

ISSUES FACING THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY

PEACEKEEPING, PEACEMAKING, AND PEACEBUILDING

The United Nations Security Council exists to maintain international peace and security and to act to resolve conflicts around the world. The most visible tool the Security Council has at its disposal to pursue these goals is peacekeeping missions. There are currently 16 ongoing peacekeeping missions around the world, several of which have had a high profile in recent years. In the history of the United Nations, there have also been 47 peacekeeping missions in whose mandates have expired. These past operations were deployed to help bring implement peace settlements ending 19 civil wars and 12 interstate and colonial disputes.

As evidenced by the 63 past and current peacekeeping operations authorized by the Security Council, the United Nations has played an active role in conflict prevention and resolution in the world since 1945. However, the Security Council's role in conflict resolution and use of peacekeeping missions has varied significantly over time. The first real distinction that can be made in the history of peacekeeping operations is between the Cold War and post-Cold War eras. Often deadlocked by the rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union, the Security Council was only able to play a small role in addressing conflict in the world. The rare instances where action was taken were generally small-scale operations established to prevent the re-emergence of conflict between two states. The Security Council established peace operations in response to the Arab-Israeli war of 1973 (UNEF II, UNDOF) and the Indian-Pakistan dispute over the Kashmir region (UNMOGIP). The UNDOF and UNMOGIP operations continue to hold their positions between the former combatants and act as a buffer zone force, reducing the probability of renewed conflict by providing a neutral observer of the ceasefires/peace agreements. Likewise, the United Nations oversaw the transfer of West New Guinea from Dutch colonial rule to Indonesian rule in 1962-1963 (UNSF). With the exception of the UN attempt to preserve the sovereignty of the Congo and prevent civil war there in 1960-1964 (ONUC), the Security Council was only able to deal with inter-state disputes in non-aligned countries. Peace operations established in the Cold War period were often lowly staffed with primarily military observers that served mostly to monitor the situation. Excluding the unusual case of ONUC, the average size of peace operations established during this period were approximately 1600 troops, with several missions having fewer than 500 troops.

Beginning in 1988, with the pending end of the Cold-War and the easing of tensions between the Soviet Union and the United States, the Security Council was able to play a much larger role in preventing and resolving both inter-state and intra-state conflict around the globe. The number of peacekeeping missions established by the Security Council proliferated, with 48 of the 63 total UN peacekeeping missions coming into existence in 1988 or later. The United Nations became increasingly involved in intra-state disputes, beginning with its guiding role in Namibia's transition to independence from South Africa in 1989-1990 (UNTAG), and this is a role that the United Nations still plays very much today. Namibia and its successor nations (i.e. ONUSAL in El Salvador, UNAVEM I – III in Angola, and ONUMOZ in Mozambique, to name a few) established the mold for a new type of peacekeeping mission. This new 'brand' of peace operations oversaw the implementation of a comprehensive peace agreement between civil war combatants. This included tasks such as organizing and holding elections, assisting with

disarming and reintegrating former combatants, de-mining efforts, revising legal codes and re-establishing the rule of law, and even running civil administrations until power can be turned over to local political leaders. Many of these newer peace operations contained not only uniformed troops, but also international civil police officers (usually without arrest power) who were intended to aid in training new police forces in the countries concerned. With the vastly increased scope of activities missions were mandated to carry out came a corresponding increase in the size of missions. The current mission in the Democratic Republic of Congo (MONUC) has an authorized strength of over 18,900 troops and a yearly budget exceeding \$1.1 billion.

As is evident from the preceding examples, the concept of the peacekeeping mission has become a much more nebulous concept than it was in the Cold War period. However, we are able to categorize UN interventions as either of two typologies: peacekeeping and peace-enforcement, or peace-making. These two categories are largely defined by the source of their legitimacy. Peacekeeping missions are given their authority by Chapter VI of the UN charter, which deals with peaceful conflict resolution. Peace-enforcement missions, on the other hand, take their legitimacy from Chapter VII of the UN charter.

Peacekeeping refers to peace operation that serves to help maintain the peace between two groups using entirely peaceful methods. Most peacekeeping missions are characterized by lightly armed troops that act as a buffer and deterrent to action between two groups. Peacekeeping missions have been utilized in both pre- and post-conflict settings. The UN Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea (UNMEE) is a peacekeeping mission that has served to separate the armed forces of the two formerly fighting countries and to stabilize the border region between the two states. Conversely, the UN Preventative Deployment Force (UNPREDEP) was established to monitor the situation along the border of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia in order to prevent conflict from ever occurring.

Peace enforcement is the term used to characterize peace operations that employ more substantive means to promote the resolution of a conflict and prevent the resumption of conflict. Peace enforcement missions are characterized by more extensive and forceful mandates. While peacekeeping missions are only able to use force in self defense, and only then if fired upon first, peace enforcement missions have increasingly been given the authority to take forceful action against those who break a peace agreement or in order to protect the delivery of humanitarian aid. The UN peace operation in Eastern Slavonia, a region of Croatia, during the Balkan wars of the mid 1990s (UNTAES) was given the authority to take military action against paramilitary groups that did not comply with the peace agreement. In Somalia (UNOSOM I, II), United Nations forces were mandated to protect the delivery of humanitarian aid to Somalis suffering the consequences of civil war and famine. Within the last year, MONUC in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) has aided the Congolese military in military operations against rebels that have failed to lay down their arms, though this is the most interventionist use of force authorized by the Security Council.

The increasingly forceful mandates that peace operations have been given draw into focus some of the crucial principles of UN peacekeeping efforts and their limits. First, UN peace operations must have the consent of all parties involved in a conflict before they can be devised and deployed. Forces cannot be unilaterally sent into a situation by the UN. The focus is on peace-

keeping, not achieving military victory in order to end a conflict. Secondly, UN operations are sent into post-civil war settings to help implement peace agreements signed by the parties involved, not to impose a peace. Third, the use of force must be limited to self defense and the protection of civilians. While the actions of UN forces in Slavonia and the DRC were forceful, the ultimate goal was to ensure the safety of civilians in the concerned areas.

