

IASMUN

Background Guide



UNHRC



IASMUN UNHRC

Background Guide

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

1. INTRODUCTION

- WELCOME LETTERS FROM THE DIAS
- INTRODUCTION TO COMMITTEE

2. AGENDA

- AGENDA 1: ENSURING ACCESS TO JUSTICE FOR MARGINALIZED COMMUNITIES: OVERCOMING BARRIERS TO LEGAL REPRESENTATION
- AGENDA 2: FREEDOM OF SPEECH VS HATE SPEECH: BALANCING HUMAN RIGHTS IN THE MODERN ERA

3. BIBLIOGRAPHY

4. APPENDICES

- SAMPLE POSITION PAPER SAMPLE
- RESOLUTION PAPER

5. CONCLUSION



Welcome Letter from Dias

ESTEEMED DELEGATES,

WE ARE THRILLED TO WELCOME YOU TO THE UNITED NATIONS HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL AT IASMUN'25. AS DELEGATES, YOU WILL STEP INTO THE ROLES OF DIPLOMATS AND WORLD LEADERS, TACKLING URGENT GLOBAL ISSUES. YOUR DEDICATION, RESEARCH, AND ENTHUSIASM WILL DRIVE FRUITFUL DEBATES AND CONSTRUCTIVE RESOLUTIONS. THIS IS YOUR CHANCE TO ENGAGE IN MEANINGFUL DIALOGUE, DEFEND YOUR COUNTRY'S POLICIES, AND COLLABORATE WITH OTHERS TO FIND SOLUTIONS TO COMPLEX INTERNATIONAL CHALLENGES. YOUR ROLE AS POLICYMAKERS AND NEGOTIATORS WILL REQUIRE NOT JUST DEDICATION, BUT ALSO AN EMPATHETIC UNDERSTANDING OF DIVERSE PERSPECTIVES. IT IS YOUR IDEAS, RESEARCH, AND PASSION THAT WILL DRIVE THE DEBATE AND LEAD TO IMPACTFUL RESOLUTIONS.

REGARDLESS OF YOUR EXPERIENCE LEVEL, WE ARE CONFIDENT YOU WILL GIVE YOUR BEST EFFORT. REMEMBER, SUCCESS IS NOT SOLELY MEASURED BY AWARDS BUT BY THE INSIGHTS GAINED, THE CONNECTIONS FORMED, AND THE COLLECTIVE STRIDES MADE TOWARD RESOLVING GLOBAL ISSUES. THE MAIN AIM OF ANY MUN CONFERENCE IS TO HAVE FUN AND MAKE THE MOST OF YOUR EXPERIENCE, WHICH WE HOPE YOU WILL, OVER THE THREE DAYS AT IASMUN.



Welcome Letter from Dias

THIS BACKGROUND GUIDE PROVIDES AN OVERVIEW OF THE TOPICS TO BE DISCUSSED, BUT WE EXPECT YOU TO CONDUCT MORE IN-DEPTH RESEARCH ALIGNED WITH YOUR RESPECTIVE DELEGATIONS. WE HOPE THIS GUIDE WILL PROVIDE A GOOD STARTING POINT FOR YOUR RESEARCH. IN PREPARATION, THOROUGHLY RESEARCH YOUR ASSIGNED COUNTRY'S STANCE ON THE TOPICS, REVIEW THE POSITIONS OF OTHER MEMBER STATES AND RELEVANT INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS, AND FAMILIARIZE YOURSELF WITH THE RULES OF PROCEDURE. A STRONG UNDERSTANDING OF MUN PROTOCOL WILL ENHANCE YOUR PARTICIPATION. WE LOOK FORWARD TO AN EXCITING, UNIQUE, AND ENLIGHTENING EXPERIENCE FOR ALL DELEGATES. BEST OF LUCK WITH YOUR PREPARATIONS, WE CAN'T WAIT TO SEE YOU ALL!

WARM REGARDS,

ARMIN DIANAT AND MANAAL SHADAB

DIAS OF THE UNITED NATIONS HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL



Introduction to Committee

THE UNITED NATIONS HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL (UNHRC) IS A PIVOTAL INTERGOVERNMENTAL BODY WITHIN THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM, ESTABLISHED TO STRENGTHEN THE PROMOTION AND PROTECTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS WORLDWIDE. IT SERVES AS A FORUM FOR ADDRESSING HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS AND FOSTERING INTERNATIONAL DIALOGUE ON GLOBAL HUMAN RIGHTS CONCERNs. ESTABLISHED IN 2006 BY THE UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY THROUGH RESOLUTION 60/251, THE UNHRC SUCCEEDED THE UNITED NATIONS COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS, WHICH FACED CRITICISM FOR ITS POLITICIZATION AND INEFFECTIVENESS.

HEADQUARTERED IN GENEVA, SWITZERLAND, THE UNHRC IS COMPOSED OF 47 MEMBER STATES ELECTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY FOR STAGGERED THREE-YEAR TERMS. MEMBERSHIP IS ALLOCATED BASED ON EQUITABLE GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION, WITH SEATS DIVIDED AMONG AFRICA, ASIA-PACIFIC, LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN, WESTERN EUROPE AND OTHER STATES, AND EASTERN EUROPE. THIS STRUCTURE AIMS TO ENSURE DIVERSE REPRESENTATION AND INCLUSIVITY IN DELIBERATIONS AND DECISION-MAKING



Introduction to Committee

THE COUNCIL OPERATES AS A SUBSIDIARY BODY OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND HOLDS AT LEAST THREE REGULAR SESSIONS ANNUALLY, WITH ADDITIONAL SPECIAL SESSIONS CONVENED TO ADDRESS URGENT HUMAN RIGHTS CRISES. ITS AGENDA COVERS A BROAD SPECTRUM OF ISSUES, INCLUDING CIVIL, POLITICAL, ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, AND CULTURAL RIGHTS. MECHANISMS SUCH AS THE UNIVERSAL PERIODIC REVIEW (UPR) ARE INSTRUMENTAL IN ASSESSING THE HUMAN RIGHTS RECORDS OF ALL UN MEMBER STATES, FOSTERING ACCOUNTABILITY AND CONSTRUCTIVE DIALOGUE. ADDITIONALLY, THE UNHRC APPOINTS SPECIAL RAPPORTEURS AND INDEPENDENT EXPERTS TO INVESTIGATE AND REPORT ON THEMATIC AND COUNTRY-SPECIFIC HUMAN RIGHTS ISSUES.

Agenda 1: Ensuring Access to Justice for Marginalized Communities: Overcoming Barriers to Legal Representation



INTRODUCTION TO AGENDA 1:

ACCESS TO JUSTICE IS AN IMPORTANT PART OF ANY SOCIETY THAT VALUES FAIRNESS AND EQUALITY. IT ENSURES THAT INDIVIDUALS CAN SEEK LEGAL SUPPORT AND PROTECT THEIR RIGHTS. HOWEVER, MANY COMMUNITIES FACE PROBLEMS WHEN TRYING TO ACCESS LEGAL REPRESENTATION, WHICH CAN LEAD TO ONGOING INEQUALITY AND INJUSTICE. THESE BARRIERS ARE COMPLEX AND DEEPLY INGRAINED IN VARIOUS SOCIETAL STRUCTURES, MAKING IT HARDER FOR AFFECTED COMMUNITIES TO ACHIEVE JUSTICE.

