

Dear Honorable Heads of State,

We are excited to welcome you to the Middle Eastern Multilateral Summit. We are a small committee so that means we are going to have more time to go in depth on our topics. We ask that each person/representative be prepared and ready to hit hard into these issues.

I want to thank you our honorable Heads of State for joining us for this Summit and to remind you that as we grapple with the issues in front of us you will be participating in one of the most important committees at WASMUN 2002. You are the Head of State of your country and it is your responsibility to represent your government's views to the best of your ability.

For those with questions specific to "Palestinian Refugee" issue we have asked on a member of the Jewish community, Micah Adler (Honorable MEMS Moderator), to bring an important perspective to the issue. Ameer (Honorable MEMS Secretary) will do his best to answer questions from an Arabic perspective when he is asked to do so, and I will do my best to answer questions as objectively as I can.

The goal of the Model United Nations is to discuss issues from many different perspectives and come to a resolution as to what to be done in regard to the issues we will be discussing. We would like to ask you to look at the Summit at WASMUN as an opportunity to learn about the world from a different perspective by totally immersing yourself in the culture of the country that you are representing. Our primary goal is for everyone to come out with an enlightened view of issues that affect the world; our secondary goal is to come to a resolution on the issues at hand.

Lastly, discussions may get heated – if you are role-playing to the best of your ability we would expect no less. That being said the reason that organizations such as the United Nations has existed for so long is that its members may be steadfast in their views, but they are willing to at least respectfully listen to views that may contradict their own by using the tools of diplomacy. Respect for your fellow committee members will better your chances of coming away from the Summit proud of your accomplishments.

If you have any questions, or if you want an excuse to come out to visit the UW, please email or call us. We will do the best to answer any questions that you have and if we don't have the answer right off the bat we will find it for you.

We're looking forward to providing you with a truly enlightening and life-affirming experience and we expect nothing less from you.

Best Regards,

NICK

Nick Hamilton
MEMS CHAIR
hamm@u.washington.edu

AMEER

Ameer Hashish
MEMS Secretary
ameerh@u.washington.edu

Brief Overview of Middle East Multilateral Summit

The Middle East Multilateral Summit (MEMS) does not exist as an organization, institution, or part of the UN. It is a summit. The Middle East Multilateral Summit (MEMS) is primarily responsible for addressing issues concerning conflict, security, and political and socio-cultural matters within the region of the Middle East. This means that the delegates from each country in this committee are supposed to be the Heads of State of each country. The goal of MEMS is to reach somewhat of a treaty on each topic, Sanctions against Iraq and Palestinian Refugees, and make a recommendation to the UN Security Council and the Secretary-General on how to handle each issue. From that point forward it is in the hands of the Security Council to take an official stance on the issues as recommended by MEMS.

TOPIC A: Sanctions Against Iraq

Statement of the problem

"We are in the process of destroying an entire society. It is as simple and terrifying as that. It is illegal and immoral." Denis Halliday, after resigning as first UN Assistant Secretary General and Humanitarian Coordinator in Iraq.

Sanctions have been levied against Iraq by the United Nations. These sanctions were initially brought against Iraq in 1991 in regard to Iraq's attack/invasion of Kuwait. These sanctions, although modified over the next decade, all in all remain in tact. The sanctions were initially imposed to passively force Iraq from its occupation of Kuwait. Sanctions have continued to be imposed because Iraq's leadership – dictatorship – continue to ignore requests of the UN's various committees to cease making biological weapons and refuse to allow UN weapons inspectors into the country for regular inspections, amongst various other violations.

On the surface, these sanctions have done little to erode the powerbase of Iraq's leadership and have proceeded to penalize the people of Iraq. Iraq's infrastructure has been decimated, its people are starving, and those in power seem to act with little to no regard for "their people".

UNICEF, mandated by the United Nations General Assembly to advocate for the protection of children's rights, in a study done in 1999 found that, "if the substantial reduction in child mortality throughout Iraq during the 1980s had

continued through the 1990s, there would have been half a million fewer deaths of children under-five in the country as a whole during the eight year period 1991 to 1998".

The poor conditions in Iraq can be directly attributed to the war waged on their country and the Sanctions that have been in place for over decade. By the Iraqi people supporting their leadership should they be held responsible for the actions of that leader? Are these sanctions punishing the people they are intended to punish? Are the Iraqi people innocent victims or are the silent partners in creating international upheaval?

