



Brief Overview of the Committee

The United Nations Development Program (UNDP) was founded in November 1965 through a merger of two programs for UN technical cooperation. Today, it is an active and influential intergovernmental organization. The UNDP is an important organ of the United Nations linked to the UN General Assembly through the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC). The UNDP serves more than 170 countries and territories around the world, and is the UN's single largest source of development assistance as well as coordination of development work.

The UNDP is headed by an Administrator, who answers to a 36-nation Executive Board representing all major regions and both donor and program countries. The Board, in turn, reports to the UN General Assembly through ECOSOC. In addition to setting policy guidelines, the Board approves the volume of assistance allocated to each country, as well as all national programs.

The goals of the UNDP are:

- To strengthen international cooperation for sustainable human development and to serve as a major substantive resource on how to achieve it;
- To help the UN family become a unified and powerful force for human development;
- To focus UNDP's strengths and assets to make the maximum contribution to sustainable human development around the world.

With a budget close to US\$2 billion, UNDP focuses its allocation of resources into four main areas: programs for poverty eradication and livelihoods for the poor, good governance, public resource management for sustainable human development, and, environmental resources and food security. Through "sustainable human development," the UNDP attempts to help countries reach a level of social, economic, and political development that will be beneficial to the greatest number of people and sustainable in the long-term. This demands an awareness of the negative impacts on the environment as well as the empowerment of women on a global scale.

Besides concentrating its activities in these areas, other special-purpose funds and programs administered by the UNDP include the Capital Development Fund, Development Fund for Women, UN Volunteers, Special Unit for Technical Cooperation Among Developing Countries, and Global Environment Facility. UNDP is also one of six UN sponsors of a Global Program to Combat HIV-AIDS (UNAIDS).



Topic 1: HIV/AIDS

Statement of the Problem

The Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV), which causes Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS), has brought about a global pandemic far more extensive than that which was predicted even a decade ago. UNAIDS and the World Health Organization (WHO) now estimate that the number of people living with HIV or AIDS at the end of the year 2000 stands at 36.1 million. This is more than 50% higher than what the WHO's Global Program on AIDS projected in 1991 on the basis of the data then available. In the year 2000, three million people are known to have died as a result of having AIDS; it is estimated that 21.8 million people have died since the beginning of the pandemic.

For this disease, no nation is an island. AIDS has already refueled a global resurgence of tuberculosis, and the virus has yet to run its course. The virus targets people in their prime—adults aged 15-49—cutting down the most energetic and productive people in any community, nation, or region. Unlike Ebola or influenza, AIDS is a slow plague, gestating in individuals for five to 10 years before killing them. Life expectancies are plummeting, and in some countries as much as 25% of the population is infected. It is a disease for which there is no cure.

Vaccine research is currently underway, yet the virus is a powerful combatant—it mutates its genes and suppresses the human immune system in ways not yet fully understood. New treatment, in the form of drug cocktails, keeps the disease from progressing and has helped the HIV death rate drop in many developed nations. These regimens must be taken for years, probably for life, within a comprehensive health care system, and they can cost more than US\$10,000 per patient per year. They are entirely unaffordable to most of the hardest-hit regions, and often the drugs produced are only used to combat strains of the virus prevalent in more developed nations. The result is that millions are infected, with more children, women and men joining the ranks each day.

While no region has been spared, Africa is the most severely besieged. Sub-Saharan Africa accounts for 25.3 million of those affected worldwide, or 69 percent of the total HIV/AIDS cases. So far, 10 million African children have lost their parents to AIDS. HIV also shows no signs of curbing its exponential growth in the Russian Federation, and in many countries in Eastern Europe and Central Asia, the epidemic is being waged against a complicated backdrop of socioeconomic instability, fueling drug-use and prostitution. An estimated 700,000 adults have become infected in South and South-East Asia in the course of the past year, and the region is on track to exceed Sub-Saharan Africa in real numbers by 2010. China, with its population movement dwarfing any other in recorded history, is also at risk of spreading disease. Only in many of the Western nations can the disease be said to have been stymied.