MARGINALIZED COMMUNITIES, INCLUDING LOW-INCOME INDIVIDUALS, RACIAL AND ETHNIC MINORITIES, IMMIGRANTS, REFUGEES, PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES, AND THOSE LIVING IN RURAL AREAS, OFTEN FIND THEMSELVES AT A DISADVANTAGE WHEN NAVIGATING THE LEGAL SYSTEM. THE EXORBITANT COST OF LEGAL SERVICES, COUPLED WITH UNDERFUNDDED LEGAL AID PROGRAMS, MAKES IT DIFFICULT FOR LOTS OF PEOPLE TO AFFORD REPRESENTATION. ADDITIONALLY, A LACK OF AWARENESS ABOUT LEGAL RIGHTS AND AVAILABLE RESOURCES FURTHER COMPLICATES THEIR ABILITY TO SEEK HELP.

Agenda 1: Ensuring Access to Justice for Marginalized Communities: Overcoming Barriers to Legal Representation



EFFORTS TO IMPROVE ACCESS TO JUSTICE MUST BE MULTIFACETED, INVOLVING VARIOUS STAKEHOLDERS, INCLUDING GOVERNMENT AGENCIES, LEGAL AID ORGANIZATIONS, NPOs, LEGAL PROFESSIONALS, AND COMMUNITY LEADERS. BY WORKING TOGETHER, THESE STAKEHOLDERS CAN DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT STRATEGIES THAT ADDRESS THE SEVERAL BARRIERS FACED BY MARGINALIZED COMMUNITIES. THIS COLLABORATIVE EFFORT IS NEEDED FOR CREATING A MORE INCLUSIVE LEGAL SYSTEM THAT SERVES ALL MEMBERS OF SOCIETY.

HISTORY OF THE AGENDA:

HISTORICALLY, MARGINALIZED GROUPS, INCLUDING RACIAL AND ETHNIC MINORITIES, LOW-INCOME INDIVIDUALS, AND INDIGENOUS PEOPLES, HAVE FACED OBSTACLES IN ACCESSING LEGAL REPRESENTATION. THESE BARRIERS OFTEN STEM FROM ECONOMIC CONSTRAINTS, LACK OF LEGAL AWARENESS, SYSTEMIC DISCRIMINATION, AND GEOGRAPHICAL ISOLATION. THE EARLY 20TH CENTURY SAW THE EMERGENCE OF LEGAL AID MOVEMENTS AIMED AT PROVIDING FREE OR LOW-COST LEGAL SERVICES TO THOSE WHO COULD NOT AFFORD THEM. THESE MOVEMENTS WERE OFTEN DRIVEN BY NPOs AND COMMUNITY GROUPS, MARKING THE BEGINNING OF A MORE STRUCTURED APPROACH TO ADDRESSING THESE DISPARITIES.

Agenda 1: Ensuring Access to Justice for Marginalized Communities: Overcoming Barriers to Legal Representation



THE MID-20TH CENTURY BROUGHT A HEIGHTENED FOCUS ON HUMAN RIGHTS, WITH THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN 1948 EMPHASIZING ACCESS TO JUSTICE AS A FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT. THIS PERIOD ALSO SAW THE RISE OF CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENTS, PARTICULARLY IN THE 1960S AND 1970S, WHICH HIGHLIGHTED SYSTEMIC DISCRIMINATION AND CALLED FOR GREATER LEGAL PROTECTIONS AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE FOR MARGINALIZED COMMUNITIES. LANDMARK LEGISLATION, SUCH AS THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964 IN THE UNITED STATES, SOUGHT TO ADDRESS RACIAL DISCRIMINATION AND IMPROVE ACCESS TO LEGAL RE COURSE. DESPITE THESE EFFORTS, SIGNIFICANT CHALLENGES REMAIN. ECONOMIC DISPARITIES, LACK OF LEGAL LITERACY, AND SYSTEMIC BIASES CONTINUE TO HINDER ACCESS TO JUSTICE FOR MANY MARGINALIZED COMMUNITIES. ADDITIONALLY, RURAL AND REMOTE AREAS OFTEN LACK ADEQUATE LEGAL INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICES, EXACERBATING THESE ISSUES.

IN RECENT DECADES, THERE HAS BEEN A FOCUS ON MODERN LEGAL REFORMS AND INNOVATIONS AIMED AT REDUCING BARRIERS TO JUSTICE. THIS INCLUDES THE USE OF TECHNOLOGY TO PROVIDE LEGAL INFORMATION AND SERVICES, AS WELL AS THE ESTABLISHMENT OF SPECIALIZED COURTS AND LEGAL AID CLINICS. COUNTRIES HAVE IMPLEMENTED POLICIES TO SUPPORT LEGAL REPRESENTATION FOR SPECIFIC MARGINALIZED GROUPS, SUCH AS INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND REFUGEES.

Agenda 1: Ensuring Access to Justice for Marginalized Communities: Overcoming Barriers to Legal Representation



COMMUNITY LEGAL CENTERS PROVIDE LOCALIZED LEGAL ASSISTANCE AND ADVOCACY, OFTEN FOCUSING ON SPECIFIC ISSUES SUCH AS HOUSING, EMPLOYMENT, AND FAMILY LAW. PRO BONO LEGAL SERVICES OFFERED BY LAW FIRMS AND INDIVIDUAL LAWYERS SUPPORT MARGINALIZED COMMUNITIES, AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS LIKE THE UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (UNDP) AND THE WORLD JUSTICE PROJECT WORK TO PROMOTE ACCESS TO JUSTICE THROUGH RESEARCH, ADVOCACY, AND FUNDING FOR LEGAL AID PROGRAMS.

KEY ISSUES:

- **ECONOMIC BARRIERS:** (ONE OF THE MOST SIGNIFICANT CHALLENGES) LEGAL REPRESENTATION IS OFTEN EXPENSIVE, AND MANY MARGINALIZED INDIVIDUALS CAN'T AFFORD PRIVATE ATTORNEYS. HIGH LEGAL FEES AND ASSOCIATED COSTS CREATE OBSTACLES TO ACCESSING LEGAL SERVICES. UNDERFUNDING LEGAL AID SERVICES FURTHER WORSENS THIS ISSUE, AS THESE ORGANIZATIONS USUALLY OPERATE WITH LIMITED RESOURCES, LIMITING THEIR ABILITY TO PROVIDE PROPER SERVICES TO ALL WHO NEED THEM.
- **LACK OF AWARENESS AND LEGAL LITERACY:** MANY MARGINALIZED INDIVIDUALS ARE UNAWARE OF THEIR LEGAL RIGHTS AND THE AVAILABILITY OF LEGAL AID SERVICES. LIMITED LEGAL LITERACY WORSENS THEIR INABILITY TO NAVIGATE THE LEGAL SYSTEM PROPERLY. THIS LACK OF KNOWLEDGE CAN PREVENT INDIVIDUALS FROM SEEKING HELP OR UNDERSTANDING THE LEGAL PROCESSES INVOLVED IN THEIR CASES.