Other considerations also go into the decision to deploy peace operations. The potential costs of the operation and the risks to UN and other associated international personnel must be assessed before the decision to deploy a mission. Also, the requirements of the mission in terms of uniformed personnel and financing must be determined and evaluated. Since the uniformed personnel for UN missions come from donor countries, a sufficient number of countries must value the intervention to garner enough troops to properly staff a mission. A failure to properly support a mission with either troops or other resources holds serious consequences for the outcome of the mission. The failure of UN member states to supply the needed troops and other military equipment, particularly helicopters, to the UN Mission in Darfur (UNAMID) has proven the most consequential factor in preventing a successful resolution of the conflict. Also, mission mandates must be clear and appropriate with respect to the challenges the situation faces. The failure of the UN mission in Rwanda (UNAMIR) to prevent the escalation of the genocide there stemmed from an insufficient and weak mandate. Lastly, clear and realistic goals should be set for the mission.

There is one more concept that is relevant to the discussion of UN peace operations – peacebuilding. Peacebuilding refers to sustained efforts to consolidate peace in post-conflict settings by bringing together all relevant parties and actors to encourage dialogue, promote reconciliation, The peacebuilding process often begins while a peacekeeping operation is still in existence and, in an ideal situation, extends long after the end of a peacekeeping mission. The United Nations Peacebuilding Commission was established in 2005 by a joint action of the General Assembly and Security Council. The role of the Peacebuilding Commission is to (1) bringing together all of the relevant actors, including international donors, the international financial institutions, national governments, troop contributing countries; (2) marshalling resources and (3) advising on and proposing integrated strategies for post-conflict peacebuilding and recovery and where appropriate, highlighting any gaps that threaten to undermine peace. The Peacebuilding Commission has established projects in Sierra Leone, Burundi, Cote d’Ivoire, and the Central African Republic.

The establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission was followed shortly after by the creation of the United Nations Peacebuilding Fund. Now totaling over \$275 million in total assets, the Peacebuilding Fund is used to finance many of the projects of the Peacebuilding Commission. The Peacebuilding Fund is also used as a funding mechanism to provide continual funding during post-conflict transitions between conflict and recovery, particularly when other sources of funding may not be available. The Peacebuilding Fund has funded projects of various design in Burundi, the Central African Republic, Guinea Bissau, Sierra Leone, Comoros, Cote d’Ivoire, Guinea, Liberia, Nepal, Haiti, and Kenya.

TERRORISM

There has never been a universally agreed-upon definition of terrorism, as it is often a matter of perspective – one man's freedom fighter is another man's terrorist. However, a few definitions have been put forth.

In 1937, the League of Nations defined terrorism as:

“All criminal acts directed against a State and intended or calculated to create a state of terror in the minds of particular persons or a group of persons or the general public.”

In 1999, a UN General Assembly included a clause condemning:

“Criminal acts intended or calculated to provoke a state of terror in the general public, a group of persons or particular persons for political purposes...whatever the considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other nature that may be invoked to justify them.”

In 2004, the Security Council, in Resolution 1566, condemned terrorism using this language:

“Criminal acts, including against civilians, committed with the intent to cause death or serious bodily injury, or taking of hostages, with the purpose to provoke a state of terror in the general public or in a group of persons or particular persons, intimidate a population, or compel a government or an international organization to do or to abstain from doing any act.”

The Security Council did not often deal with matters of terrorism prior to the attacks on September 11, 2001. Spurred by Vietnam War and growing Arab-Israeli tension, a 1970 Resolution declared it was a member nation's responsibility not to "organize" or "instigate" acts of terrorism. In the 1990's, the Security Council imposed sanctions against States that were believed to have ties to terrorism - Libya (1992), Sudan (1996), and the Taliban-ruled Afghanistan (1999). Resolution 1269 in 1999 called upon States to work together to prevent and suppress all terrorist acts.

After the terrorist attacks on the United States on 9/11, the UN Security Council passed Resolution 1373. The resolution dealt with financial aspects of terrorism, directing States to prevent and suppress funding of terrorist acts, and to freeze the assets of terrorists. It called for States to share information about terrorism, to deny terrorists safe haven, and to cooperate with other governments in investigating, arresting, and extraditing terrorists. It asked States to criminalize terrorist acts in their domestic laws and to establish and carry out strong punishments for violators, but it did not give any new definition of “terrorism.” Resolution 1373 also established the Counter-Terrorism Committee.

The Counter-Terrorism Committee, which is made up of the 15 Security Council members, monitors the implementation of Resolution 1373. Member States are obligated to report to the committee on how they are implementing Resolution 1373. The Counter-Terrorism Committee is assisted by the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED), which carries out the policy decisions of the Committee, conducts assessments of all member States, and provides counter-terrorism technical assistance to States.

Resolution 1566 was another major anti-terrorist resolution, passed in 2004. It gave an idea of what the Security Council sees as terrorism (found above), called on States to prosecute or extradite those who plan, support, or carry out terrorist acts, and targeted other terrorist groups in addition to just the Taliban and al-Qaeda. It set up the 1566 Working Group, made up of the 15 Security Council Members, to recommend practical solutions to fighting terrorists and terrorist groups, and to explore the possibility of a compensation fund for victims of terrorism.

Resolution 1540 (2004) called upon States to prevent non-States actors (such as terrorist groups) from acquiring weapons of mass destruction, and created the 1540 Committee, which is responsible for monitoring States' compliance with the resolution. Resolution 1624 (2005) reiterated the Security Council's condemnation of terrorist acts, and also the incitement of them, and again called on member States to legally prohibit both terrorist acts and the incitement of terrorist acts, and to deny safe haven to anyone guilty of such conduct.

NONPROLIFERATION

Weapons pose a significant risk to global security. Weapons are defined as instruments or instrumentality used in fighting or hunting. Since the advent of tools, there have existed weapons. The very nature of a conflict can drastically change with the addition or subtraction of weapons. Weapons proliferation is the act of acquiring new weapons or weapon systems. This is a serious problem not only on the individual level, but on the global level as well. Countries involved in disputes have seen them escalate with the proliferation of weapons on one side or the other. The issue of nonproliferation is centered on preventing proliferation as well as disarming existing weapons. Nonproliferation, as seen globally, does not deal with weapons used on an individual level but rather with those that affect large numbers of individuals at once. These generally fall in the categories of nuclear, biological or chemical weapons (NBC). Recently, there is increasing global concern with the missile systems (NBC/M) involved in the use of these weapons. The current climate of unstable regimes and shifting power structures/balance increases the risk of NBC use greatly. It is currently thought that approximately 20 countries have NBCs, and approximately 25 countries have ballistic missiles.