History of the problem

On 2 August 1990, the United Nations Security Council imposed economic sanctions on Iraq in response to its invasion of Kuwait. Under these sanctions, all imports into Iraq and all exports from Iraq were prohibited, unless the Security Council permitted exceptions. Resolution-661 was adopted by the Security Council on August 6th 1990. This resolution was supported by the majority of the Security Council. It completely isolated Iraq from the developing "world economy". It also left a country battered by war with an eroding infrastructure to fend for itself and its people. Much of Iraq's economy was supported by the exportation of oil.

Article 661 stated, " that all States shall not make available to the Government of Iraq, or to any commercial, industrial or public utility undertaking in Iraq or Kuwait . . . except payments exclusively for strictly medical or humanitarian purposes and, in humanitarian circumstances, foodstuffs". This resolution was passed with the hopes of ending Iraq's occupation of Kuwait and subsequently the "Gulf War".

In late 1991 the UN sent in a team of experts to determine how the sanctions were affecting Iraq. This is an excerpt from the findings from the team:

"It should be said at once that nothing that we had seen or read had quite prepared us for the particular form of devastation which has now befallen the country (Iraq). Iraq has, for some time to come, been relegated to a pre-industrial age, but with all the disabilities of post-industrial dependency on an intensive use of energy and technology".

Prior to these sanctions being implemented and the effects of the Gulf War Iraq had a developing economy rivalling some countries in Western Europe. It was importing approximately 70% of its food needs. The team found that not only was Iraq short on food, fuel, and medical supplies, its infrastructure had

deteriorated to the point that “emergency medical supplies can be moved to health centres only with extreme difficulty, and, usually, major delay.”

In response to the teams findings the UN adopted resolution 706 in late August 1991. This resolution offered Iraq the opportunity to trade oil for essential humanitarian supplies. The resolution was not accepted by Iraq. It wasn't until December of 1996 that Iraq and the UN came to a compromise with resolution 986 in regard to trading oil for essential human supplies. In March of 1997 the first shipment of supplies (wheat and flour) is received by Iraq.

Since the first food arrived in March 1997, foodstuffs worth \$7.5 billion and health supplies worth about \$1.4 billion have been delivered to Iraq. Although it is difficult to assess the impact of the program, the average daily food ration has increased by 1000 calories to approximately 2000 calories in May 2001. Security Council resolution 1284 (1999) lifted completely the ceiling on the amount of oil Iraq can export under the program. At the average rate of over 2.1 million barrels a day, Iraqi oil exports, in the week 20 - 26 October.

A report on the effect of Sanctions authored in March of 1999 found that low birth weight in babies has risen from 4% to approximately 25% of all births since 1991, nearly all of the population of children under five (5) years old is malnourished, Iraq has one of the highest infant mortality rates in the world, hospitals haven't been repaired, potable water has fallen 50% in urban areas and approximately 70% in rural areas, and school enrollment for all ages has dropped by half, amongst other societal problems.

A quote from the report cited that the following societal problems were frequently mentioned by Iraqi people, “an increase in juvenile delinquency, begging and prostitution, anxiety about the future and lack of motivation, a rising sense of isolation bred by absence of contact with the outside world, the development of a parallel economy replete with profiteering and criminality, cultural and scientific impoverishment, (and) disruption of family life.”

Past UN Action

After the onset of the Oil for Food program implemented by the United Nations in 1996 there have been several revisions on the part of the UN to satisfy demands by Iraq to withhold oil until it received a better price or to withhold oil until the UN repealed a resolution it had passed with regards to the situation.

The UN is currently on its tenth phase of the Oil for Food program with Iraq. The majority of the phases increased the ceiling for amount of oil that Iraq could sell providing Iraq with more funds to deploy with each phase (one phase = variable time frame). In 1999, the ceiling on the amount of oil that Iraq could export was withdrawn. The UN has provided Iraq with more humanitarian aid through the same program as well as replacement parts for machinery related to the oil Iraq is producing.

Sanctions against Iraq have not been lifted. In December of 1998 military action by the United States and England took place due to Iraq violating guidelines/rules set by the United Nations.

Proposed Solutions

All proposed solutions will be considered recommendations to the Security Council. The Middle Eastern Multilateral Summit is not allowed to change/revise/contradict actions of the United Nations through its own actions. The resolution that the Summit comes to will be forwarded to the Security Council for review. Recommendations to the Security Council can range from:

Lift Sanctions: The sanctions imposed on Iraq have done nothing but destroy innocent people and have failed to erode the power-base or curb the actions of Iraqi leadership. The leadership has not promoted the well-being of its people by obeying the international laws/rules set by the UN and as a result has never been acting in the best interest of its people. The UN has waged a passive war on the innocents of Iraq that has lasted for over a decade. It is time to try different tactics.