The challenges presented by HIV vary enormously from place to place, depending on how far and fast the virus is spreading and on whether those infected have started to fall ill or die in large numbers. Yet the challenges remain similar: to bring health care, support and solidarity to a growing population of people with HIV-related illness; reduce the annual toll of new infections by enabling individuals to protect themselves and others; and cope with the cumulative impact on orphans and other survivors, on communities and on national development.

Brief History of the Problem

The origins of HIV remain mysterious, yet scientists have slowly been able to piece together a coherent past which may shed light on its obscure history. First discovered in 1983, the virus appears to have originated in chimpanzees. In fact, the virus is still budding: there have been seven documented mutations and moves from apes and monkeys into humans. More variants are emerging everyday, some escaping detection by conventional blood tests, and others which are found only in isolated individuals. “The AIDS viruses are not over,” notes Preston A. Marx, an expert on the evolution of HIV at the Aaron Diamond AIDS Research Center in New York. “It’s possible we could develop an AIDS vaccine and have viruses that the vaccine doesn’t work against.”

The virus appears to have its roots in Africa, a continent that is home to a greater variety of HIV strains than anywhere else. Fanciful notions about the virus, its birth on the continent, and its spread to humans still exist; however AIDS viruses have probably existed in many different animals for thousands of years, perhaps longer—not entering large human populations until the 1970s.

There are, in fact, two separate AIDS epidemics. The major one—which has killed more than 16 million people—is caused by HIV-1. Another, much smaller epidemic caused by HIV-2 and concentrated in West Africa, is less virulent, less transmissible, but just as deadly. However, the origin of the virus and the origin of the pandemic are different. The first is purely biological; the latter is also social and behavioral. This pandemic has occurred less because of medical reasons, and more due to the socioeconomic context surrounding the disease.

What allowed a crossover virus to explode into a pandemic is almost certainly the cultural upheaval that has shaken Africa. Colonial rule, social dislocation, more open travel, urbanization, poverty, migrant labor, and the breakdown of traditional cultures leading to industrial scale prostitution are all significant factors in the spread of HIV. The rest of the world is not immune, and HIV/AIDS has subsequently penetrated into every country on the globe. With few exceptions, the spread is due more to dramatic changes in human behavior and broader social, economic, and technological developments than to mutations in pathogens. Other factors affecting the growth and spread of HIV/AIDS include large growths in population and



movements, developments in technology, medicine and industry, changes in economic status, land use, international travel and commerce, and breakdowns in public health care.

In short, although infection and death rates have slowed considerably in developed countries owing to the growing use of preventive measures and costly new multi-drug treatment therapies, HIV continues to widen its scope in much of the developing world, where 95 percent of global infections and deaths have occurred. Sub-Saharan Africa currently has the largest regional burden, but the disease is spreading quickly in India, Russia, China, and much of the rest of Asia.

Challenges we face as a result of the pandemic are just now coming to light. Much disease incidence in developing countries in particular, is either unreported or under-reported due to a lack of adequate medical and administrative personnel, the stigma associated with the disease, or a general reluctance of countries to incur the trade, tourism, and other losses that such revelations might produce. For example, nearly every country initially denied or minimized the extent of HIV/AIDS virus within its borders, and even today, some countries known to have significant rates of HIV infection refuse to cooperate with the WHO. Behavioral changes at the individual level are also hard to bear for many cultures.

But the challenges seem minor in the face of the effects of the disease. The economic costs are already significant; with inaction, perhaps the worst is still to come. The increasingly heavy toll on productivity, profitability, and foreign investment may be reflected in growing GDP losses. AIDS is also forcing cultural changes—because many of the issues surrounding the disease provoke questions of sexuality and human identity. Demographic upheaval in terms of huge orphan cohorts and in some countries, 30-year reductions of human life expectancy are all taking their toll. All of these effects are creating tensions between individuals, families, nations, as well as the developing and developed world, and it may be said that no nation will be exempt feel the economic and social effects of the disease.