Weapons proliferation, at its most basic, is the act of acquiring weapons or weapons systems not previously possessed. This can include an increase in numbers of weapons already held. A nation acquiring a new technology in the field of weaponry is weapons proliferation. This technology could improve existing weapons or lead to the construction of new weapons. While small arms are a concern, the international community regards NBC as the primary concern. There is no general definition of weapons that qualify in regards to proliferation measures. The specialization of threat from NBCs creates a need to separate each type of weapon for detailed and specific mention within treaties.

The two main types of NBC proliferation are horizontal and vertical. Vertical proliferation is improving pre-existing NBC technology. This includes development of new and more efficient delivery methods. Horizontal proliferation can be defined as the spread of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons to countries not originally involved in developing them. The primary nuclear proliferators are these countries that actively developed nuclear technology. These are the United State, France, Great Britain and Russia. There are also secondary nuclear proliferators that are countries that have developed programs from the work of the primary proliferators. One of the main problems regarding these secondary proliferators is that they may now be involved in the sale of NBCs. They are considered to include China, Iran, Iraq, Libya, Egypt, North Korea, Former USSR States and Syria.

Treaties are the main means of restricting and establishing measure to monitor NBC proliferation. The primary treaty governing biological weapons is the Biological Weapon Convention (BWC). It has measures against proliferation but there is no provision for verification or inspections. It has no compliance organization. The main treaty governing chemical weapons is the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC). Along with measures against proliferation, the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapon (OPCW) is the regulatory/compliance organization.

The Nuclear Proliferation Treaty (NPT) is the treaty governing nuclear weapons. The main functions of the NPT are to place an “international taboo” against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, prevent proliferation and disarm existing weaponry. It has been mostly successful in stemming nuclear proliferation. The NPT also establishes a safeguard system governed by the International Atomic Energy Association (IAEA). The IAEA conducts inspections outlined in the treaty. The other focus of the NPT is sharing peaceful nuclear technology amid signers. It outlines methods for all nations to have equal access to peaceful nuclear technology. It also places safeguards within the technology from diverting technology to weapon use.

SANCTIONS

The Columbia Encyclopedia defines the term “sanction” as “any inducement to individuals or groups to follow or refrain from following a particular course of conduct.” “A sanction may either be either positive, i.e., the promise of reward for desired conduct, or negative, i.e., the threat of penalty for disapproved conduct, but the term is most commonly used in the negative sense.” Sanctions are imposed as a means of avoiding the last step of handling conflict: war. “Under Article 41 of the UN Charter, the Security Council may call on Member States ‘to apply measures not involving the use of armed force to give effect to its decisions,’” (Paul and Akhtar). The Security Council (SC) has turned to mandatory sanctions as a disciplinary tool when peace is being jeopardized and diplomatic efforts have been unsuccessful.

There are several types of sanctions: comprehensive economic and trade sanctions and the commonly grouped targeted sanctions (arms embargo, travel bans, financial, and diplomatic). Comprehensive sanctions covered a wide territory. These sanctions did more harm than good. Many times innocent civilians suffered the consequences of sanctions that were only intended to punish those violating international law. For example, Madeline Albright (the United States’

Secretary of State in 2000) was criticized about the sanctions place on Iraq by the United States in 2000 because it was responsible for the death of half a million Iraqi children. The Security Council has begun to use more targeted sanctions rather such broad means as comprehensive sanctions.

Economic sanctions typically deal with some sort of ban on trade. This ban could be limited to armaments, particular goods, and services. Many times there are exceptions to this sanction such as food and medicine. Economic sanctions can yield much success. A successful example is when the United Nations placed a rigid economic sanction on Iraq after the Gulf War. This was done to as an attempt to make the Iraqi government cooperate with United Nations weapon inspectors' monitoring of Iraq's weapons and weapons programs.

There are four main targeted sanctions: arms embargo, travel bans, financial, and diplomatic. The central purpose of an arms embargo is "to limit the resources an actor has to inflict violence on others and to maintain neutral standing in an ongoing conflict," (BeyondIntractability.com) Arms embargos, in the past, have been place on Afghanistan, Haiti, Iraq, Liberia, Libya, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Somalia, and Yugoslavia. Travel bans or travel sanctions are limitations placed on numerous types of transportation to and from a particular country or region. This may also include limitations on international travel. One classic instance of a travel ban was seen in the passing of Resolution 670 (1990) which "called on all states to deny landing and over-flight to aircraft destined for Iraq unless such aircraft landed at a designated airfield to be inspected for contraband or had a humanitarian clearance from the Sanctions Committee," (UN Sanction Committee). Financial sanctions are placed on a country in order to "freeze" the assets or certain groups, organizations, or individuals who are defying international law. For example, financial sanctions were placed on Al Qaida and the Taliban (not specifically countries).

Last but not least are diplomatic sanctions. This form of sanction usually occurs because a threat for an opposing force to a county's political leader(s). Consequences of this sanction include ending or cutting off certain government relations with that nation. An example of this sanction was placed on Sudan in 1996 because an Egyptian terrorist group attempted to murder the current Egyptian president at that time.

HUMAN SECURITY

Human security focuses on people and their well-being and the impact and importance of human relationships. While it is critical for issues such as weapons proliferation and sanctions to be addressed by the United Nations, the defining of human security to encompass human rights, poverty, opportunities, and the environment has introduced a new element of security in the United Nations. This element emphasizes people and the sustainability of people.

The former Secretary-General of the United Nations Kofi Annan defines and explains human security in the following way:

"Human security, in its broadest sense, embraces far more than the absence of violent conflict. It encompasses human rights, good governance, access to education and health care and ensuring that each individual has opportunities and

choices to fulfill his or her potential. Every step in this direction is also a step towards reducing poverty, achieving economic growth and preventing conflict. Freedom from want, freedom from fear, and the freedom of future generations to inherit a healthy natural environment – these are the interrelated building blocks of human – and therefore national – security.”

According to Annan’s definition, human security can no longer be simply defined as a prevention or response to warfare, terrorism, and organized violence, but it must incorporate human growth and development and the quality of life. Annan’s broad definition of human security also emphasizes the importance for people to have certain essential freedoms, such as the “freedom from want, the freedom from fear, and the freedom of future generations to inherit a healthy natural environment.” The “freedom from want” and “the freedom from fear” focus on essential needs being met and people having the right to live without fear of disease or war or other harmful acts. In contrast to the first two, the third freedom Annan mentions is “the freedom of future generations to inherit a healthy environment”; he implies that to ensure this freedom for future generations people today have to take responsibility for the environment and keep it healthy.