Agenda 1: Ensuring Access to Justice for Marginalized Communities: Overcoming Barriers to Legal Representation



- **GEOGRAPHICAL BARRIERS:** RURAL AND REMOTE AREAS FREQUENTLY LACK PROPER LEGAL SERVICES, MAKING IT DIFFICULT FOR RESIDENTS TO ACCESS LEGAL REPRESENTATION. TRAVEL COSTS AND LOGISTICAL CHALLENGES FURTHER HINDER ACCESS, AS INDIVIDUALS MAY NEED TO TRAVEL LONG DISTANCES TO REACH LEGAL AID OFFICES OR COURTROOMS.
- **SYSTEMIC DISCRIMINATION AND BIAS WITHIN THE LEGAL SYSTEM:** CAN DETER MARGINALIZED INDIVIDUALS FROM SEEKING LEGAL HELP. FEAR OF DISCRIMINATION AND NEGATIVE PAST EXPERIENCES WITH THE LEGAL SYSTEM CONTRIBUTE TO THIS RELUCTANCE. THESE BIASES CAN MANIFEST IN VARIOUS WAYS, INCLUDING RACIAL PROFILING, BIASED JUDGMENTS, AND DISPARITIES IN LEGAL REPRESENTATION.
- **CULTURAL AND LANGUAGE BARRIERS:** LANGUAGE DIFFERENCES AND CULTURAL MISUNDERSTANDINGS CAN DELAY EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION BETWEEN LEGAL PROFESSIONALS AND CLIENTS FROM MARGINALIZED COMMUNITIES. LACK OF CULTURALLY COMPETENT LEGAL SERVICES FURTHER COMPLICATES ACCESS, AS LEGAL PROFESSIONALS MAY NOT FULLY UNDERSTAND THE CULTURAL BACKGROUNDS OF THEIR CLIENTS.

Agenda 1: Ensuring Access to Justice for Marginalized Communities: Overcoming Barriers to Legal Representation



KEY STAKEHOLDERS:

1. UNITED STATES

- ROLE:** HOME TO MANY PROMINENT LEGAL AID ORGANIZATIONS AND NON-PROFITS THAT WORK TO ADDRESS SYSTEMIC BARRIERS TO JUSTICE.
- KEY INTERESTS:** ENSURING ACCESS TO LEGAL REPRESENTATION FOR LOW-INCOME INDIVIDUALS, ADDRESSING RACIAL AND ETHNIC DISPARITIES, AND PROMOTING CIVIL RIGHTS.

2. AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL (GLOBAL)

- ROLE:** ADVOCATES FOR HUMAN RIGHTS AND PROVIDES SUPPORT FOR LEGAL REFORMS.
- KEY INTERESTS:** PROMOTING HUMAN RIGHTS, ADVOCATING FOR LEGAL REFORMS, AND SUPPORTING VICTIMS OF HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES.

3. HUMAN RIGHTS WATCH (GLOBAL)

- ROLE:** INVESTIGATES AND REPORTS ON HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES AND ADVOCATES FOR LEGAL REFORMS.
- KEY INTERESTS:** INVESTIGATING HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES, ADVOCATING FOR LEGAL REFORMS, AND PROMOTING ACCOUNTABILITY FOR HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS.

4. INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE RED CROSS (SWITZERLAND)

- ROLE:** OFFERS HUMANITARIAN AID AND LEGAL SUPPORT IN CONFLICT ZONES.
- KEY INTERESTS:** PROVIDING HUMANITARIAN AID, SUPPORTING LEGAL PROTECTIONS IN CONFLICT ZONES, AND ADVOCATING FOR INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN LAW.

Agenda 1: Ensuring Access to Justice for Marginalized Communities: Overcoming Barriers to Legal Representation



5.OXFAM INTERNATIONAL (GLOBAL)

- **ROLE:** WORKS ON ISSUES RELATED TO POVERTY, INEQUALITY, AND SOCIAL JUSTICE.
- **KEY INTERESTS:** ADDRESSING POVERTY AND INEQUALITY, PROMOTING SOCIAL JUSTICE, AND SUPPORTING COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT.

6.LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION (UNITED STATES)

- **ROLE:** PROVIDES FUNDING FOR CIVIL LEGAL AID TO LOW-INCOME AMERICANS.
- **KEY INTERESTS:** ENSURING ACCESS TO LEGAL REPRESENTATION FOR LOW-INCOME INDIVIDUALS, PROMOTING EQUAL JUSTICE, AND ADDRESSING LEGAL NEEDS IN UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES.

7.UNITED KINGDOM

- **ROLES:** HAS A WELL-ESTABLISHED LEGAL AID SYSTEM AND NUMEROUS NGOS THAT ADVOCATE FOR LEGAL RIGHTS.
- **KEY INTERESTS:** ENSURING ACCESS TO LEGAL REPRESENTATION, PROMOTING HUMAN RIGHTS, AND SUPPORTING VULNERABLE POPULATIONS.

Agenda 1: Ensuring Access to Justice for Marginalized Communities: Overcoming Barriers to Legal Representation



QUESTIONS A RESOLUTION MUST CONSIDER:

- WHAT ARE THE PRIMARY BARRIERS TO ACCESSING LEGAL REPRESENTATION FOR MARGINALIZED COMMUNITIES?
- HOW CAN LEGAL AID SERVICES BE EXPANDED AND MADE MORE ACCESSIBLE?
- WHAT ROLE CAN COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS PLAY IN SUPPORTING ACCESS TO JUSTICE?
- HOW CAN AWARENESS AND EDUCATION ABOUT LEGAL RIGHTS BE IMPROVED?
- WHAT MEASURES CAN BE TAKEN TO ADDRESS SYSTEMIC DISCRIMINATION WITHIN THE LEGAL SYSTEM?
- HOW CAN INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ENHANCE ACCESS TO JUSTICE?
- WHAT RESOURCES ARE REQUIRED TO IMPLEMENT THESE SOLUTIONS?
- WHAT ARE THE EXPECTED OUTCOMES OF IMPROVING ACCESS TO JUSTICE FOR MARGINALIZED COMMUNITIES?

Agenda 2: Freedom of Speech vs Hate of Speech: Balancing Human Rights in the Modern Era



INTRODUCTION TO THE AGENDA:

“ADDRESSING HATE SPEECH DOES NOT MEAN LIMITING OR PROHIBITING FREEDOM OF SPEECH. IT MEANS KEEPING HATE SPEECH FROM ESCALATING INTO SOMETHING MORE DANGEROUS, PARTICULARLY INCITEMENT TO DISCRIMINATION, HOSTILITY AND VIOLENCE, WHICH IS PROHIBITED UNDER INTERNATIONAL LAW.”

— UNITED NATIONS SECRETARY-GENERAL ANTÓNIO GUTERRES, MAY 2019

FREEDOM OF SPEECH STANDS AS ONE OF THE MOST CHERISHED AND FUNDAMENTAL HUMAN RIGHTS, PROTECTED BY INTERNATIONAL INSTRUMENTS SUCH AS ARTICLE 19 OF THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS (UDHR) AND ARTICLE 19 OF THE INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS (ICCPR). IT EMBODIES THE CORNERSTONE OF DEMOCRATIC SOCIETIES, EMPOWERING INDIVIDUALS TO EXPRESS THEIR BELIEFS, CHALLENGE AUTHORITY, AND PARTICIPATE IN SHAPING PUBLIC DISCOURSE. YET, IN THE MODERN ERA, THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION AND THE REGULATION OF HATE SPEECH PRESENTS A PROFOUND CHALLENGE.