But hope is in sight. Social transformations in many of the nations most heavily affected are improving relations and inducing equality between men and women. Successful HIV programs in Uganda, Thailand and Senegal can serve as models for the world. The number of AIDS related deaths in many developed nations has stabilized and perhaps even decreased due to large scale prevention and education measures, as well as the availability of new classes of antiretroviral drug “cocktails”. This shows that lessons learned in the recent past can be replicated, and human ingenuity as well as the ready availability of resources can combat the disease in its biological, as well as social, economic and psychological form.

Past United Nations Action

Nearly every one of UNDP’s offices has a focus on HIV/AIDS, and through them, lessons first learned in countries such as Uganda, Thailand and Senegal are now being applied across the



world. UNDP is advising governments on how to decentralize responsibility, administer resources at the community level, as well as offering advice on how to strengthen social security nets for vulnerable groups such as orphans. The UNDP is also helping governments to address the impact of HIV/AIDS on specific sectors such as education and rural development. Some 1,200 African officials have participated in UNDP workshops on HIV/AIDS.

The UNDP also sponsors networks on HIV and human rights, as well as support networks through which those living with the disease may find resources, and contribute to national responses to the pandemic. Working together through UNAIDS, the UNDP and other co-sponsors are expanding their outreach through strategic alliances with other UN agencies, national governments, corporations, media, religious organizations, community-based groups, regional and country networks of people living with HIV/AIDS, and other non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Together, they have launched a global advocacy campaign to increase donor awareness and raise additional funds. Moreover, the establishment of the HIV and Development Program has strengthened the capacity of the UNDP and nations of the world to respond to the evolving development challenges of the HIV epidemic, taking into account that while HIV remains a major public health concern, the nature of the epidemic, the speed of its spread and its socio-economic dimensions require a multi-sectorial and interdisciplinary response with the fullest collaboration of the many parties involved.

Proposed Solutions

The policy issues surrounding the disease are complex and will change as the pattern and the impact of the pandemic evolves. Policies must remain responsive to this change and must be able to adapt creatively and constructively to meet the evolving needs. The UNDP's focus should be to help governments manage the crisis, form partnerships with related agencies or organizations (across all sectors), link communities to national action, deal with human rights, coordinate and fundraise, and experiment with innovative and cost-effective programs.

Recent experience in Africa and Southeast Asia shows that the most effective responses to the HIV/AIDS crisis are those in which national governments commit their own political prestige and financial resources, involve civil society fully, and pursue a comprehensive agenda that includes prevention, care and support. International assistance is most effective when it is closely coordinated with such local efforts.

International organizations such as the WHO and the World Bank, institutions in several developed countries such as the US Center For Disease Control and France's Pasteur Institute, as well as NGOs, will continue to play an important role in strengthening both international and national surveillance and response systems. Nonetheless, progress is likely to be slow without strong advocacy, and an integrated global surveillance and response system, though crucial to responding to this pandemic, is likely to be years away. The magnitude of the challenge will



require greater cooperation and commitment at the national level, as well as funds, capacity and cooperation at the international level. Any resolution must address this reality.

On a broader level, any socioeconomic development in developing countries, however fitful, will result in improvements in water quality, sanitation, nutrition, education, and health care. This will enable the most susceptible population cohorts to better withstand HIV/AIDS both physically and behaviorally, and allow more specific programs targeting the disease a significant chance of success.