Continue with the Current Sanctions: The sanctions imposed on Iraq have done much to curb the threat that Iraq once was. Iraq was an aggressive county with the means to invade another country in 1991 and throw off the balance of power and peace that had recently been established after the end of “The Cold War”. These sanctions have kept a various dangerous military state under control for the last 10 decade. The quality of life has continued to improve for the Iraqi people with the initiation of Food for Oil program. The UN is helping the Iraqi people make the best of a bad situation while keeping the international economy safe from further attacks from Iraq.

Revise Sanctions: Iraq is a dangerous military state. Innocent people are dying due to sanctions imposed by the United Nations even with the initiation of the Food for Oil program in 1996. It seems logical that there is a better balance

between curbing the power and ambition of a dangerous leader and ensuring that the amount of innocent victims in this situation are minimized as much as possible.

Block Positions

France:

France has a view that is similar to the United States, but a little bit more liberal on sanction lifting – see recent UN proposal - France's Second Draft Resolution for the UN Security Council, 19 June 2001

Iran:

Iranian foreign minister recently quoted, “It seems the time is ripe for a review of the economic sanctions against Iraq, and at the same time measures should be taken to check its proliferation of weapons of mass destruction”.

quote from King Abdullah of Jordan.

Iraq:

Iraq said that it is willing to comply with the UN’s request to limit weapons of mass destruction if all of the countries in the surrounding area do so as well. It said it will not comply with the UN until this request is met.

“At the Arab summit [last month in Jordan], there was an atmosphere of reconciliation and an attempt by Arab countries to end 10 years of animosity. Fifteen Arab delegates representing their leaders, with the blessing of Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, sat down with the Iraqis and said, "Look, let’s put the past behind us” Iraq did not agree with the proposal and walked from the summit.

In a recent letter to the Secretary-General and President of the Security Council asked oil-for-food money to be donated to Palestine (27 November 2000).

Israel:

View is very similar to that of the United States – “smart sanctions”.

Jordan:

Wants all sanctions lifted, but is wary of Iraq’s ability to produce weapons of mass destruction.

Kuwait:

Would like sanctions to be revised to less dramatically impact Iraqi civilians.
Would like Iraqi leadership lifted – there is a small opposition to Iraq's current government existing in Iraq.

Russia:

More aggressive than other members of the Security Council in wanting sanctions lifted – wants sanctions almost totally lifted, this includes international monitoring over the non-reconstruction of prohibited military programs – see resolution Russian Federation June 26, 2001: DRAFT RESOLUTION ON IRAQ

Saudi Arabia:

Would like to lift sanctions against Iraq. Would like continued international involvement/monitoring of Iraq's production ability of weapons of mass destruction.

UK:

“Iraq has preferred the continuation of sanctions, whatever the effect on the Iraqi people, to acceptance of the disarmament process set out in resolution 687 and 1284” – recent statement by UK. Lifting sanctions against Iraq was recently proposed by UK with the precursor that Iraq continues to disarm dangerous weapons and limit production capacity of these weapons. The UK has proposed to revise current UN rule that no export is allowed in or out of Iraq unless approved by the “661 Committee”.

United States:

Most recently proposed “smart sanctions” on Iraq which would lighten up on civilian sanctions and increase number of sanctions on sales of equipment used to make weapons of mass destruction (biological, chemical, nuclear). The United States would like to differentiate between Iraqi civilians and its government with its sanctions.

At Recent Arab Summit:

We (Arab Countries) have a very far-reaching proposal for reconciliation." The Iraqis did not agree to the proposal, and they lost a golden opportunity. The summit, to an extent, was successful because nobody screamed at each other and nobody walked out, but there's still a long way to go. Unfortunately,

because we didn't achieve a resolution, we're back at the drawing board" – King Abdullah (Jordan).

TOPIC B: Palestinian Refugees

Statement of the Problem

The fate of Palestinian Refugees and the future of peace in The Middle East are closely tied together. The problem of the refugees and the right of return presents formidable obstacles to the achievement of a lasting, peaceful resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The problem is significant not only because of the sheer number of refugees but also because of the need for a multilateral solution that is acceptable to all the countries in the region that have been affected by the issue.

In the negotiations for peace between Palestine and Israeli parties are likely to find it especially difficult to arrive at mutually satisfactory solutions of the refugee problem. For the Palestinian Refugees their right to return to their homes and or receive compensation for their loss is seen as a fundamental issue that must be resolved. Israel refuses to consider the idea of allowing the refugees to return in mass and reclaim their land as it sees them as a threat to the Jewish state. These are two completely opposed views that result from the strikingly different view of the issue. The Palestinians feel that they were forcibly expelled by Jewish forces or left in a panic flight to escape massacres committed by Jewish forces. While at the same time Israelis see the situation as a result of the war that the Arab nations launched against Israel making the refugee a problem of the region not Israel.

