



SRMUN ATLANTA 2016

*The United Nations Post-2015 Agenda:
Peace, Security and Development for a Sustainable Future*
November 17 - 19, 2016
pbcaatlanta@srmun.org

Greetings Delegates,

Welcome to SRMUN Atlanta 2016 and the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). My name is Kristina Drye, and I will be serving as your Director for the PBC. This will be my second conference as a SRMUN staff member. Previously, I served as the Assistant Director for the Press Corps in SRMUN Atlanta 2015. I currently serve as the Program and Membership Manager for the World Affairs Council of Charlotte and hold a Bachelors of Arts in International Studies and Political Science. I also completed a minor in Russian and have completed graduate coursework at the American University of Bosnia and Hercegovina in Sarajevo. Our committee's Assistant Director will be Jamie Aron. This will be Jamie's first time as a staff member, but she has participated in SRMUN as a delegate prior to this year. Jamie graduated in 2016 with a Bachelor of Arts in Political Science and Mathematics.

It is with great pleasure that we welcome you to the PBC for SRMUN 2016. Both Jamie and I have extensive experience with conflict resolution and are passionate about peacebuilding and the potential this committee has for dialogue in this conference.

By focusing on the mission of the PBC and the SRMUN Atlanta 2016 theme of "*The United Nations Post-2015 Agenda: Peace, Security and Development for a Sustainable Future*", we have developed the following topics for the delegates to discuss at the conference:

- I. Peacebuilding Efforts in Response to Censorship, Libricide, and the Destruction of Cultural Heritage
- II. Effective Financing for Conflict Resolution and Peacebuilding

While this guide should provide substantial information and background on the topics, you should view this as a starting point—a foundation for your peacebuilding studies and discoveries. We encourage you to focus on primary statements and documents as well as your own research. Further, we ask you to contemplate the current strengths and weaknesses of each topic, and think strategically about ways to address the topics at hand. In this committee, you are representing a neutral peace expert nominated by your Member State; not, as is usual in Model UN, the specific agenda of your represented Member State. Therefore, this committee is focused on analysis and research and is uniquely non-partisan.

Each delegation is required to submit a position paper that covers each of the two selected topics and discusses the history, policies, and recommendations pertaining to the aforementioned topics. Position papers should be no longer than 2 pages in length and single-spaced. The objective of the position paper is to convince and persuade the members of your committee that the approach outlined in your paper is the best course of action. It is important to ensure all sides of each issue are adequately addressed and presented in a clear and concise manner that is easy for your audience to understand. We expect each delegation to have well-developed and researched papers that will serve as the foundation for the peacebuilding dialogue we expect will occur. For specific details of formatting or if you need help in crafting a position paper, please visit the SRMUN website (www.srmun.org). ***Please note that all position papers MUST be submitted by October 28, 2016 by 11:59 PM EST using the submission system on the SRMUN website.***

The PBC will be a report writing committee at SRMUN Atlanta 2016 and delegates should contact us if there are questions regarding what will be expected at the conference.

We are excited to see what your position papers will hold and the discussions during SRMUN. We wish you the best of luck on your preparation and look forward to seeing you in the future. Please feel free to contact Allie Molinari, or myself should you have any questions or concerns.

Kristina Drye
Director
pbcaatlanta@srmun.org

Jamie Aron
Assistant Director
pbcaatlanta@srmun.org

Allie Molinari
Deputy Director-General
Ddgatlanta@srmun.org

Committee History of the Peacebuilding Commission

The Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) was first proposed in December 2004.¹ The reasoning behind the proposal of creating the PBC was that the High Level Panel on Threats, Challenges, and Change suggested that unlike the difficult task of ending existing conflicts, the United Nations (UN) could begin to focus on preventing violent conflicts.² In September 2005, the Millennium 5+ Summit was held and it was officially agreed that the PBC would be established by the end of the year but any further details were left for future debate within the General Assembly (GA).³ The largest hurdle that the UN faced in establishing the PBC was determining which UN body PBC would report to, which was decided at the 60th Session of the GA.⁴ It was decided that PBC would report to both the GA and the Security Council (SC), but that GA would be directly in charge of reviewing and overseeing the PBC's operations.⁵ The PBC was officially established on 20 December 2005 by SC Resolution 60/180 and GA Resolution 1645 (2005).⁶ The mandate of PBC included a threefold approach to peacebuilding.⁷ The three fold approach centered on bringing the appropriate groups together to oversee resource use, pay special attention to reconstruction and institution building efforts, and to provide accurate information for a group's participation in peace building activities.⁸ On 11 October 2006, the UN created the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) to finance the PBC.⁹ The PBF relies on voluntary contribution from Member States.¹⁰ The current chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission is Amb Kamau, who is Kenya's Permanent Representative to the UN.¹¹