Since Annan’s defining of human security, the United Nations Commission on Human Security (CHS) has been established with the goal of ensuring the “freedom from want” and the “freedom from fear.” The CHS has since developed a framework for achieving these goals. The framework consists of two steps: protection and empowerment. While the protection of the people is essential to keep people from serious threats, the empowerment of people is also a critical step because it helps individuals and gives them the resources to make informed choices.

Also incorporated into Annan’s definition is the relationship between human security and national security. To ensure human security, people must be protected and empowered. Through the combination of protection and empowerment, individuals are able to develop and strengthen, and in turn, nations are able to develop and strengthen themselves.

Overall, the issue of human security is not one to be taken lightly. Even though the term ‘human security’ encompasses a broad range of topics, each topic is directly related to the people and the relationships and bonds that connect them. The ability to ensure human security can and will shape the future of not only today’s people, but also of future generations.

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE

A relatively recent issue, the United Nations is becoming increasingly concerned with the issue of sustainable development in the international community in the context of changing climatic conditions. Sustainable development more or less refers to the effort by which states seek to obtain and maintain natural resources, i.e. food, water, and energy (fuel), for the purpose of meeting the needs of its population, growing its economy, and sustaining its infrastructure. It is important to note that sustainable development is inherently not only linked to food and water security, but also substantially to a state’s fuel or energy security. Basically, access to energy means access to development. According to the U.N. Economic and Social Council, though, the

challenge is “finding ways to reconcile this necessity and demand for energy with its impact on the natural resource base in order to ensure that sustainable development goals are realized.” To further study and address these issues, the U.N. Economic and Social Council formed the Commission on Sustainable Development in the 1990s. The Commission’s “Agenda 21” report published in 1992 found that “current levels of energy consumption and production are not sustainable, especially if demand continues to increase.” The Commission’s Johannesburg Plan of Implementation, produced in 1997, laid down an institutional framework for by which states can obtain sustainable development. Currently, the Commission has organized the Poznań Climate Change Conference for 2008 and plan to hold an U.N. Framework Convention in Copenhagen in 2009 to discuss current trends of climate change and growing threats to food, water, and energy security, as well as possibly provide a “call to action” for member states act.

As previously stated, a state’s food, water, and energy (fuel) security is crucial to obtaining sustainable development. Over the last two decades, specifically, the U.N. along with several scientists, academics, and research organizations have been both observing and are increasingly predicting growing environmental and human stresses on food, water, and energy resources, although the extent of which human activity has contributed to Earth’s natural warming and cooling patterns is still hotly debated. One major concern threatening natural resource security is the incredible growth and consumption patterns of the human population over the past century. The human population has grown some four-fold over the past century, more rapid than any other period of human history. This intense growth in population is straining the food, water, and energy resources of many states. As a result, according the Earth Policy Institute, the world’s average grain land per person has halved from 1950 to 2007. Correspondingly, in seven of the past eight years, world grain consumption has been greater than the world’s grain production, leading to increased instances of hunger and poverty across the globe. The rise of hunger and poverty in a state can result in a major humanitarian crisis and also destabilize a region in which the government is unable or unwilling to meet to basic needs of its citizens.

Desertification, or the process in which irrigable land is eroded into desert, is increasingly being observed in several parts of the globe and is projected to further continue. Desertification is currently observed in Africa, the Middle East, and in Western China, and affects some 1/6 of the world’s population and about ¼ of the world’s land area. It is significant because desertification reduces the amount of land available for agriculture and raising animals, thereby further reducing the world’s food supply. This is especially significant as Western China serves as one of three breadbasket regions for the world’s supply of grain. Desertification is also of great concern because as land needed for food production is further reduced, farmers and herders are forced to migrate into new areas, usually resulting in conflict over the extremely important resource of land. Sudan is a particularly effective example of such conflict. Desertification is forcing black Christian farmers northward for new land as ethnically Arab herders are moving southward in search of viable pastureland. According to which state is asked, the ethnically Arab Sudanese government has allowed militants to launch waves of genocide against farmers, which has killed many and forced others into refugee camps in Sudan or in surrounding states.

Another major issue of concern is increasing water scarcity in the world. As the world’s population increases, the demand for water also increases. Humans need water for survival, but water is also required to raise crops and animals for food production. To meet these needs, states

are increasingly over-pumping their aquifer systems past their rate of recharge, which lowers the water table, possibly causing some water wells to dry up. As the water table lowers, farmers are increasingly hard-pressed to obtain sufficient amounts of water to produce enough crops to feed a growing population. Furthermore, with increased instances of urbanization, water is being diverted from agricultural production to meet the increasing needs of urban areas. As water is pulled from agriculture, fewer crops can be grown, thereby further reducing the amount of food available for growing populations.

A final issue threatening water, food, and fuel security is rising ocean levels. Although still debated by some, several scientific organizations are observing ocean levels rise at a rate previously thought not possible due to massive glacial melts from the Greenland and Antarctic ice sheets. Current projections by the International Institute for Environment and Development estimate that the approximate one-eighth of the world's urban population living along shorelines would be threatened by the currently projected 10 meter rise in sea level. Small island nations would be particularly at risk, as they are currently being slowly pushed toward higher ground and could suffer a collapse of its food, water, and energy sources. In a U.N. press release on September 25, 2008 representatives from several small island states reported that "soaring fuel prices [have] made transportation of food and other essential commodities prohibitively expensive." In addition, as sea levels are currently projected to continue to rise, there remains the possibility of future mass migration of people from low-lying areas to other states, possibly resulting in political tensions and humanitarian crises. Also of note is that as seas continue to rise and warm, more powerful storms are being created which can interrupt oil production and refining in certain areas and flood residential and farming areas.

At this point you may be wondering how these environmental and climatic changes bear upon international political and humanitarian security? Well, according to Earth Policy Institute researcher Lester Brown, food, water, and fuel insecurity often lead to political insecurity. As food, water, and energy security is increasingly becoming threatened by human and environmental events, a state's government could become unable to provide for the basic needs of its people or be unable to secure a viable form of energy for sustainable economic development. That government will often subsequently lose its political legitimacy and its population will instead often turn to regional or tribal authorities, such as warlords, for leadership. Fragmenting governmental and social stability often arises and often leads to the outbreak of civil war. Civil wars, unfortunately, have a tendency to destabilize its surrounding region and can even spill into neighboring states. Destabilized states and regions concern the U.N. and sometimes even the Security Council because within these destabilized areas, there is a possibility that genocide can occur, or a major humanitarian crises can erupt due to a potentially large number of displaced persons and refugees. Also, in destabilized areas, terrorist groups and members of the international drug trade have been known to establish safe havens in these areas.

