and highly contested issue within the broader Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The desire for self-determination and the establishment of an independent and sovereign Palestinian state has been a longstanding aspiration of the Palestinian people. The complexities surrounding this topic, rooted in historical, political, and legal dimensions, have drawn international attention and triggered debates among various stakeholders. Palestine's quest for statehood revolves around the fundamental principles of sovereignty, territorial integrity, and the right to self-determination enshrined in international law. Supporters of Palestinian statehood argue that the Palestinian people, like any other nation, have the inherent right to govern themselves and determine their own political destiny. They assert that the creation of an independent Palestinian state would address historical grievances, promote regional stability, and lay the foundation for a just and lasting peace between Israelis and Palestinians. However, the path towards Palestinian statehood has been marked by numerous challenges and obstacles. The Israeli-Palestinian conflict, rooted in competing historical narratives, territorial disputes, security concerns, and the status of Jerusalem, has hindered progress towards a resolution. Issues such as Israeli settlements in the occupied territories, the division of land, the right of return for Palestinian refugees, and the delineation of borders continue to be major points of contention. The international community has been actively engaged in efforts to address the statehood of Palestine. United Nations resolutions, international legal instruments, diplomatic initiatives, and the involvement of regional organizations have all played significant roles in shaping the discourse and seeking a way forward. The positions of key stakeholders, including Israel, Palestine, neighboring Arab states, and major international powers, influence the dynamics surrounding the statehood question and impact the prospects for a negotiated settlement.

As discussions on the statehood of Palestine persist, it is crucial to understand the historical context, legal frameworks, regional dynamics, and the aspirations of both Israelis and Palestinians. The search for a viable and sustainable resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, grounded in the principles of justice, self-determination, and peaceful coexistence, remains a complex challenge that requires ongoing dialogue, compromise, and international cooperation.



# HISTORY OF THE AGENDA

The Israeli-Palestinian conflict is a complex and protracted dispute rooted in the competing national aspirations of Israelis and Palestinians. The conflict has its origins in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, with the rise of Jewish and Arab national movements in the region.

## **Pre-1948:**

In the late 19th century, Zionism emerged as a movement seeking to establish a homeland for Jews in Palestine, which was then under Ottoman rule. As Jewish immigration increased, tensions grew between Jewish settlers and the Arab population, leading to sporadic violence and clashes. Following World War I, the League of Nations granted Britain a mandate over Palestine, with the aim of facilitating the establishment of a Jewish homeland. The Balfour Declaration of 1917 expressed British support for the establishment of a "national home for the Jewish people" in Palestine.

## **1947-1949: Partition and War:**

Faced with growing unrest, the United Nations proposed a partition plan in 1947, recommending the creation of separate Jewish and Arab states in Palestine. Jewish leaders accepted the plan, while Arab states and Palestinian leaders rejected it, arguing it disregarded the rights of the Arab population. Following the British withdrawal in 1948, Israel declared independence, triggering a war between the newly established state and neighboring Arab countries. The war resulted in an Israeli victory, with Israel gaining control over a larger territory than originally allocated under the UN partition plan. Many Palestinians became refugees. 1967-1993: Occupation and Peace Efforts: In the Six-Day War of 1967, Israel occupied the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, and the Gaza Strip, effectively bringing the entire Palestinian territory under Israeli control. The United Nations passed Resolution 242, calling for Israel to withdraw from the occupied territories in exchange for peace and recognition. In 1978, Israel and Egypt signed the Camp David Accords, leading to the return of the Sinai Peninsula to Egypt. In the 1990s, negotiations between Israel and the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) led to the Oslo Accords, which aimed to establish a framework for Palestinian self-governance. Post-Oslo Era: Despite the Oslo Accords, peace efforts faced numerous challenges, including settlements, security concerns, and disagreements over key issues such as borders, refugees, and Jerusalem.



The breakdown of negotiations and the failure to establish a Palestinian state have led to recurrent cycles of violence, including the Second Intifada (2000-2005) and subsequent conflicts. The question of Palestinian statehood remains a central and contentious issue, with Palestinians seeking recognition of their sovereignty and the establishment of an independent state within pre-1967 borders.