Agenda 2: Freedom of Speech vs Hate of Speech: Balancing Human Rights in the Modern Era



WHILE FREEDOM OF SPEECH SAFEGUARDS DIVERSE VOICES AND IDEAS, UNCHECKED HATE SPEECH CAN UNDERMINE DEMOCRATIC VALUES, FUEL SOCIETAL DIVISIONS, AND PERPETUATE SYSTEMIC INJUSTICES. Thus, the dilemma lies in balancing the right to free expression with the imperative to prevent harm and protect vulnerable communities from hate-driven rhetoric. The rise of digital platforms and social media has amplified this debate, offering unprecedented platforms for expression but also creating fertile grounds for hate speech to proliferate.

HISTORY OF THE AGENDA:

HISTORICALLY, FREEDOM OF SPEECH HAS BEEN A CORNERSTONE OF DEMOCRATIC SOCIETIES, ENSHRINED IN KEY LEGAL DOCUMENTS SUCH AS THE FIRST AMENDMENT OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION, ARTICLE 19 OF THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS (UDHR), AND ARTICLE 19 OF THE INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS (ICCPR). THESE FRAMEWORKS underscore the principle that freedom of expression is fundamental to the functioning of a free society, enabling the exchange of ideas, fostering innovation, and promoting accountability.

Agenda 2: Freedom of Speech vs Hate of Speech: Balancing Human Rights in the Modern Era



HOWEVER, THE EMERGENCE OF HATE SPEECH AS A SIGNIFICANT SOCIAL CONCERN HAS ADDED COMPLEXITY TO THIS PRINCIPLE. HATE SPEECH, BROADLY DEFINED AS EXPRESSIONS THAT INCITE HATRED, DISCRIMINATION, OR VIOLENCE AGAINST INDIVIDUALS OR GROUPS BASED ON RACE, RELIGION, ETHNICITY, GENDER, OR OTHER CHARACTERISTICS, POSES DIRECT THREATS TO SOCIETAL HARMONY AND INDIVIDUAL DIGNITY. HISTORICAL EVENTS SUCH AS THE HOLOCAUST, APARTHEID IN SOUTH AFRICA, AND THE RWANDAN GENOCIDE HAVE UNDERSCORED THE CATASTROPHIC CONSEQUENCES OF UNCHECKED HATE SPEECH, LEADING TO AN INTERNATIONAL RECOGNITION OF THE NEED FOR SAFEGUARDS.

IN RESPONSE, LEGAL SYSTEMS AND INTERNATIONAL FRAMEWORKS HAVE SOUGHT TO ADDRESS HATE SPEECH WHILE PROTECTING THE ESSENCE OF FREE EXPRESSION. ARTICLE 20 OF THE ICCPR EXPLICITLY PROHIBITS PROPAGANDA FOR WAR AND ADVOCACY OF NATIONAL, RACIAL, OR RELIGIOUS HATRED THAT INCITES DISCRIMINATION OR VIOLENCE. SIMILARLY, REGIONAL BODIES LIKE THE EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS (ECHR) HAVE ESTABLISHED JURISPRUDENCE BALANCING THESE COMPETING RIGHTS. HOWEVER, THE LINE BETWEEN PERMISSIBLE SPEECH AND PROHIBITED HATE SPEECH REMAINS CONTENTIOUS, VARYING ACROSS CULTURAL AND LEGAL CONTEXTS.

THE RISE OF DIGITAL PLATFORMS HAS INTENSIFIED THIS DEBATE IN THE MODERN ERA. SOCIAL MEDIA AND THE INTERNET HAVE AMPLIFIED VOICES GLOBALLY, EMPOWERING MARGINALIZED COMMUNITIES BUT ALSO ENABLING THE RAPID DISSEMINATION OF HARMFUL CONTENT. NOTABLE EFFORTS INCLUDE THE EUROPEAN UNION'S DIGITAL SERVICES ACT, WHICH AIMS TO HOLD PLATFORMS ACCOUNTABLE FOR MODERATING ILLEGAL AND HARMFUL CONTENT, AND INITIATIVES BY TECH COMPANIES TO IMPLEMENT COMMUNITY GUIDELINES.

Agenda 2: Freedom of Speech vs Hate of Speech: Balancing Human Rights in the Modern Era



KEY ISSUES:

- **1. DEFINING HATE SPEECH:** THE LACK OF A UNIVERSALLY ACCEPTED DEFINITION OF HATE SPEECH MAKES REGULATION DIFFICULT, ESPECIALLY IN DIVERSE CULTURAL AND LEGAL CONTEXTS. SOME DEFINITIONS FOCUS ON INCITEMENT TO VIOLENCE, WHILE OTHERS INCLUDE BROADER INTERPRETATIONS OF OFFENSIVE SPEECH. THIS AMBIGUITY CREATES CHALLENGES IN IMPLEMENTING CONSISTENT LAWS AND POLICIES GLOBALLY.
- **2. LEGAL AND ETHICAL BOUNDARIES:** ESTABLISHING A CLEAR BOUNDARY BETWEEN PERMISSIBLE FREE EXPRESSION AND PUNISHABLE HATE SPEECH IS A DELICATE TASK. EXCESSIVE REGULATION CAN STIFLE DEMOCRATIC DISCOURSE, WHILE LAX ENFORCEMENT CAN ALLOW HARMFUL IDEOLOGIES TO SPREAD UNCHECKED. THE DEBATE ALSO INVOLVES ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS, SUCH AS PROTECTING MARGINALIZED GROUPS VERSUS UPHOLDING THE RIGHT TO DISSENT OR CRITICIZE AUTHORITY.
- **3. INTERNATIONAL VS. NATIONAL STANDARDS:** INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS FRAMEWORKS LIKE THE ICCPR PROMOTE FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION BUT ALSO ALLOW RESTRICTIONS FOR PUBLIC SAFETY AND RIGHTS PROTECTION. HOWEVER, NATIONAL INTERPRETATIONS VARY SIGNIFICANTLY, WITH SOME COUNTRIES ADOPTING STRINGENT HATE SPEECH LAWS AND OTHERS PRIORITIZING FREE SPEECH EVEN AT THE RISK OF SOCIETAL HARM. THESE DISCREPANCIES COMPLICATE CROSS-BORDER COOPERATION ON HATE SPEECH ISSUES.