Even the Security Council is beginning to realize that a relationship exists between the maintenance of global security and the ability of a state to obtain sustainable development. In its resolution 1809 adopted on 16 April 2008 concerning peace and security in Africa, one perambulatory clause stated that "one major constraint facing some regional organizations, in particular the African Union, in effectively carrying out the mandates of maintaining regional peace and security is securing predictable, sustainable and flexible resources." Exacerbating this

problem is the growing threat to food and water security due to increased human demand for water and food resources, as well as more extreme climatic events such as drought, flood, and heat wave, which further impede the ability of food producers to provide grain and meat for human consumption. As Brown also points out, “political insecurity and food insecurity go hand-in-hand.” The U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization’s list of states in most dire need of food assistance reports that 17 of the 33 states on its current list need external food help because of internal conflict within its borders. The list includes notable states such as Afghanistan, Burundi, Côte d’Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Guinea, Pakistan, Somalia, Sudan, and Zimbabwe. Food insecurity, among other demographic and environmental factors, contributes to the failures of states. Those above listed states with dire food needs are among the top 20 states on a 2006 list of currently failing states.

The case in point for the United Nations is that if international states are unable to procure a viable source of energy for sustainable development within the parameters of changing climatic conditions, a substantial possibility exists that the U.N. could face increasing instances of failing states, resource conflicts, humanitarian crises, and destabilized regions. “Failing states are of international concern because they are a source of terrorists, drugs, weapons, and refugees.” The most basic point here is that “it is failing states that provide the greatest threat to global order and stability.”

As the world is beginning to realize potential problems with the inability of states to achieve sustainable development, some states have taken a proactive effort to develop other means of sustainable energy, in addition to fossil-based fuels. One source of alternative energy that has been developed is biofuel. Biofuel, as it exists in the United States, is produced by distilling corn into ethanol and then mixing with gasoline. The United States also produces biodiesel, which is similar to corn-based biofuel, but made from soybean ethanol and mixed with diesel gasoline. Brazil also produces a biofuel from sugarcane-based ethanol, but the focus at the moment is on corn-based biofuel. Although some states are still researching the viability of biofuel for sustainable energy, proponents claim that biofuel produces cleaner emissions, improves air quality, provides additional revenue to farmers, and serves as a domestic source of energy, which can create jobs and reduce a state’s dependence on foreign sources of oil.

Concerns have arisen, however, about the “real” viability and “true costs” of using biofuel for sustainable development. Some scientists argue that although the use of ethanol “stretches” the supply of oil, biofuel does not provide the same power output of a regular gasoline mixture. The argument is that because ethanol apparently does not provide the same power output, the mile-per-gallon performance of biofuel is less than gasoline, requiring more fuel to achieve the same energy output, although studies are still being conducted by various organizations and companies. Another major concern over the use of biofuel is that because corn is used to produce biofuel, corn that would have originally gone to food production is instead diverted into fuel production. The issue here is that as the United States is a major “bread basket” of corn and wheat for the world’s supply of grain, along with China and India, removing a substantial portion of corn from America’s production of grain reduces the world’s supply of food. As the U.S. has started converting corn into fuel, the world’s price of corn has nearly doubled and the price of wheat has more than doubled, making it harder for more impoverished populations to obtain sufficient food. This is a major issue because as the price of grain worldwide has risen, crop-

producing states have been reducing the amount of food given to the U.N. World Food Bank to help stave off starvation and humanitarian crises in refugee camps and war-torn regions of the globe. As the United States currently has enough ethanol distilleries to convert one-fifth of its corn crop into fuel, the possibility exists that world food prices can continue to climb and the overall world's food supply grain will dwindle. As the U.S. is converting more grain into fuel, the world's human population is still rapidly expanding, especially in regions where there are already climatic and human threats to food and water security, further creating an ever-increasing demand for food resources. If the U.S. continues to pull corn from the world's supply, states across the globe will increasingly find it more difficult to obtain sufficient grain supplies to feed growing populations.

In addition, scientific observations show that the world's amount of land used for meat and crop production is rapidly declining due to increased urbanization, which pulls needed water from agriculture, increased instances of desertification, especially in war-torn Africa and the breadbasket region of western China, dropping water tables due to aquifer over-pumping, and increased instances of flooding attributed to rising sea levels and more powerful oceanic storms. To reiterate the Earth Policy Institute, the world's average grain land per person has halved from 1950 to 2007. Furthermore, some scientists attribute increasingly observed crop yield reduction and failure to slowly rising atmospheric temperatures. Crop plants can only grow and yield its harvest if it remains below its "thermal optimum," or the temperature at which photosynthesis slows, reducing plant growth. A crop can also suffer "thermal shock," killing the plant if temperatures reach high enough. In effort to maximize harvest, most crops in the world are grown just under their thermal optimum, resulting in a substantial chance for mass crop failure if atmospheric conditions continue to rise, as currently projected.

The overall concern over the use of corn-based biofuel is how viable is biofuel as a source of energy for sustainable development, based upon not only the economic costs of producing biofuel, from seed to gas tank, but also what are the environmental costs, and more importantly, what is the "human" cost of using biofuel? Is biofuel an acceptable and viable source of energy for sustainable development? How do the projected benefits compare to the projected problems, especially if the result is a reduction of the world's food supply at a time, when demand for food is currently ever-increasing?

Another possible alternative source of energy that is available is nuclear energy. With nuclear energy, the unstable element uranium undergoes radioactive decay by which it releases waves of atomic energy in its process of becoming the stable element lead. Nuclear reactor stations harness this atomic energy and convert it into electricity for human use. Proponents of peaceful nuclear energy claim that nuclear energy is capable of both supplying efficient energy for sustainable development and helping to mitigate climate change. In a September 26, 2008 press release to the U.N., India's Prime Minister Manmohan Singh exclaimed that, "the opening of international civil nuclear cooperation with India will have a positive impact on global energy security and on efforts to combat climate change." Scientist Thomas B. Cochran recently published a report entitled "Environmental, Safety, and Economic Implications of Nuclear Power." In his report, Cochran explains that currently, nuclear power is a low carbon emitter, a reliable generator of electricity, a provider of low cost electricity from existing power plants, a

reliable and plentiful supply of fuel, and has low health impacts from routine power plant emissions.