## IMPORTANCE OF THE QUESTION OF STATEHOOD FOR PALESTINE

The question of statehood for Palestine is crucial due to several reasons:

- **Self-Determination:** Like any other nation, Palestinians aspire to exercise their right to self-determination and have their own sovereign state.
- **Security and Stability:** A recognized and independent Palestinian state is seen as essential for achieving long-term security, stability, and peace in the region.
- **International Legitimacy:** Statehood would provide Palestinians with international recognition, enabling them to participate fully in global affairs and access international institutions. **Addressing Humanitarian Issues:** The establishment of a Palestinian state could contribute to addressing humanitarian issues, including the rights and welfare of Palestinian refugees and the improvement of living conditions for Palestinians living under occupation.
- **International intervention:** The United Nations has played a significant role in addressing the statehood of Palestine and facilitating efforts to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.





## UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTIONS

The UN General Assembly has passed several resolutions related to the statehood of Palestine. Resolution 181, adopted in 1947, recommended the partition of Palestine into separate Jewish and Arab states. While the Arab states rejected the resolution, it served as a foundational document for subsequent discussions on the issue. The General Assembly has also passed resolutions recognizing the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and supporting the establishment of a Palestinian state.

UN General Assembly resolutions, while non-binding, carry significant political weight and have been used to express support for the establishment of a Palestinian state. Resolution 181 (1947) recommended the partition of Palestine into separate Jewish and Arab states, providing a basis for the establishment of a Palestinian state. Other resolutions, such as 67/19 (2012) and 67/20 (2012), granted Palestine non-member observer state status within the UN, indicating international recognition of Palestinian statehood aspirations.



## UN SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTIONS

The UN General Assembly has passed several resolutions related to the statehood of Palestine.

Resolution 181, adopted in 1947, recommended the partition of Palestine into separate Jewish and Arab states. While the Arab states rejected the resolution, it served as a foundational document for subsequent discussions on the issue. The General Assembly has also passed resolutions recognizing the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and supporting the establishment of a Palestinian state. UN General Assembly resolutions, while non-binding, carry significant political weight and have been used to express support for the establishment of a Palestinian state. Resolution 181 (1947) recommended the partition of Palestine into separate Jewish and Arab states, providing a basis for the establishment of a Palestinian state. Other resolutions, such as 67/19 (2012) and 67/20 (2012), granted Palestine non-member observer state status within the UN, indicating international recognition of Palestinian statehood aspirations.



## UN SPECIAL COMMITTEES AND AGENCIES

The UN has established specialized committees and agencies to address specific aspects of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. For example, the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People was created in 1975 to support Palestinian rights and promote a peaceful settlement. The United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) provides assistance to Palestinian refugees.



## **INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES AND INITIATIVES**

The UN has convened international conferences and initiatives to facilitate negotiations and peace processes. Notable examples include the Madrid Conference in 1991, the Oslo Accords in the 1990s, the Annapolis Conference in 2007, and the Paris Peace Conference in 2017. These initiatives aimed to bring together Israeli and Palestinian leaders, as well as other stakeholders, to discuss and advance the prospects for peace and statehood.



## MEDIATION AND DIPLOMATIC EFFORTS

The UN has been involved in diplomatic efforts and mediation processes to promote dialogue and negotiations between Israelis and Palestinians. The Quartet on the Middle East, consisting of the UN, the United States, the European Union, and Russia, has been actively engaged in facilitating the peace process. UN envoys and mediators, such as the Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process, have been appointed to support peace efforts and encourage direct negotiations. International Legal Framework: The UN provides a legal framework for addressing the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The International Court of Justice (ICJ) has issued advisory opinions on the construction of the separation barrier in the West Bank and the legality of Israeli settlements. The UN Human Rights Council has established commissions of inquiry to investigate alleged violations of human rights and humanitarian law. Relevant international documents



## UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

The UN Charter, adopted in 1945, is the foundational document of the United Nations and establishes the principles and purposes of the organization. Article 2(4) prohibits the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state. Article 2(7) prohibits the UN from intervening in matters that are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state. Montevideo Convention on the Rights and Duties of States: The Montevideo Convention, adopted in 1933, defines the criteria for statehood under international law. According to the convention, a state must possess a permanent population, defined territory, effective government, and capacity to enter into relations with other states. While the Montevideo Convention is widely recognized, it is not binding on all states, and statehood can be achieved through other means.