Agenda 2: Freedom of Speech vs Hate of Speech: Balancing Human Rights in the Modern Era



- **4. IMPACT OF DIGITAL PLATFORMS:** SOCIAL MEDIA HAS REVOLUTIONISED HOW WE COMMUNICATE, OFFERING VAST OPPORTUNITIES FOR FREE SPEECH AND AMPLIFYING THE REACH OF HATE SPEECH. PLATFORMS OFTEN NEED HELP TO MODERATE CONTENT EFFECTIVELY DUE TO SHEER SCALE, LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY, AND CULTURAL SENSITIVITIES. ADDITIONALLY, ALGORITHMS THAT PRIORITIZE ENGAGEMENT CAN INADVERTENTLY PROMOTE POLARIZING OR HARMFUL CONTENT, EXACERBATING THE ISSUE.
- **5. CENSORSHIP CONCERNs:** WHILE COMBATING HATE SPEECH IS VITAL, OVERLY BROAD OR VAGUE LAWS CAN LEAD TO CENSORSHIP, SILENCING POLITICAL DISSENT OR MINORITY VOICES UNDER THE GUISE OF REGULATION. AUTHORITARIAN REGIMES, IN PARTICULAR, MAY MISUSE HATE SPEECH LAWS TO SUPPRESS OPPOSITION. SAFEGUARDING AGAINST SUCH MISUSE IS CRITICAL TO ENSURE THAT THE FIGHT AGAINST HATE SPEECH DOES NOT INFRINGE ON FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS.
- **6. HATE SPEECH AND MARGINALIZED GROUPS:** HATE SPEECH DISPROPORTIONATELY TARGETS MINORITIES, INCLUDING ETHNIC, RELIGIOUS, AND SEXUAL MINORITIES, PERPETUATING DISCRIMINATION AND EXCLUSION. THE EFFECTS EXTEND BEYOND INDIVIDUALS, FOSTERING AN ENVIRONMENT OF FEAR AND DIVISION WITHIN SOCIETY. ADDRESSING THIS ISSUE REQUIRES A FOCUS ON PROTECTING THESE GROUPS WHILE PROMOTING INCLUSIVITY AND MUTUAL RESPECT.

Agenda 2: Freedom of Speech vs Hate of Speech: Balancing Human Rights in the Modern Era



- **7.CULTURAL AND HISTORICAL CONTEXTS: WHAT CONSTITUTES HATE SPEECH VARIES WIDELY ACROSS SOCIETIES. FOR INSTANCE, CERTAIN SOCIETIES MAY CONSIDER CRITIQUES OF RELIGION AS HATE SPEECH, WHILE OTHERS VIEW IT AS A LEGITIMATE FORM OF EXPRESSION. HISTORICAL EXPERIENCES, SUCH AS COLONIALISM, GENOCIDE, OR CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENTS, FURTHER SHAPE PERCEPTIONS AND SENSITIVITIES, MAKING A ONE-SIZE-FITS-ALL SOLUTION IMPRACTICAL.**
- **8.PREVENTIVE MEASURES AND PUBLIC AWARENESS: PREVENTING HATE SPEECH REQUIRES PROACTIVE EFFORTS, INCLUDING EDUCATION ON TOLERANCE, DIVERSITY, AND MEDIA LITERACY. PUBLIC AWARENESS CAMPAIGNS CAN COUNTER HARMFUL NARRATIVES BY PROMOTING UNDERSTANDING AND EMPATHY. SUCH INITIATIVES ARE OFTEN MORE SUSTAINABLE THAN PUNITIVE MEASURES, ADDRESSING THE ROOT CAUSES OF HATE SPEECH RATHER THAN MERELY ITS SYMPTOMS.**
- **9.ACCOUNTABILITY MECHANISMS: DETERMINING RESPONSIBILITY FOR HATE SPEECH IS COMPLEX. SHOULD INDIVIDUALS WHO SPREAD HATE SPEECH, PLATFORMS THAT HOST IT, OR GOVERNMENTS THAT FAIL TO REGULATE IT BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE? EFFECTIVE MECHANISMS FOR REPORTING AND PENALIZING HATE SPEECH MUST BE TRANSPARENT, FAIR, AND ADAPTABLE TO EVOLVING CHALLENGES, PARTICULARLY IN THE DIGITAL AGE.**

Agenda 2: Freedom of Speech vs Hate of Speech: Balancing Human Rights in the Modern Era



KEY STAKEHOLDERS:

- **1.GOVERNMENTS AND LEGISLATORS:** GOVERNMENTS ARE TASKED WITH BALANCING THE PROTECTION OF FREE SPEECH WITH THE PREVENTION OF HARM CAUSED BY HATE SPEECH. THEY MUST DRAFT CLEAR, ENFORCEABLE LAWS THAT RESPECT INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS OBLIGATIONS WHILE ADDRESSING LOCAL CHALLENGES. ADDITIONALLY, THEY OVERSEE LAW ENFORCEMENT AND JUDICIAL SYSTEMS TO ENSURE FAIR APPLICATION OF THESE LAWS.
- **2.INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS:** BODIES LIKE THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE PROVIDE OVERARCHING FRAMEWORKS AND GUIDELINES FOR MEMBER STATES. THEY PLAY A CRUCIAL ROLE IN FOSTERING DIALOGUE, SETTING STANDARDS, AND MEDIATING DISPUTES BETWEEN NATIONS OVER HATE SPEECH AND FREE EXPRESSION. THEIR INFLUENCE HELPS SHAPE A MORE COHESIVE GLOBAL APPROACH TO THESE ISSUES.
- **3.TECH COMPANIES AND SOCIAL MEDIA PLATFORMS:** AS THE PRIMARY MEDIUM FOR MODERN COMMUNICATION, PLATFORMS LIKE FACEBOOK, TWITTER, AND YOUTUBE BEAR SIGNIFICANT RESPONSIBILITY. THEY MUST DEVELOP POLICIES FOR CONTENT MODERATION, INVEST IN AI TOOLS TO IDENTIFY HATE SPEECH, AND ENSURE TRANSPARENCY IN DECISION-MAKING. THEIR INFLUENCE EXTENDS TO SHAPING USER BEHAVIOR AND MANAGING THE TENSION BETWEEN FREE EXPRESSION AND REGULATION.

Agenda 2: Freedom of Speech vs Hate of Speech: Balancing Human Rights in the Modern Era



- 4.CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS (CSOs): NGOs AND ADVOCACY GROUPS WORK TO PROTECT VICTIMS OF HATE SPEECH, RAISE AWARENESS ABOUT ITS SOCIETAL IMPACTS, AND HOLD GOVERNMENTS AND CORPORATIONS ACCOUNTABLE. THEY OFTEN BRIDGE GAPS BETWEEN POLICY-MAKERS AND AFFECTED COMMUNITIES, ENSURING THAT DIVERSE VOICES ARE REPRESENTED IN THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS.
- 5.CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS (CSOs): NGOs AND ADVOCACY GROUPS WORK TO PROTECT VICTIMS OF HATE SPEECH, RAISE AWARENESS ABOUT ITS SOCIETAL IMPACTS, AND HOLD GOVERNMENTS AND CORPORATIONS ACCOUNTABLE. THEY OFTEN BRIDGE GAPS BETWEEN POLICY-MAKERS AND AFFECTED COMMUNITIES, ENSURING THAT DIVERSE VOICES ARE REPRESENTED IN THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS.
- 6.MARGINALIZED AND VULNERABLE COMMUNITIES: THESE GROUPS ARE THE MOST AFFECTED BY HATE SPEECH AND HAVE FIRSTHAND EXPERIENCE WITH ITS CONSEQUENCES. THEIR PERSPECTIVES ARE CRITICAL FOR CREATING INCLUSIVE POLICIES. EMPOWERING THESE COMMUNITIES TO PARTICIPATE IN DEBATES AND POLICY FORMULATION CAN LEAD TO MORE EFFECTIVE AND EQUITABLE SOLUTIONS.
- 7.ACADEMICS AND LEGAL EXPERTS: RESEARCHERS AND LEGAL SCHOLARS ANALYZE THE IMPACTS OF HATE SPEECH LAWS AND PROPOSE EVIDENCE-BASED STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS THE ISSUE. THEIR WORK HELPS FRAME THE DEBATE, OFFERING INSIGHTS INTO THE EFFECTIVENESS OF VARIOUS APPROACHES AND HIGHLIGHTING POTENTIAL PITFALLS IN REGULATION.