The sheer size of the refugee group only magnifies the issue in light of the strong difference in position. There exist many different counts of the actual number of refugees the UNRWA figure of 3,469,109 refugees (January 1998) as the minimum number, including 1,308,438 in the territories (548,874 in the West Bank and 759,564 in Gaza); some Palestinian sources argue that the total figure is as high as 4,900,000. This huge number of people drastically magnifies the differences in stance between the Palestinians and Israel. For any solution will be expensive and place a great strain on any country, that must bear it.

Currently this strain is spread out over all the countries in the region and the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near

East (UNRWA) which provides education, health, and relief and social services to 3.7 million registered Palestine refugees in Jordan, Lebanon, the Syrian Arab Republic, the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. This is not a final solution and the countries affected are interested in getting the refugees placed permanently somewhere other than where they are now.

Besides the political and economic sides of this issue is the fact that the Palestinian refugees are frequently denied basic human rights because they lack permanent citizenship. This prevents them from attending school, receiving health care, getting jobs, participating in government and owning property. It also severely limits their freedom of movement in and between countries.

Finding a solution to the Palestinian refugee problem is a very complicated and difficult-to-achieve goal. The large number of refugees complicates the problem along with the number of international players in this issue, and the extreme difficulty of finding a realistic satisfactory solution. If peace is to replace violence in the Middle East, the refugee problem has to be solved. Moreover, the search for a realistic solution for the Palestinian refugee problem along with taking immediate actions to improve the standards of living for the refugees is very rewarding due to its huge humanitarian aspects and is a step on the path of peace.

Brief History of the Problem

The roots of the problem go deep into the turbulent history of both the Palestinians and the Israelis. The roots of the problem can be traced back as far as the 19th century. Most recently it is a result of the conflict between Israel and its neighbors during the 1940's.

Starting in the later half of the 19th century foreign immigration to Palestine increased significantly including many Zionists seeking to establish a Jewish homeland. During World War I this area suffered as it became the site for many campaigns of that war and eventually became controlled by Great Britain. Following this the British supported the creation of a Jewish homeland through the use of unfair laws that led to the confiscation of land to the benefit of Jewish settlers. Following World War II on 29 Nov 1947, the UN adopted a resolution that decided to partition Palestine into an Arab and a Jewish state, while Jerusalem and its environs were to be international. This division was biased towards the Jewish minority which received not only a larger piece but also the more fertile areas. This led to armed conflict between the Zionists and the Palestinians and Arabs. During this conflict many civilians died but the pivotal point was the massacres of Deir Yassin that was committed by the

Irgun gang and resulted in the killing of about 240 civilians the news of which lead many Palestinians to flee their homes in search of security. Then in 1948 the state of Israel was declared and recognized by the major world powers. Quickly following this war broke out between Israel and the Palestinians backed by the Arab armies of the region. After a year Israel emerged triumphant and in control of the rest of Palestine. Palestine had ceased to exist.

This is not the end of the plight of the Palestinians, for in 1967 Israel launched a surprise attack on the Arab countries, fearing that an Arab invasion was imminent. This resulted in a surprisingly quick 6 day war with Israel the victor and occupier the West Bank, the Gaza strip, the Sinai desert, and the Golan Heights. As a result about 400,000 Palestinian refugees were forced out into the neighboring Arab countries mainly into refugee camps.

Not all those who were displaced by these conflicts are actually considered refugees though. When we talk about the Palestinian refugees, we must understand who we are talking about and the number of people this represents. The Working Group (RWG) held in Ottawa, Canada on 13 May 1992 gave this definition.

The Palestinian refugees are all those Palestinians (and their descendants) who were expelled or forced to leave their homes between November 1947 (Partition Plan) and January 1949 (Rhodes Armistices Agreements), From the territory controlled by Israel on that latter date. This coincides with the Israeli definition of absentees, a category of Palestinians meant to be stripped of its most elementary human and civil rights: Any person was declared to be and absentee if he was, on, or after 29th November 1947 a citizen or a subject of any of the Arab states; in any of these states for any length of time in any part of Palestine outside the Israeli-occupied area, or in any place other than his habitual residence even if such place as well as his habitual abode were within Israeli-occupied territory.