# ROME STATUTE OF THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT (ICC)

The Rome Statute, adopted in 1998, established the ICC, an international tribunal for prosecuting individuals accused of genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes, and the crime of aggression. Palestine submitted an application to join the ICC in 2009, and in 2012, the UN General Assembly granted Palestine non-member observer state status, enabling it to accede to the Rome Statute. In 2015, the ICC recognized Palestine as a State Party, allowing the court to exercise jurisdiction over crimes committed within its territory, including alleged crimes by Israeli and Palestinian individuals.

## **REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS:**

### **Arab League -**

Position: The Arab League has consistently supported the establishment of an independent and sovereign Palestinian state based on the 1967 borders, with East Jerusalem as its capital. Arab Peace Initiative: In 2002, the Arab League introduced the Arab Peace Initiative, which offers Israel full recognition, normalization of relations with Arab states, and a comprehensive peace agreement in exchange for Israel's withdrawal from the occupied territories and the creation of a Palestinian state.

Unity: The Arab League seeks to maintain Arab unity and solidarity on the Palestinian cause, coordinating efforts and support for Palestinian rights.

## **ORGANIZATION OF ISLAMIC COOPERATION (OIC):**

Position: The OIC, comprising 57 member states with a majority of Muslim-majority nations, strongly supports the establishment of an independent and viable Palestinian state with East Jerusalem as its capital.

Recognition: The OIC recognizes East Jerusalem as the capital of Palestine and rejects any measures or actions that undermine the historical, legal, and religious status of Jerusalem.

Solidarity: The OIC emphasizes solidarity with the Palestinian people, supporting their right to self-determination, the return of refugees, and the end of the Israeli occupation. It has called for international recognition of Palestinian statehood.



Both the Arab League and the OIC have used their platforms to condemn Israeli actions in 18 the occupied territories, support Palestinian political initiatives, and advocate for international recognition of Palestinian statehood. These organizations have also provided financial and humanitarian assistance to the Palestinian Authority and supported efforts to achieve a just and lasting resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.the occupied territories, support Palestinian political initiatives, and advocate for international recognition of Palestinian statehood. These organizations have also provided financial and humanitarian assistance to the Palestinian Authority and supported efforts to achieve a just and lasting resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.





## **STANCE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY**

### **Israel -**

Position: Israel considers itself a sovereign state with a right to exist and secure borders. It maintains that it has a historical and religious connection to the land of Israel. Israel supports a two-state solution but with certain conditions, such as maintaining control over security in the West Bank and a united Jerusalem as its capital.

### **Palestine -**

Position: The Palestinian leadership seeks the establishment of an independent and sovereign Palestinian state based on the 1967 borders, with East Jerusalem as its capital. They advocate for the right of Palestinian refugees to return to their homes or receive compensation.

Neighboring Arab States: Position: Arab states generally support the establishment of a Palestinian state based on the 1967 borders and the right of Palestinian refugees to return. They emphasize the importance of Arab solidarity and the Arab Peace Initiative, which offers normalization of relations with Israel in exchange for a comprehensive peace agreement.

## **MAJOR INTERNATIONAL POWERS:**

### **United States -**

The US has traditionally been a key mediator in the peace process. It has supported Israel's security concerns and its right to exist, while advocating for a two-state solution. US policy has varied depending on administrations, but it has consistently sought to facilitate negotiations between Israelis and Palestinians.

### **European Union -**

The EU supports a two-state solution based on the 1967 borders and has expressed concern about settlement expansion and the humanitarian situation in the occupied territories. It provides financial aid to the Palestinians and has called for the recognition of Palestinian statehood.



## **Russia -**

Russia has called for a negotiated settlement based on international law, UN resolutions, and the Arab Peace Initiative. It supports the establishment of an independent Palestinian state with East Jerusalem as its capital and has engaged in diplomatic efforts