Bloc Positions

HIV/AIDS has disproportionately affected the African continent, yet no region of the world remains untouched. Every region has faced its own pattern of transmission and history of disease. In North America, HIV was first discovered in the gay community, and the death rate has largely stabilized due to effective prevention education and combination drug therapies. Western Europe, as an international hub of travel and commerce, faced similar problems, and has mainly been able to deal with the disease because of its advanced health care system. In Latin America, a complex mosaic of transmission patterns spreads the disease, and some 1.4 million adults and children were estimated to be living with AIDS by the end of 2000. In the Russian Federation and former Soviet states, more new HIV infections have been registered this year than all the previous years of the pandemic combined. The real growth is largely fueled by increased unsafe drug-injecting practices as well as prostitution, and the problem is most likely masked by a faulty national registration and health care system. Central Asia and Eastern Europe have recently shown increased levels of HIV infection, but political and legal reforms are creating effective avenues of HIV prevention. The region of South and South-East Asia is estimated to have 5.8 million adults and children living with HIV/AIDS as of the end of 2000, and faces ample room for growth due to a wide variety of transmission factors. China is seeing a steep rise in infection rates, which could translate, into higher HIV spread down the road. Because of insufficient data, few new country estimates of HIV infection were produced for the North Africa and the Middle East between 1994 and 1999. Recent evidence suggests new infections are on the rise; however, an epidemic has largely been contained due to strict social and religious factors as well as adequate health care systems in oil-rich countries. In Sub-Saharan Africa, an estimated 3.8 million people became infected with HIV in the year 2000, thus bringing the total number of people living there with HIV/AIDS to 25.3 million people. This region continues to face a challenge of colossal proportions. HIV rates in the Caribbean are highest in the world outside of Africa.



In relation to the disease, every country faces a different social, economic and cultural reality, individual to its geographic and demographic makeup, and yet advocated results and proposals remain similar. Though requiring specific resolutions in the areas of prevention, care, and support, each region must reach consensus on the topic—thus sustaining greater human development in the context of the HIV/AIDS pandemic.



Topic 2: Cultural Preservation in the Face of Economic, Political, and Cultural Globalization

Statement of the Problem

“I do not want my house to be walled in on all sides and my windows to be stuffed. I want the cultures of all the lands to be blown about my house as freely as possible. But I refuse to be blown off my feet by any.” —Mahatma Gandhi

Globalization has emerged as a key economic, political, and cultural reality of the 20th Century. Unprecedented in its scope, magnitude, and possibilities, this phenomenon shows no sign of slowing and demands careful scrutiny. Extraordinary human achievements can be said to have contributed to its rise, yet many of its effects are not yet well understood, and can even be said to be exceeding adequate control.

Although not limited to the economic arena, as currently driven by competitive global markets, globalization is largely outpacing the governance of markets and its repercussions on people. The challenge remains to ensure that the benefits are shared equitably, and that the increasing interdependence works for people, not profits. In general, financial integration is far more advanced than other areas of activity while the provision of direct, non-financial services remains the most localized. Faced with this unprecedented integration of world markets, there has also been much less progress in strengthening rules and institutions to promote universal ethics or norms, or to protect the integrity of cultures in individual communities and nations. Recently, cultural concerns have become more and more polarizing as nations realize that the changes brought about by globalization may cause irreparable damage.

Any move to change the effects of this phenomenon must be based on an adequate understanding. Currently five competing themes dominate the debate on the nature of globalization and its relationship to culture. Summed up succinctly, the proponents of each largely consider globalization as:

- “McDonaldization”: whereby global capital and bureaucratic systems define meanings and practices in global culture
- “Cultural Imperialism”: whereby the predominant position of the United States is stressed in the relationship between world economic power and global culture
- “Post-Modernist”: whereby a world-wide “spatially disoriented culture” has developed
- “Democratization”: whereby the institutions and practices of liberal democracy have triumphed over rivals, framing global culture with democracy
- “Nationalism”: whereby the globe has been converted into a mosaic of cultures, as represented and promoted by nation-states



By themselves, each theme may maintain a partial snapshot of the phenomenon; yet this much is obvious—globalization is promoting a restructuring of cultural relations, both within and beyond communities and nations, and perhaps of a magnitude yet to be understood.

What many people agree on is that there may be in fact two large cultural changes occurring simultaneously. One is the establishment of a “global culture,” largely dominated by Western and often American products, and the other involves a culture flow in the opposite direction. Salsa music from the Caribbean, the cuisine of China and many other traditions are spreading globally. More and more nations are becoming multiethnic, by choice, or by fate. However, people are for the most part concerned about the spread of a global “consumer culture” and subsequent cultural homogenization. And there is no doubt that today’s flow of culture and cultural products is heavily weighted in one direction—from the rich countries to the poor.