Cochran, however, also explains that there are some concerns about the use of nuclear energy. Cochran explains that with nuclear power there is an increased risk of nuclear weapon proliferation, a risk of a reactor accident, an unresolved waste disposal problem, health and environmental problems with uranium mining, and the projection that is not economical to build new power plants at the moment. Furthermore, the International Atomic Energy Association (IAEA) has recently expressed concern over its ability to respond effectively to a major nuclear accident.

States around the globe are increasingly looking to alternative source of energy for sustainable development. Accordingly, nuclear power increasingly seems to a particularly attractive candidate for states in search for efficient and sustainable energy. The U.N. has been aware for some time that Iran and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (North Korea) have apparently been developing or attempting to develop a nuclear energy program for "peaceful purposes." India declared on September 26, 2008 its support for developing peaceful nuclear energy programs around the globe and will probably attempt to start its own in the immediate future. Just a day or two after that announcement to the U.N., Venezuela's president announced to his citizens that Venezuela seeks to establish a peaceful nuclear energy program. The major contingency here, especially for the U.N. Security Council, is determining which states honestly wish to pursue nuclear energy for peaceful purposes and which states are seeking to develop nuclear weapons programs. So, which states are allowed to develop an atomic energy program and which states have sanctions leveled against them?

Traditionally, the United Nations has relied on the International Atomic Energy Association to enforce and monitor proliferation agreements. Unfortunately for the U.N., on September 29, 2008, Dr. Mohamed ElBaradei, Director General of the IAEA, warned the United Nations that it "urgently needs greater funds and resources to carry out its multifaceted tasks, from verifying that Iran is not seeking nuclear weapons and preventing terrorists from acquiring radioactive materials to spurring advances in medicine and agriculture." Dr. ElBaradei specifically expressed concern that "years of zero-growth budgets have left the IAEA with a failing infrastructure and a troubling dependence on voluntary support." Dr. ElBaradei specifically pointed out that no less than 90 per cent of the IAEA's nuclear security program depends upon voluntary funding. Other major issues of concern expressed to the U.N. included shortcomings in adequate legal authority, state-of-the-art technology, timely access to all relevant information, and sufficient human and financial resources. Essentially, Dr ElBarade argued that "there is a disconnect between what you, the member States, are asking us to do, and the legal authority and resources available to us."

As with biofuel, nuclear energy has the capacity to provide effective and sustainable energy to fulfill the need for states across the globe to achieve sustainable development for their domestic needs. The question with nuclear energy is how viable is nuclear energy in the context of the monetary cost for developing and maintaining nuclear reactors and the possible environmental costs of waste disposal and a possible nuclear meltdown or reactor explosion? Perhaps more important to the U.N., especially for the Security Council, is how to balance the need for states to

obtain a viable source of energy for sustainable development and the need to maintain world security, namely in preventing rogue states and terrorist groups from building or obtaining nuclear weapons.

DEMOCRATIZATION AND ELECTIONS MONITORING

Few movements defined the twentieth century more than the struggle for democracy. Although there is no standard definition of democracy that has been adopted by the United Nations, the United Nations Democracy Fund has recognized that the ability for citizens to influence their government is the identifying factor in identifying a nation as a democracy. This ability breaks into several factors, identified as follows: the ability to amend the Constitution, elections at national and sub-national levels, legislative structures at the regional and national level, the rule of law, human rights, public participation and political parties, transparent administration and public administration. Democracy must occur at more than just the national level, it also must occur at regional and local levels. Recognizing the impact of democracy on human rights and international security and the impact of elections on domestic security, the United Nations has taken an interest in promoting democracy and monitoring elections through several methods.

Democracy matters for several reasons. According to Ban Ki-moon's 2008 International Day of Democracy address, "Consolidated democracies do not go to war against each other. Human rights and the rule of law are best protected in democratic societies. And development is much likelier to take hold if people are given a genuine say in their own governance, and a chance to share in the fruits of progress." Secretary General Ki-moon makes an important qualification to his democracies though, they must be consolidated democracies. Consolidated democracies are democracies in which democracy is the only respected method of getting things done in a society. Citizens in a consolidated democracy respect the democratic process and the notion of basic human rights that come with the system. Consolidated democracy is a structure of popular opinion in which the citizens consider it, "the only game in town."

Democratization is the process by which institutions are changed to follow democratic principles. Previous theories of democratization focused on the Western experience and its application to non-Western nations. Many of the non-Western democracies based on Western models have fallen. Current democratization theories therefore stress organic models of democratization that emphasizes the culture of the nation. These theories are often grouped by similar culture, i.e. the theory of democratization for East Asia is different than that for Latin America which is different from the one for Islamic states. Attempts to democratize societies must therefore be guided not by past experience with democratization but an analysis of the society one tries to democratize.

As identified above elections are important to the democratic process. In a paper published in the American Political Science Review, Edward N. Muller and Mitchell A. Seligson analyzed various factors (including regime repressiveness, land distribution and income inequality) that could affect political violence. One of the significant variables in their model was regime repressiveness. The authors explained the importance of impact of regime repressiveness by analyzing how the electoral system affected political behavior. If a society has an electoral system which does not respond to the actual voters, change cannot occur through peaceful

means. This leaves violence as a safe method of executing change in a society. Contrast this with societies that have functioning electoral systems. In such systems change can occur through peaceful, electoral methods. It is therefore important that elections be fair and accurate representations of popular opinion so that violence does not result.

Several organizations within and outside the United Nations are responsible for democratization and elections monitoring. The United Nations Democracy Fund is the primary organization responsible for democratization; it conducts research and evaluates the progress of nations as they move towards a sustainable democracy. The United Nations Department on Political Affairs is responsible for much of the elections monitoring done by the United Nations as well as linking democratization efforts by the UN to many of its other efforts. The Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights makes efforts to promote human rights, especially through promoting democratization. The UN Office on Drugs and Crime promotes democratization through analysis of the issue of corruption in countries. The UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs work to promote good economic social policy in nations by tying it to effective public administration. The UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations handles much of the democratization and elections monitoring in post-conflict and transition states in which they operate (often with the assistance of the United Nations Department of Political Affairs). The United Nations Development Fund for Women promotes the equal involvement of women in government. The United Nations Resident Coordinator System seeks to enforce the consistency and complimentary of the United Nations programs. Various International Financial Institutions outside of the UN structure also play a role in planning the macroeconomic policy necessary to build the economic support for democracy. NGOs and other international organizations play a crucial role in the democratization process; these include the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, the Club of Madrid, and the Inter-Parliamentary Union. Several regional organizations also have established procedures for when democracy is under attack in their region.