Agenda 2: Freedom of Speech vs Hate of Speech: Balancing Human Rights in the Modern Era



- **8. EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS:** SCHOOLS AND UNIVERSITIES ARE PIVOTAL IN SHAPING YOUNG MINDS, PROMOTING VALUES OF TOLERANCE, CRITICAL THINKING, AND RESPECT. BY INCORPORATING DISCUSSIONS ON HATE SPEECH AND FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION INTO CURRICULA, THEY CAN FOSTER A GENERATION THAT IS BETTER EQUIPPED TO NAVIGATE THESE CHALLENGES.
- **9. TECH USERS AND ONLINE COMMUNITIES:** EVERYDAY USERS ARE BOTH CONTRIBUTORS TO AND VICTIMS OF THE ONLINE DISCOURSE. THEY PLAY A ROLE IN REPORTING HATE SPEECH, HOLDING PLATFORMS ACCOUNTABLE, AND SELF-REGULATING THEIR BEHAVIOR TO FOSTER HEALTHIER ONLINE ENVIRONMENTS. AWARENESS AMONG USERS IS ESSENTIAL FOR CREATING A CULTURE OF MUTUAL RESPECT.
- **10. HUMAN RIGHTS ACTIVISTS:** ACTIVISTS ADVOCATE FOR POLICIES THAT STRIKE A FAIR BALANCE BETWEEN PROTECTING FREEDOMS AND ADDRESSING HATE SPEECH. THEY OFTEN CHALLENGE GOVERNMENTS OR CORPORATIONS WHEN THESE ENTITIES OVERSTEP OR FAIL TO ACT, ENSURING THAT HUMAN RIGHTS REMAIN AT THE CORE OF THE DEBATE.

Agenda 2: Freedom of Speech vs Hate of Speech: Balancing Human Rights in the Modern Era



QUESTIONS A RESOLUTION MUST CONSIDER:

- 1. HOW SHOULD HATE SPEECH BE DEFINED IN A MANNER THAT IS UNIVERSALLY ACCEPTABLE YET ADAPTABLE TO DIFFERENT CULTURAL AND LEGAL CONTEXTS?
- 2. WHAT CRITERIA CAN BE USED TO DISTINGUISH BETWEEN HATE SPEECH AND PROTECTED FORMS OF OFFENSIVE OR UNPOPULAR SPEECH?
- 3. WHAT LEGAL LIMITS ON FREEDOM OF SPEECH ARE NECESSARY TO ADDRESS HATE SPEECH WHILE SAFEGUARDING FUNDAMENTAL HUMAN RIGHTS?
- 4. HOW CAN INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS, SUCH AS THE ICCPR, GUIDE NATIONAL LEGISLATION WITHOUT UNDERMINING CULTURAL SOVEREIGNTY?
- 5. WHAT RESPONSIBILITIES DO SOCIAL MEDIA PLATFORMS AND TECH COMPANIES HAVE IN MODERATING CONTENT THAT CONSTITUTES HATE SPEECH?
- 6. HOW CAN THE BALANCE BETWEEN CURBING HATE SPEECH AND AVOIDING EXCESSIVE CENSORSHIP BE MAINTAINED?
- 7. WHAT SAFEGUARDS SHOULD BE IMPLEMENTED TO PREVENT THE MISUSE OF HATE SPEECH LAWS FOR SILENCING POLITICAL DISSENT OR MARGINAL VOICES?
- 8. WHAT EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND AWARENESS CAMPAIGNS CAN BE IMPLEMENTED TO PROMOTE TOLERANCE AND COMBAT HATE SPEECH?

Agenda 2: Freedom of Speech vs Hate of Speech: Balancing Human Rights in the Modern Era



- 9. HOW CAN MEDIA LITERACY INITIATIVES EMPOWER INDIVIDUALS TO CRITICALLY ASSESS AND RESPOND TO HATE-DRIVEN NARRATIVES?
- 10. WHO SHOULD BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE FOR HATE SPEECH: INDIVIDUALS, PLATFORMS, OR GOVERNMENTS?
- 11. WHAT MECHANISMS CAN BE PROPOSED TO NAVIGATE SENSITIVE ISSUES LIKE BLASPHEMY, POLITICAL DISSENT, AND HISTORICAL GRIEVANCES?
- 12. HOW CAN THE RESOLUTION ENSURE ACCOUNTABILITY IN ITS IMPLEMENTATION AT BOTH NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL LEVELS?



Bibliography

FOR AGENDA 1: ENSURING ACCESS TO JUSTICE FOR MARGINALIZED COMMUNITIES: OVERCOMING BARRIERS TO LEGAL REPRESENTATION

- 1.IAALS.DU.EDU/SITES/DEFAULT/FILES/DOCUMENTS/PUBLICATIONS/PATHS_TO_JUSTICE_BARRIERS_EQUITY_PAPER.PDF
- 2.JUSTICE.GOV/OPA/PR/JUSTICE-DEPARTMENT-RELEASES-ACTION-PLAN_ADVANCE-EQUITY
- 3.STATE.GOV/KEY-STAKEHOLDERS-SPECIAL-REPRESENTATIVE-FOR-RACIAL-EQUITY-AND-JUSTICE/
- 4.NCSL.ORG/CIVIL-AND-CRIMINAL-JUSTICE/RACIAL-AND-ETHNIC-DISPARITIES-IN-THE-CRIMINAL-JUSTICE-SYSTEM
- 5.UN.ORG/RULEOFLAW/THEMATIC-AREAS/ACCESS-TO-JUSTICE-AND-RULE-OF-LAW/
- 6.WHO.INT/NEWS-ROOM/FACT-SHEETS/DETAIL/HUMAN-RIGHTS-AND-HEALTH
- 7.USCOURTS.GOV/ABOUT-FEDERAL-COURTS/EDUCATIONAL-RESOURCES/EDUCATIONAL-ACTIVITIES/ACCESS-JUSTICE
- 8.AMNESTY.ORG/EN/WHAT-WE-DO/ACCESS-TO-JUSTICE/
- 9.WORLDJUSTICEPROJECT.ORG/OUR-WORK/ACCESS-JUSTICE
- 10.REACHWELL.ORG/EMPOWERING-MARGINALIZED-COMMUNITIES-THROUGH-LEGAL-ADVOCACY-CASE-STUDIES-AND-BEST-PRACTICES/
- 11.SCLEGAL.ORG/BRIDGING-THE-GAP/