It is noteworthy that as a result of this trend, “culture” has become more important economically. A UNESCO study shows that world trade in goods with cultural content—printed matter, literature, music, visual arts, cinema and photographic, radio and television equipment—almost tripled between 1980 and 1991, from \$67 billion to \$200 billion. The single largest export industry of the United States is not aircraft, computers, or automobiles, but rather entertainment. The risk here is reducing cultural concerns to protecting what can be bought and sold, because culture as an economic good has added to the its identification with commodities that can be sold and traded, such as crafts, tourism, music, books, and films. Important realms such as community, custom and tradition may be neglected.

For many, the exposure to new cultures is exciting, and even empowering. For others, it is disquieting, as they try to cope with a rapidly changing world. It also induces a sense of loss of control. National borders are disappearing not only for trade, capital, and information, but also for ideas, norms, cultures and values. The flow of cultural symbols across the borders of nation-states means that is increasingly difficult for those states to regulate and order internal cultural relations. As the pressures of staying competitive in global markets constrain options for national policy, many nations are feeling a loss for which no words can be given, and only a few have voiced openly. Critics of them contend that there is good in a new global society and culture, yet many counter that this view contrasts sharply with a world in which economic dislocation, cultural and religious division and myriad armed conflicts flourish and intensify around the globe.

Brief History of the Problem

The seeds of the phenomenon, which we now call globalization, can be said to have been sown in fifteenth-century Europe, as conceptions of the individual, national communities, and humanity emerged. Subsequent developments included the appearance of the unitary state, the idea of citizenship, and formal international relations. By the twentieth century, both nationalism



and internationalism had crystallized, and it was from then that ideas of a “global nation” began to be systematically thematized. Unprecedented in its scale and magnitude, globalization could be identified as global communication arose, world competitions such as the Olympics and the Nobel Prize were initiated, and the First World War occurred. The struggle for hegemony between the United States and the Soviet Union during the Cold War, as well as the regional crises during the 1990s consolidated globalization’s scope. Throughout this time, ever larger portions of the world came into contact with one another, raising awareness and consciousness of the planetary environment in its social, physical and ecological dimensions. What frontiers globalization will take us into in the near future is difficult to predict, but history dictates that it may bring unprecedented economic, political, and cultural changes.

The economic aspect of this historical globalization is unique as well. In human history, although commerce has long been regional in scope, often with dimensions in long-distance trade, never before has the world witnessed a “global economy” of the magnitude we now share. Yet, the development of a world economy has largely driven globalization’s pace in the twentieth century. Legal structures before World War II ensured property rights in international exchange. Then, as protectionism fell under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) regime and transport costs also decreased, trade grew rapidly throughout the post-war period, with the exception of the early 1980s. Although tariff protection has since been reduced to negligible levels and falls in transport costs has mostly ceased, trade continues to grow. The intensity of the trading system has been transformed since the war so that there is now a much denser network of world trade than before as well.

As a wider range of goods and services became tradable, international competition developed accordingly. International trade has also grown alongside the development of market relations domestically, particularly in developing countries, so that international markets have increasingly become enmeshed with domestic ones.

More recently the patchwork nature of global markets through trade networks has led to increasing demands for institutional harmonization—including national standards for trade in products and services, and for an agreed framework for securing intellectual property rights in exchange. The pressure to harmonize is evident in the formation of the World Trade Organization (WTO), as well as other regional blocs such as the Single European Market and the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). Thus the emergence of global markets is leading to an institutional harmonization and a deeper integration of harmonized standards of competition policy, health, safety, labor and environmental standards, trade in services and in intellectual property rights.

Globalization, led by the markets, has brought about unprecedented changes in the history of humankind. The cultural aspects—which many up until now have been neglecting—appears to be of more and more concern. That this phenomenon should leave us with more losses, and less



enriched, or perhaps inequitably so, is unacceptable by many accounts. Recognition that market competition is forcing governments towards policy changes which sacrifice their nations' or communities' cultural identity is the first step towards ameliorating this state of affairs.