SECURITY COUNCIL REFORM

The United Nations was formed in 1945. Since then the political, economical and social aspects of the world have drastically changed, yet the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) has remained relatively the same. In 1963, despite unwillingness from permanent members, the UN did manage to pass Resolution 1991 that expanded the number of elected seats from six to ten. Most United Nations Member States agree that UNSC reform, specifically expansion, is again important and necessary; however, technical aspects of the reform have caused a virtual stalemate in progress on the issue for the last several decades. The disagreement is most specifically centered on the number of new seats that will be created, the type of new seats, and which member states should occupy the new seats.

When the Cold War ended, the UNSC became active across the world, and it became apparent that reform should take place. In 1992 a resolution was passed that asked for Member States to submit proposals for UNSC reform. In 1993 there were many proposals, most Member States agreed that change should occur, but there were major differences on the number and type of seats, as well as which countries should be given the seats. Later that same year, a resolution was passed that established an “Open-ended Working Group on the Question of Equitable Representation and Increase in the Membership of the Security Council and Other Matters

related to the Security Council.” Since then this working group is where most debate on UNSC reform takes place.

In the early 1990’s, Germany and Japan became top contributors to the UN, especially during the Gulf War. Both countries began to advocate for permanent seats. Italy also showed interest in wanting a permanent seat but soon realized that it was not likely they would receive a permanent seat. Instead, with the establishment of the European Union, Italy pushed for the EU to have a seat. However, the EU can not feasibly have a seat without becoming a federal state like the United States. Also, Italy did not want Germany to receive a seat because they felt it would create a new power center in Europe, and stifle the affects of the European Union. The United States was willing for both Germany and Japan to have permanent seats. The United Kingdom and France began to push for the German seat because they felt it would legitimize their permanent seat and relieve the EU’s desire for a seat. Soon several factions developed in regards to UNSC reform. The groups include Uniting for Consensus, the Group of Four, and the African group.

Uniting for Consensus (UC) is a group of smaller Member States. Italy, Pakistan, Argentina, South Korea, Spain, Mexico, Canada and several other Member States called for a push to establish more non-permanent seats that would elect members regionally. The UC staunchly opposed creating new permanent seats. They felt permanent seats would restrict the chance of smaller states being able to serve on the UNSC, and they felt permanent seats would create new power centers around the world. Also, the creation of permanent seats would violate the principle of sovereign equality by showing that the new permanent members are “better” than other Member States.

The Group of Four (G-4) consists of Japan, Germany, Brazil and India. This group wants the establishment of new permanent seats based on Article 23 of the UN Charter. The G-4 realized, however, that it would be more feasible to establish permanent seats if they did not have veto power. Japan and Germany are the 2nd and 3rd leading contributors to the UN’s regular budget, respectively. Brazil is a contender for a permanent seat as the largest country, in size and population, in South America. Also, South America does not have a permanent seat, and Brazil feels as a leader of the region, they should receive a seat. India has the second largest population in the world, and one of the largest economies in the world. India also has pushed for their seat because they are the third largest contributor of troops to the United Nations.

The African group wants Africa to have two permanent seats in the UNSC, and they demand to have veto power. The African group makes their argument based on the fact that many UNSC resolutions deal with conflict in Africa. They also claim they are the only continent without a permanent seat (they count North and South America as one continent). The African group published their position in Ezulwini-Consensus, and they request that the two seats would be chosen by the African Union.

Some smaller states, which either do not want a permanent seat or do not think it is realistic for them to get a permanent seat, decided in 1993 that reform should center on the UNSC being available to the General Assembly and that veto votes would be explained in front of the General

Assembly. Reform of UNSC procedures can be done simply by passing a resolution, instead of having to amend the UN Charter.

In 2004 Kofi Annan made two proposals through the Security Council Task Force High Level Panel's Report on Threats, Challenges and Change. Annan wanted UN reform to be discussed during the 2005 World Summit. Article 23 of the UN Charter establishes that UNSC membership should be geographically balanced but also based on contributions to maintaining peace and security. The report goes on to say that the Council's permanent five members (P-5) are not contributing any more to the UN than other member states, yet they get special privileges. The UN would be more effective if the UNSC involved those who contribute more, whether it is monetary contributions, voluntary contributions or troop contributions.

The first proposal, Model A, in the High Level Panel's Report on Threats, Challenges and Change calls for six new permanent seats that do not have veto power and three new two-year, non-permanent seats. Each region, Africa, Asia and Pacific, Europe, and the Americas, would have a combination of permanent and elected seats for a total of six seats each.

Model B does not set up any new permanent seats but establishes one new two-year non-permanent seat and eight semi-permanent seats. The new semi-permanent seats provide four-year, renewable terms. Each region, like in Model A, will get six seats.

The High Level Panel's Report on Threats, Challenges, and Change uses Article 23 to decide which member states will receive the newly established seats. Preference is given to countries that are either a top three financial contributor in their region, a top three voluntary contributor in their region or a top three troop contributor in their region. The report also states that the UNSC should be able to reform in the future based on its effectiveness.

The report states that neither Model A nor B will expand the veto. There is not a realistic or probable way to change existing veto powers, but the veto is problematic because it is in opposition of the diplomatic nature of the UN. The report does urge that P-5 members use their veto power sparingly, and it especially requests that a veto would not be used against resolutions pertaining to genocide or other human rights issues.

Annan also wants to implement "indicative voting" where the General Assembly would be able to cast a public vote to inform the UNSC of Member States' positions resolutions. The GA vote would not have any legal force. The UNSC is supposed to take into consideration the overall position on an issue during their formal vote. The report also reminds that member states who are contributing troops to a specific operation must be consulted under the Article 44 of the UN Charter.

The Member States that made up the Uniting for Consensus group held firm the position that there should be no new permanent seats. Instead they proposed a resolution to the General Assembly that would keep the current P-5 members and create 10 new elected, non-permanent seats.

The G-4 countries group proposed a different resolution. They called for the establishment of 6 new permanent seats, four for each of the sponsoring countries (Germany, Japan, India and Brazil), as well as 2 permanent seats for African countries. The G-4 hoped to gain the support of the African group, but the African group still insisted on veto power.

The reform issue was almost passed at the 2005 World Summit, but the G-4 was unable to convince the African group to give up the veto power. Also, the United States did not want a council with more than 20 members, and they were in support of only Japan receiving a permanent seat.