Bibliography

FOR AGENDA 2: FREEDOM OF SPEECH VS HATE SPEECH: BALANCING HUMAN RIGHTS IN THE MODERN ERA

- [HTTPS://WWW.UN.ORG/EN/HATE-SPEECH/UNDERSTANDING-HATE-SPEECH/HATE-SPEECH-VERSUS-FREEDOM-OF-SPEECH#:~:TEXT=%E2%80%9CADDRESSING%20HATE%20SPEECH%20DOES%20NOT,IS%20PROHIBITED%20UNDER%20INTERNATIONAL%20LAW.%20](https://www.un.org/en/hate-speech/understanding-hate-speech/hate-speech-versus-freedom-of-speech#:~:text=%E2%80%9CADDRESSING%20HATE%20SPEECH%20DOES%20NOT,IS%20PROHIBITED%20UNDER%20INTERNATIONAL%20LAW.%20)
- [HTTPS://WWW.UN.ORG/EN/HATE-SPEECH/UNDERSTANDING-HATE-SPEECH/WHAT-IS-HATE-SPEECH](https://www.un.org/en/hate-speech/understanding-hate-speech/what-is-hate-speech)
- [HTTPS://WWW.IBANET.ORG/HATE-SPEECH-VERSUS-FREE-SPEECH](https://www.ibanet.org/hate-speech-versus-free-speech)
- [HTTPS://WWW ARTICLE19.ORG/DATA/FILES/PDFS/PUBLICATIONS/STRIKING-A-BALANCE.PDF](https://www.article19.org/data/files/pdfs/publications/striking-a-balance.pdf)
- [HTTPS://DIGITALCOMMONS.LAW.UTULSA.EDU/CGI/VIEWCONTENT.CGI?PARAMS=/CONTEXT/TJCIL/ARTICLE/1265&PATH_INFO=03_16TULSAJCOMP_IN_TLL1_FALL2008_.PDF](https://digitalcommons.law.utulsa.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?params=/context/tjcil/article/1265&path_info=03_16TULSAJCOMP_IN_TLL1_FALL2008_.pdf)
- [HTTPS://FUTUREFREESPEECH.ORG/HUMAN-RIGHTS-HERE-PLATFORM-LIABILITY-HATE-SPEECH-AND-THE-FUNDAMENTAL-RIGHT-TO-FREE-SPEECH/](https://futurefreespeech.org/human-rights-here-platform-liability-hate-speech-and-the-fundamental-right-to-free-speech/)
- [HTTPS://SCHOLARSHIP.LAW.WM.EDU/CGI/VIEWCONTENT.CGI?ARTICLE=1923&CONTEXT=WMLR](https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1923&context=wmlr)
- [HTTPS://ACADEMIC.OUP.COM/BOOK/666/CHAPTER-ABSTRACT/135356763?REDIRECTEDFROM=FULLTEXT](https://academic.oup.com/book/666/chapter-abstract/135356763?redirectedfrom=fulltext)
- [HTTPS://FOUNT.AUCEGYPT.EDU/CGI/VIEWCONTENT.CGI?ARTICLE=2644&CONTEXT=ETDS](https://foount.aucgypt.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2644&context=etds)
- [HTTPS://WWW.AMERICANBAR.ORG/GROUPS/CRSJ/PUBLICATIONS/HUMAN_RIGHTS_MAGAZINE_HOME/THE-ONGOING-CHALLENGE-TO-DEFINE-FREE-SPEECH/THE-ONGOING-CHALLENGE-TO-DEFINE-FREE-SPEECH/](https://www.americanbar.org/groups/crsj/publications/human_rights_magazine_home/the-ongoing-challenge-to-define-free-speech/the-ongoing-challenge-to-define-free-speech/)

Appendices



SAMPLE POSITION PAPER

Delegation from

The Federal Republic of
Germany

Represented by

International Academic
School

The Position Paper for the Disarmament and International Security Committee

The Disarmament and International Security Committee (DISEC) is the United Nations (UN) General Assembly First Committee that has been responsible for maintaining international peace and security since 1945. Germany is a crucial member as it participates in initiatives on disarmament, non-proliferation, and arms control. The topics discussed are 'Militarization of Outer Space and the Possibility of a Space Arms Race' and 'Gun Control Policies: Effective or a Hindrance'.

I. Militarization of Outer Space and the Possibility of a Space Arms Race

Due to dramatic technological and scientific advancements in the past decades, nations have been interested in exploring outer space and retaining superiority over other countries through outer space militarization. After the lengthy competition between USSR and the US for paramount space exploration that started in 1957, the Anti-Satellite (ASAT) test being first executed by Russia, other countries have been building and developing more advanced technologies. Thus, due to its calamitous consequences, the UN placed numerous treaties, conventions, and agreements to cease any arms race or militarization in space. The Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (COPUOS) was established by the General Assembly in 1959 to govern the exploration and usage of space for the benefit of all humankind: peace, security, and development.

Germany is firmly devoted to terminating the arms race and establishing peace and security in outer space. To accomplish that, Germany has ratified The Partial Test Ban Treaty, the Outer Space Treaty, the Rescue Agreement, the Liability Convention, and the Launch Registration Convention to ensure concord. Forbye, Germany actively contributed to the work of the Group of Governmental Experts on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space (GGE PAROS). Germany is wholly supportive of a resumption of the substantive endeavours of the Geneva Disarmament Conference. It persists in actively contributing to the discussions and negotiations under the PAROS working group in multiple fora within the UN system.

Germany is open to initiatives to substantially advance arms control policy concerning menaces to space systems. During the forum of the draft resolutions on outer space in the First Committee (DISEC) on 29 October 2019, Germany was concerned about the increasing development of various counter-space capabilities. Germany then abstained due to the inadequate response to the long-term objective, ambiguities, and shortcomings which could raise the risk of conflict in space. Furthermore, a German representative stated, "Germany emphasizes that a future framework for arms control concerning outer space should involve comprehensive, practical, and verifiable legally binding instruments designed to eventually cover all relevant threats [...]." Thus, there ought to be more than the current normative framework for outer space.

Further, Germany voted against the draft resolution L.58/Rev.1 because it was inadequate and restricted. Germany is seeking an approach that principally excludes the militarization of outer space, which is flawless, sufficient, and time-independent.

Germany calls for the continuation and strengthening of the Outer Space Treaty of 1967 to prohibit placing nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction in outer space and for all nations to ratify and adhere to the treaty. The UN should create a space confidence-building

Appendices



SAMPLE POSITION PAPER

Delegation from

The Federal Republic of
Germany

Represented by

International Academic
School

The Position Paper for the Disarmament and International Security Committee

measures (CBMs) mechanism to prevent misunderstandings that could lead to a space arms race, which would involve transparency through sharing information on space-related activities and developing a code of conduct for the peaceful use of outer space.

Establishing a joint international space research and development program would be open to participation by all nations and would promote collaboration and cooperation between developed and non-developed countries that require aid in exploring and using outer space. Lastly, promoting international cooperation for the peaceful use of outer space, including developing technologies for space exploration, satellite-based services, and space debris management.

II. Gun Control Policies: Effective or a Hindrance

One of the fundamental human rights is the right to life. This is one of the cornerstones of basic rights that should be guaranteed to any human being. However, this right is usurped by one of the world's prevalent issues: gun control. Even the international community has signed many treaties, such as the UN firearms protocol, the UN small arms programme of action, the UN Register of Conventional weapons, and the UN arms trade treaty. Despite all these measures, the availability of guns and their threat are still at large. This is quite evident by the recent statistic that shows 250,000 people died due to firearms worldwide.