PBC operates with three primary configurations meant to simplify the flow and organization of funds and resources from the international community to areas of post-conflict peacebuilding and conflict resolution.¹² The Organizational Committee is comprised of 31 Member States that establish the work agenda for the PBC and the calendar for the Commission's activities.¹³ These 31 Member States consist of seven members elected by the General Assembly, seven selected by the Security Council, seven members elected by the Economic and Social Council, the five top providers of military personnel and civilian police to UN missions, and five of the top providers of assessed contributions to the UN budgets and of voluntary contributions to the UN funds, programs, and agencies.¹⁴ Currently these members are (in order of the descriptions given above, respectively): Colombia, Egypt, El Salvador, Kenya, Malaysia, Montenegro, and Morocco; Angola, China, France, Russia, United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela; Brazil, Georgia, Italy Kazakhstan, Republic of Korea, South Africa, Trinidad and Tobago; Bangladesh, Ethiopia, India, Nigeria, and Pakistan; Canada, Germany, Japan, The Netherlands, and Sweden.¹⁵

The Country-Specific Configuration (CSC) is a group of six working groups pertaining specifically to a post-conflict Member State who has a general sense of security and has expressed interest in appearing on the PBC agenda.¹⁶ These working groups use video communication, field research, and relevant actors to work together to enable the

¹ "The Peacebuilding Commission," *Global Policy Forum*, <https://www.globalpolicy.org/un-reform/un-reform-topics/the-peacebuilding-commission.html>, (Accessed August 4, 2016).

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ "Mandate of the Peacebuilding Commission," *United Nations Peacebuilding Commission*, <http://www.un.org/en/peacebuilding/mandate.shtml>, (Accessed August 4, 2016).

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ "The Peacebuilding Commission," *Global Policy Forum*, <https://www.globalpolicy.org/un-reform/un-reform-topics/the-peacebuilding-commission.html>, (Accessed August 4, 2016).

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ "Chairperson," *United Nations Peacebuilding Commission*, <http://www.un.org/en/peacebuilding/chairperson.shtml>, (Accessed August 4, 2016).

¹² "Structure & Membership," *United Nations Peacebuilding Commission*, <http://www.un.org/en/peacebuilding/structuremember.shtml>, (Accessed August 4, 2016).

¹³ "Organizational Committee Members," *United Nations Peacebuilding Commission*, <http://www.un.org/en/peacebuilding/orgcommittee.shtml>, (Accessed August 4, 2016).

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ "Country Specific Configurations," *United Nations Peacebuilding Commission*, <http://www.un.org/en/peacebuilding/countryconfig.shtml>, (Accessed August 4, 2016).

establishment of peace.¹⁷ The CSCs include all of the members of the Organizational Committee, the Member State in question, the Member States in the region engaged in the post-conflict process, major financial, troop, and police contributors, a senior UN representative in the field and other relevant UN representatives, and relevant regional and international financial institutions.¹⁸ Currently, there are six CSCs: Burundi, Central African Republic, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Sierra Leone, and Liberia.¹⁹

The Working Group on Lessons Learned (WGLL), chaired currently by H.E. Oh Joon, the Ambassador and Permanent Representative of the Republic of Korea to the UN, was established to “distil lessons from previous national and international experiences in post-conflict engagements.”²⁰ This group meets in hopes that it will be an opportunity to incorporate lessons and recommendations from previous peacebuilding efforts into current policies.²¹

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ “Working Group On Lessons Learned,” *United Nations Peacebuilding Commissions*, http://www.un.org/en/peacebuilding/sm_lessonslearned.shtml, (Accessed August 4, 2016).

²¹ Ibid.

I: Peacebuilding Efforts in Response to Censorship, Libricide, and the Destruction of Cultural Heritage

*"The fire lasted into the next day; the sun was obscured by the smoke of books, and all over the city sheets of burned paper, fragile pages of grey ash, floated down like a dirty black snow. Catching a page you could feel its heat, and for a moment read a fragment of text in a strange kind of black and grey negative, until, as the heat dissipated, the page melted to dust in your hand."*²²

—Kemal Bakarsic, Chief Librarian of the National Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina

Introduction

While cultural heritage has beginnings in time immemorial, the active protection of cultural heritage, the active prevention of and protection against censorship, and the active study of libricide are all recent developments. Just like the term “terrorism”, there exists no specific definition for “cultural heritage,” though many definitions are given in various pieces of international law.²³ Libricide and biblioclasm, both extensions of cultural heritage, are also new words, accompanying newer areas of study that have just taken root in scholarly discourse.²⁴ Despite the lack of awareness and study, the destruction of books and cultural property is a very real issue in conflict today.²⁵

The advancement of humanity directly correlates with the advancement of the book.²⁶ One of the most revolutionary inventions by man was the printing press, which resulted in 10 to 12 million books less than 50 years after its invention in Europe.²⁷ Prior to the printing press, it is estimated that there were less than 30,000 books in the same area.²⁸ Books represent a means of cultural heritage that is both fragile and significant. Barbara Tuchman, Pulitzer Prize-winning American historian, corroborated this idea in her address to the Library of Congress in 1980: “Books are the carriers of civilization. Without books, history is silent, literature dumb, science crippled, thought and speculation at a standstill. Without books, the development of civilization would have been impossible”.²⁹

A consistent occurrence throughout history and irrespective of geographical boundaries, the destruction of books, and now digital information, is a tool used by varying parties in conflicts to control information, destroy culture, and erase or manipulate identity.