With reform once again failing, the smaller countries that wanted to again consider centering reform on the working methods of the Council. Costa Rica, Liechtenstein, Singapore, Jordan and Switzerland formed a group known as the Small Five (S-5). They focused on creating more accountability and transparency in the Security Council. They requested that Security Council members consult with the General Assembly before voting on a resolution, and they also called for all vetoes be explained.

The P-5 members were not pleased with the draft of the S-5's resolution. They felt it infringed on their veto right. All of the P-5 members said that "any initiative to reform the working methods should come from within the Security Council."

The S-5 was able to revive the dormant Working Group, and debate on enhancing the working methods of the Security Council began again. The group created five categories for consideration: the number of members on the SC, the type of new membership (whether permanent, non-permanent or semi-permanent), the idea of regional representation, veto power, and working methods of the Security Council.

Panama in 2007 created a proposal that received a lot of attention. The proposal allowed for the creation of six non-permanent seats with five year terms. The members of the new seats could be immediately being re-elected, and four continuous terms automatically allowed permanent membership. This proposal gained support because it seemed to be a good transition from the current Security Council to a new enlarged Council with more permanent members.

This intermediate model was hoped to foster some type of reform since the G-4, the African group or Uniting for Consensus did not have enough support separately. However, each of the factions disagreed with the intermediate model, so again no progress was made.

There are two aspects to Article 23 in the UN Charter. The first is equal regional representation. Africa likes to use this aspect because even though their continent makes up around ¼ of total member states, they do not have a permanent seat on the Security Council. This argument also makes Europe over represented on the Security Council. The other aspect is the UNSC should be made up off the biggest contributors to the UN. Countries like Germany and Japan are big contributors to the UN, yet they do not have a permanent seat.

Theoretically the UNSC members are to serve the interest of the world as a whole, and they are not representing their region. Without regional accountability UNSC members could represent

their national interests instead of the interests of their region. This brings the idea of having regional organizations, such as the EU and AU, hold permanent seats instead of specific countries from those regions.

The issue of veto is also problematic. One view is that veto powers should not be extended even if the Council is expanded. This group of people feels that the veto is undiplomatic to begin with and should not exist in the first place, but also they understand that current veto powers will be unwilling to relinquish their rights. The other view is that the veto should be extended because it would be anticlimactic if permanent membership is extended without the veto. The African group is a supporter of this idea. Some people, however, feel that adding more veto powers would make the UNSC more inefficient.

GENOCIDE

Genocide was defined by the United Nations in 1948 at the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. Genocide is defined “as any of a number of acts committed with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnic, racial or religious group: killing members of the group; causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group, and forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.”

The Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide was important because it defined genocide and officially condemned it- citing it as a crime under international law (whether it occurs during a time of peace or a time of war). The convention also negated the argument of immunity when genocide is concerned: “Persons committing this crime shall be punished, whether they are constitutionally responsible rulers, public officials or private individuals.” Those accused of committing acts of genocide are to be tried in the State where the genocide was committed or an international tribunal that has jurisdiction over the respective parties involved. It is also important to note that the Genocide Convention did not establish a United Nations body or committee to find and punish acts of genocide. Rather “it stipulates that any Contracting Party may call upon the competent organs of the United Nations to take such action under the United Nations Charter, which they consider appropriate for the prevention and suppression of acts of genocide.” By these stipulations, a case may be brought before the International Court of Justice for trial.

The Rome Statue of the International Criminal Court created “an international criminal court for the trials of people accused of crimes the international community considers the most serious. Its purpose is to establish a fair and just international criminal justice system, with competent and impartial judges and an independent prosecutor. Unlike a tribunal formed for a particular case, the Court is a permanent institution. This guarantees that the international community can make immediate use of its services when atrocities occur, and deters people who would perpetrate such crimes.” The Rome Statue is important to the issue of genocide because it declared genocide a crime that is a justifiable offense.

Commonly Cited Case of Genocide

The situation in Rwanda dates back to the 1800s, when there was European occupation of the State. German colonial possession lasted from 1899 until 1916, when the Belgians took power by way of the Treaty of Versailles.

The Europeans in power applied arbitrary labels to the people of Rwanda- either labeling the people Hutus or Tutsis. Resentment between the two groups was culminated by years of Tutsi rule – The Tutsis were favored by the Europeans.

In 1933, the Belgians instituted an identification card system, which only increased resentment between groups.

Social revolution led by Hutu nationalists in 1959 resulted in Rwanda's independence of European control and a Hutu majority. This was the beginning of the Rwandan Civil War and set the stage for widespread genocide. Many Tutsis fled to neighboring states – by 1993, displaced persons count reached 600,000.

Tutsis began forming the Rwandan Patriotic Front and by 1990, the RPF made several attacks in Rwanda.

In June 1993, the United Nations established the United Nations Observer Mission Uganda-Rwanda (UNOMUR) “to monitor the border between Uganda and Rwanda and verify that no military assistance was being provided across it.” The program failed to fully implement its mandate and was officially closed on 21 September 1994.

In October 1993, United Nations Assistance Mission for Rwanda (UNAMIR) was created “to help implement the Arusha Peace Agreement signed by the Rwandese parties on 4 August 1993” and its mandate was strengthened when UNOMUR was officially closed. UNAMIR's mandate ended on 8 March 1996.

In 1994, genocide fully erupts between the Tutsis and the Hutus and the UN creates UNAMIR II to resolve the conflict. UNAMIR II is ineffective and the genocide does not stop until the RPF has control of most of the country and declares a cease fire. By then, nearly one million people had been killed – half that number was killed in 100 days.

Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon said, “As we attempt to learn from the lessons of genocide in Rwanda, two messages should be paramount. First, never forget. Second, never stop working to prevent another genocide. Our thoughts go to the victims – the more than 800,000 innocent people who lost their lives with terrifying speed. Our thoughts go to the survivors. Their resilience continues to inspire us. It is the responsibility of us all to support them in rebuilding their lives. How different it would have been, had we, the international community, acted properly at the proper time.”

Lessons from Rwanda was established on 23 December 2005 by the United Nations General Assembly. The goal of the program was “mobilize civil society for Rwanda genocide victim remembrance and education in order to help prevent future acts of genocide.” The mandate for

the program was extended on 17 December 2007. The purpose of the program was to prevent similar acts of genocide in the future through raising awareness of the impact of genocide on the Rwandan people.