Germany considers that firearm ownership, not a right but a privilege. Thus, Germany firmly believes that strict gun control policies effectively reduce gun crime and protect citizens' safety. This is evident by Germany's gun control laws that require all firearms to be registered; individuals must pass background checks and attend a firearms safety course. The effects of these strict laws are shown as Germany has one of the lowest numbers of deaths by firearms worldwide. Moreover, just from 1998-2018, Germany saw an almost 50% drop in deaths caused by gun violence. Despite this decrease in gun violence, Germany is one of the largest exporters of firearms. However, the government is enacting and has stated plans for measures to restrict firearm exports. This will reduce firearm exports to other nations, reducing firearm casualties in other nations. Furthermore, Germany has signed and ratified many UN and other international firearm treaties, such as the Arms Trade Treaty, UN Firearms Protocol, the Geneva Declaration on Armed Violence and development, and other EU treaties relating to firearms. Additionally, Germany has provided funds to other UN member states to aid in implementing UNPoA. It would enable other nations as well to reduce deaths by gun violence.

One solution is to increase funding for background checks and mental health evaluations for gun ownership. This will reduce the risk of firearms landing in the hands of mentally unstable individuals. Additionally, implementing an international buyback program for illegal firearms can help decrease the number of illicit firearms in circulation and increase penalties for unlawful possession.

Moreover, this can be coupled with measures such as restricting the sale of certain types of ammunition and increasing international cooperation to combat the illegal trade of firearms. Hence, implementing stricter regulations such as the import and export of weapons, developing technology to trace firearms and pinpoint their origin, and mandating an age limit and gun safety education programs before purchasing a firearm will result in awareness of the dangers posed by

Appendices



SAMPLE POSITION PAPER

Delegation from

The Federal Republic of
Germany

Represented by

International Academic
School

The Position Paper for the Disarmament and International Security Committee

the mishandling of weapons. Following all these measures being integrated successfully will lead to a reduction in gun violence across the world.

In conclusion, the Federal Republic of Germany strongly believes that strict gun control policies can reduce gun crime and protect citizens' safety through the initiatives mentioned.

References:

I. Militarization of Outer Space and the Possibility of a Space Arms Race:

<https://gpil.jura.uni-bonn.de/2020/02/preventing-an-arms-race-in-outer-space-and-political-game-play-at-the-united-nations/>

<https://scholarship.law.unc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=2011&context=ncili>

<https://unidir.org/sites/default/files/publication/pdfs//prevention-of-an-arms-race-in-outer-space-a-guide-to-the-discussions-in-the-ed-en-451.pdf>

<https://www.nti.org/education-center/treaties-and-regimes/proposed-prevention-arms-race-space-paros-treaty/>

<https://www.unoosa.org/oosa/en/ourwork/copuos/index.html>

II. Gun Control Policies: Effective or a Hindrance:

<https://www.ohchr.org/en/special-procedures/sr-executions/international-standards>

<https://worldpopulationreview.com/country-rankings/gun-deaths-by-country>

https://www.gunpolicy.org/firearms/compareyears/69/total_number_of_gun_deaths

<https://www.iamexpat.de/expat-info/german-expat-news/germany-poised-introduce-new-law-aimed-limiting-arms-exports>

<https://www.gunpolicy.org/firearms/region/germany>

Appendices



SAMPLE RESOLUTION PAPER

AUSMUN/2023/GA1

General Assembly First Committee (Disarmament and International Security)

Main submitters: Russian Federation, Japan

Sponsors: Germany, Iran, Iceland

Signatories: Palestine, Libya, Algeria, Syria, Jordan, Bulgaria, Egypt, Nigeria, Iraq, Sweden, United Kingdom, Saudi Arabia, Thailand, Luxembourg, Hungary, Kuwait, Tunisia, Pakistan, France, Cuba, Poland, Colombia, South Africa, India, Bangladesh, Yemen, Turkey, Paraguay, Switzerland, New Zealand, Central Africa, United Arab Emirates, Bulgaria

Agenda: "Gun Control Policies: Effective or a Hindrance"

The General Assembly,

Alarmed by the increasing gun violence across the world,

Bearing in mind every citizen has the right to their safety, security and self defense and that their right to live is their most important right,

Recognizing the need for effective gun control policies in order to prevent tragedies and mass shootings,

Concerned that illicit trafficking and diversion of arms and related material of all types undermine the rule of law and human rights, and has the potential to undermine the respect for international humanitarian law, can impede the provision of humanitarian assistance and have wide ranging negative humanitarian and socioeconomic consequences,

Emphasizing the need for proper implementation of measures to curb arms trafficking,

Noting with deep concern that the illicit transfer, destabilizing accumulation and misuse of small arms and light weapons in many regions of the world continue to pose threats to international peace and security, cause significant loss of life,

Emphasizing the need for international cooperation on this issue,

1. *Recommends* for the establishment of rules and regulations internationally over the eligibility for obtaining firearm licenses of all kinds;
 - a. These include a thorough testing process which includes;
 - i. Background checks including mental health evaluations;
 - ii. Must be over the age of Twenty-One;
 - iii. Physical tests to make sure the person is capable of being responsible;

Appendices



SAMPLE RESOLUTION PAPER

- b. These tests must be done every two years to renew one's license;
- c. Must have a rational reason or motive to own the firearm;
 - i. hunting;
 - ii. sport shooting;
 - iii. collection;
 - iv. tradition;
- d. Only one firearm is allowed for each license;
2. *Further recommends* alternative government initiatives such as buyback programs for illicit firearms;
3. *Condemns* the illicit trade of small arms and light weapons;
 - a. Small arms refer to weapons designed for individual use, and light weapons are designed for use by several people serving as a crew;
4. *Calls for* mandatory gun safety education programmes for any who would like to wield a firearm;
 - a. This teaches the responsibilities and consequences of using a firearm;
 - b. Both physically and psychologically prepares citizens for the usage of a firearm;
 - c. Furthermore, raises awareness by showing gun violence related statistics;
5. *Encourages* the use of lengthier punishments against transgressors of gun laws;
 - a. Illegal gun ownership will entail a sentence of at least 5 years;
 - b. Crimes committed with a firearm will entail a sentence of 7 years;
 - c. Gun related homicides will result in 30 years in prison;
6. *Emphasizing* the creation and maintenance of a National Firearms Registry for each nation;

Appendices



SAMPLE RESOLUTION PAPER

10. *Solemnly affirms* modifications to the following treaties;
 - a. The UN Arms Trade Treaty;
 - i. Ammunition needs to appear included in the Arms Trade Treaty;
 - ii. The recording of weapons should be under a central authority;
 - b. The UN Firearm Protocol;
 - i. Adopting this protocol universally and implementing all provisions;
 - ii. Including enforcement mechanisms;
 - iii. Modifying the protocols to track the movement of firearms and to identify their origin;
 - iv. Criminalizing the illicit trade of firearm;



Conclusion

THANK YOU FOR CHOOSING UNITED NATIONS
HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL. WE WISH YOU A
PRODUCTIVE AND REWARDING MUN EXPERIENCE.