Currently the Palestinian refugees are spread throughout the region and the world most of them in countries surrounding Israel and the in the occupied territories. Many of them in camps maintained by the UNRWA, United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East.

Past United Nations Action

There are two main areas of action taken by the UN in relation to the Palestinian refugee problem. The first is providing humanitarian assistance to the refugees mainly through the UNRWA. The second is issuing several UN

security Council resolutions that ask for the restoration of the refugees to their homes.

Following the 1948 Arab-Israeli conflict, UNRWA, the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, was established by United Nations General Assembly resolution 302 (IV) of 8 December 1949 to carry out direct relief and works programs for Palestine refugees. The Agency began operations on 1 May 1950. In the absence of a solution to the Palestine refugee problem, the General Assembly has repeatedly renewed UNRWA's mandate, most recently extending it until 30 June 2002.

Since its establishment, the Agency has delivered its services in times of relative calm in the Middle East, and in times of hostilities. It has fed, housed and clothed tens of thousands of fleeing refugees and at the same time educated and given health care to hundreds of thousands of young refugees.

UNRWA is unique in terms of its long-standing commitment to one group of refugees and its contributions to the welfare and human development of four generations of Palestine refugees. Originally envisaged as a temporary organization, the Agency has gradually adjusted its programs to meet the changing needs of the refugees. Today, UNRWA is the main provider of basic services - education, health, relief and social services - to over 3.7 million

There is a series of United Nations and Security Council resolutions issued since 1948 that have recognized Palestinian nationhood, sovereignty and right of return. In December 1948 the Security Council unanimously adopted Resolution 194, maintaining that Palestinian refugees wishing to return to their homes, "and live in peace with their neighbors," must be allowed to do so "at the nearest opportunity possible." It also recognized the right of Palestinians to compensation if they did not wish to return. Israel's membership in the UN was contingent upon it agreeing to Resolution 194 when they were entered Israel refused to comply with the resolution. This led to the adoption of Resolution 513 which was to allow for assistance to refugees in building homes elsewhere if they did not return to their original homes. In 1973, the General Assembly issued Resolution 3089, reiterating the Palestinian refugees' right of return. This led to the adoption Resolution 242 which established the concept of land for peace as a basis for a solution to the refugee issue.

This is not a complete list of all UN resolutions or actions but shows the main attempts at solving the issue and dealing with the humanitarian concerns.

Proposed Solutions

There are three areas that should be examined as sources for solutions to the Palestinian refugee problem. The first is in returning them to their original homes in accordance with Resolution 194 and 3089. The second is compensation to be paid to the refugees instead of letting them return to their homes. The third would be to improve the living conditions of the refugees. In determining this solution, one must acknowledge that any thing short of complete agreement on both sides to the solution will not create a lasting solution. In addition only solving for the humanitarian concerns of the refugees does not create a long term solution at some point another solution beyond that will have to be found.

Bloc Positions

In discussing final status issues, Palestinians and Israelis approach the question of the refugees and the right of return from radically different perspectives. The Palestinian narrative maintains that the Zionists forcibly expelled the Arab refugees in 1948. The Palestinians insist on the right of the refugees to return to their homes or, for those who choose not to do so, to accept compensation. And they demand that Israel unilaterally acknowledge its complete moral responsibility for the injustice of the refugees' expulsion.

In contrast, the Israeli narrative rejects the refugees' right of return. Israel argues that it was the Arabs who caused the Palestinian refugee problem, by rejecting the creation of the State of Israel and declaring war upon it -- a war which, like most wars, created refugee problems, including a Jewish one. Israel sees the return of Palestinian refugees as an existential threat, insofar as it would undermine the Jewish character and the viability of the state

In Lebanon, in view of the delicate demographic/political balance, their status is particularly sensitive from a political and socioeconomic standpoint, and the government is likely to insist that a solution to the refugee question involve their total removal.

Spokespersons for the Jordanian government have indicated that Jordan (rather than, say, the PLO) will seek to negotiate with Israel regarding compensation for the assets that Palestinians now resident in Jordan were forced to abandon in Israel in 1948. Considerations regarding "demographic security" are also likely to move Jordan to encourage relocation of a significant portion of its refugee population to the West Bank within the framework of a

settlement. In their peace treaty, Israel and Jordan agreed to a Jordanian role in final status negotiations on the refugee question.

Near unanimous UN resolutions since 1967 declare that Israel has no right to assert its sovereignty over Jerusalem. Near unanimous UN resolutions since 1949 endorse the position that Palestinian Arab refugees possess the "inalienable right of return" to the homes that they left in 1948. Both positions are supported by the US and Canada.