Past United Nations Action

United Nations action in the area of cultural preservation in the face of globalization has been limited, largely due to the novelty and continually changing aspect of the phenomenon. Often, other organizations of policy have been used to address individual nations' or groups' concerns. An example of this is apparent in the North-South debate over labor. With the increasing integration of labor markets, tensions have flared among developed nations concerning whether jobs and investment are going to nations in which wage rates are lower or environmental and labor standards "softer". Strongly advocated by the EU and the USA as well as Northern trade unions is the addition of a "social clause" in trade agreements. This would oblige all member states to comply with internationally recognized standards. However, Southern states have largely criticized the moves and say that labor standards cannot be universalized liked human rights because they should reflect economic circumstances and culture-specific standards.

Another flashpoint, which has continually been opened for negotiation, is whether cultural goods should be exempt from free trade agreements. The Uruguay Round acknowledged the special nature of cultural goods, granting some exemptions. NAFTA required substantial negotiations before limited exemptions or exclusions of cultural industries were adopted. The issue was reopened in the negotiations for the Multilateral Agreement on Investments, polarizing countries that see cultural goods as an economic good or service like any other (Germany, Japan, the United Kingdom, the United States) and countries that see cultural goods as having intrinsic value to be protected for artistic diversity and national identity (Canada, France).

Proposed Solutions

Strategies, which resist globalization, will be most successful where they build upon the constraints presently dealt by currently globalized social practices. That is, in order to secure communities more fully from the disruptive incursions of the capitalist global structure of markets, newly emergent cultural patterns must be understood. Simply exalting the national over the global is no solution, and "world cities" as well as rural villages in peripheral economies must be taken into account.

In general, governments and states have developed to become genuine and enthusiastic participants in capitalism, so paradoxes must be resolved within current policy. For example, promotion of a welfare apparatus and encouraging forms of labor relations supportive of large-scale industry consolidates capitalism on the home ground of the national economy, while these actions are generally less than beneficial to the sustainability of local culture. National laws and



the formulation of strategies, policies, programs and development priorities must recognize the significance of and give full respect to various religious and ethical values, cultural backgrounds and philosophical convictions of individuals and their communities. Corporations, institutions, as well as governments must be held responsible for cultural developments.

What concrete solutions might this involve? One policy might be to empower the family as an institution—endowing it with the capacity to overcome the sudden economic dislocations, which are often the consequences of speculative behavior. Actions towards this goal might include income support to insulate the purchasing power of families from sudden swings in currency parities or interest rates, which often translate directly into job losses. Alternatively, it could mean ensuring the provision of the kinds of health, leisure and community-related services, which serve as anchors for stable communities. Crucially, this would require accountability for and control over these services to pass to local communities, in order to reflect local priorities. In either case the goal would be to provide a safe and secure environment, which family and community relations can develop without fear of sudden disruptions to the social fabric.

The social relations at the head of the market economy are less bound by family and domicile (although not devoid of them), and less subject to tradition. They are more open to encouraging personal mobility and forging new social relationships. At the same time, there is a shared “mental horizon” dominated by stable expectations about the future. It is a mentality, which accepts the cyclical nature of change and considers the profit motive in line with personal and/or family security. In other words, the market economy sets up a system in which the needs and requirements of maintaining a livelihood necessitates (perhaps) social or cultural estrangement. One or other factors leading to this result would need to be altered.

Ultimately, any strategy to resist globalization must enlist the power of the state to insulate the market economy from the speculative logic of capitalism. Two prongs of approach might be considered: macroeconomic and microeconomic. Ironically, the macroeconomic change, which might bring about the most cultural protection are regional markets such as NAFTA. One of its cardinal achievements has been to establish a transparent and competitive trading environment in which firms of all sizes can participate on a level playing field. Large corporations and smaller firms alike can benefit, because regional markets provide a bigger and more transparent environment in which to do business. The microeconomic approach might be some combination of taxation and fiscal policy designed to privilege and encourage small businesses, many of which are owned by families.

Bloc Positions

Although developing countries contain about 80% of the world’s people within their borders, with less than a fifth of global GDP, they wield little influence in the area of cultural preservation. At the same time, levels of engagement in international trade vary considerably



even among developed nations. Amongst the advanced industrial countries, exports as a percentage of GDP ranged, in 1991, from 7 percent for the USA, to 60 percent for Belgium. At the same time, financial markets have been largely deregulated in the richest nations and is progressing among the developing ones. Argentina, Mexico and Thailand have opened their capital markets. China, Mongolia and Vietnam also began to liberalize their economies and dramatically reshape their trading relationships, opening their economies to trade and direct foreign investment. Countries of Eastern Europe and the former Soviet states have largely begun the dramatic transition from centrally planned economic systems to market democracies. Sub-Saharan Africa, with its economy deeply integrated into world trade, finds itself increasingly vulnerable to the whims of primary commodity markets.

Globalization has brought new players to the world economic, political and cultural stage, largely working beyond national borders. Multinational corporations are integrating their production and marketing, and dominating world production. The World Trade Organization is the first multilateral organization with authority to enforce national governments' compliance with rules. An international criminal court system is in the making, and there is a booming network of NGOs. Some NGOs now have more members than some countries have citizens. Regional blocs are proliferating and gaining importance—examples include the European Union, Association of East Asian Nations, Mercosur, NAFTA, Southern African Development Community, among many others. Other global policy coordinating groups carrying great weight include the G-7, G-22, G-77 and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.



Bibliography

The United Nations Development Program's official website: www.undp.org

Topic A: HIV/AIDS

Central Intelligence Agency. "The Global Infectious Disease Threat and Its Implications for the United States." 2000. < <http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/nie/report/nie99-17d.html> > (6 January 2001).

Schoofs, Mark. "AIDS: The Agony of Africa." 2000. < www.villagevoice.com/specials/africa > (6 January 2001).

UNAIDS and WHO. "AIDS Epidemic Update: December 2000." 2000. < www.unaids.org/wac/2000/wad00/files/WAD_epidemic_report.htm > (6 January 2001).

UNDP. "UNDP's Role in the Fight Against HIV/AIDS." UNDP Policies and Statements. 2000. < www.undp.org/hiv/policies/undp_role.htm > (6 January 2001).

Topic B: Cultural Preservation in the Face of Globalization

Cagatay, Nilufer; Keklik, Mumtaz; Lal, Radhika; and Lang, James. "Budgets as if People Mattered: Democratizing Macroeconomic Policies." 2000. < www.undp.org/seped/publications/budgets.pdf > (6 January 2001).

UNDP. "Globalization with a Human Face." Human Development Report. 1999. < www.unpd.org/hdro/99.htm > (6 January 2001).

Germain, Randall D. "Globalization in Historical Perspective." Globalization and Its Critics. 2000.

Jones, R. J. Barry. "Globalization in Perspective." Globalization and Its Critics. 2000.

Malloch Brown, Mark. "Message from Mark Malloch Brown, Administrator, United Nations Development Programme." 2000. < www.undp.org/dpa/statements/administ/2000/december/1dec00.htm > (6 January 2001).

"Part 3: Social Clauses and Trade Agreements." Globalisation and liberalisation: Implications for poverty, distribution and inequality. 1997. < www.undp.org/hdro/oc32c.htm > (6 January 2001).



Perraton, Jonathan. "What are Global Markets: The Significance of Networks of Trade?" Globalization and Its Critics. 2000.

Reich, Michael. Economic Globalization and the Future of the Welfare State. Michigan: University of Michigan, School of Social Work, 1999.

Speth, James Gustave. "How Should the United Nations Respond to the Globalization Challenge?" 1998. < www.undp.org/dpa/pressrelease/releases/p990318e.htm > (6 January 2001).

Stevenson, Nick. "Globalization and Cultural Political Economy." Globalization and Its Critics. 2000.

Talalay, Michael. "Technology and Globalization: Assessing Patterns of Interaction." Globalization and Its Critics. 2000.