History of Censorship, Libricide, and the Destruction of Cultural Heritage

In the beginning of the history of writing, all methods were usually only available in private collections or in libraries.³⁰ In ancient civilizations, libraries were cultivated as centers of learning.³¹ As the Dark Ages commenced, books were largely unavailable, and monasteries were the only places where texts were conserved.³² Collections of

²² Knuth, Rebecca, *Libricide: The Regime-sponsored Destruction of Books and Libraries in the Twentieth Century*, Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003, pp.1-19.

²³ Mollick, Jennifer Otterson, "The Fate of Cultural Property in Wartime: Why It Matters and What Should Be Done," *Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs*, September 17, 2013, http://www.carnegiecouncil.org/publications/ethics_online/0085, (Accessed July 20, 2016).

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Knuth, Rebecca, *Libricide: The Regime-sponsored Destruction of Books and Libraries in the Twentieth Century*, Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003, pp. 19-49.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Knuth, Rebecca, *Libricide: The Regime-sponsored Destruction of Books and Libraries in the Twentieth Century*, Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003, pp. 5.

³⁰ Báez, Fernando, and Mac Adam Alfred J, *A Universal History of the Destruction of Books: From Ancient Sumer to Modern Iraq*, New York: Atlas, 2008.

³¹ Ibid.

³² "The Gutenberg Press," *Oregon State University Libraries: Treasures of the McDonald Collection*, (Accessed July 26, 2016).

books became more available as the Renaissance spurred the growth of intellectual havens, and the invention of the printing press by Johannes Gutenberg in the mid-15th century revolutionized the availability of books and the ability of authorship.³³ After the printing press, literature was widely available to a growing audience.³⁴

Censorship, through destruction and other wise, was not limited to one geographical area of the world. Qin Shi Huang, who ascended the Chinese throne in 230 BCE, ordered in 213 BCE the destruction of all books in China except those dealing with agriculture, prophecy, or medicine.³⁵ He ordered all the books that were not of the Legalists, who were supporters of his regime, confiscated; and ordered his men to go house-to-house burning anything that did not fit into his approved categories.³⁶ He also ordered literary men burned alive and their families ostracized.³⁷ After his death, in the conflict surrounding his successor, his own library was destroyed.³⁸ Even after a period of literary renaissance, that paralleled the invention of paper, libraries were destroyed, sometimes by invading Mongol forces, sometimes by dynasty transitions, and once by the Emperor himself, who burned his royal library, containing over 140,000 books, as his capital was seized.³⁹ In the West, during the Middle Ages, books were often censored and then destroyed because they were considered heretical.⁴⁰ Queen Isabella of Spain, during the Reconquista, lifted Francisco Jimenez de Cisneros to the position of archbishop of Toledo.⁴¹ In this position he ordered all Muslims to burn their Korans and other books.⁴² It is estimated that at least half of Sufi literature was devastated by the Reconquista during this time period.⁴³

Though books, and literature in general, saw a resurgence in the Renaissance and following the invention of the printing press, censorship was still commonplace.⁴⁴ Many books and pamphlets, now readily available, were destroyed because of their content; sometimes it was considered too atheistic, sometimes it was considered too revolutionary, and sometimes it was considered licentious.⁴⁵ These copies were usually ordered to be burned or otherwise destroyed, and their authors were forced to find asylum in other Member States.⁴⁶ During the French Revolution, a movement intended to fight censorship that had been seen in Europe, and the world, for centuries gave little thought to the preservation of books or of cultural property.⁴⁷ Hundreds of thousands of manuscripts and an unquantifiable number of cultural artifacts were destroyed or lost during the French turmoil.⁴⁸

As censorship continued to occur throughout history, so did libricide and the destruction of cultural artifacts. Ancient Egypt was a location of some of the most important libraries in the ancient world.⁴⁹ Baez notes that more than 80 percent of Egyptian literature and science has been lost.⁵⁰ Constantinople experienced centuries of burned libraries and iconoclasm. The sack of Constantinople in the Fourth Crusade in 1204 resulted in the destruction of

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Báez, Fernando, and Mac Adam Alfred J, *A Universal History of the Destruction of Books: From Ancient Sumer to Modern Iraq*, New York: Atlas, 2008.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Gracie, Carrie, "Qin Shi Huang: The Ruthless Emperor Who Burned Books," *BBC News*, October 15, 2012, <http://www.bbc.com/news/magazine-19922863>, (Accessed June 24, 2016).

³⁹ Polastron, Lucien X., and Jon E. Graham, *Books on Fire: The Destruction of Libraries throughout History*, Rochester, VT: Inner Traditions, 2007.

⁴⁰ Báez, Fernando, and Mac Adam Alfred J, *A Universal History of the Destruction of Books: From Ancient Sumer to Modern Iraq*, New York: Atlas, 2008.

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

manuscripts and damage to the Hagia Sophia.⁵¹ The siege by Sultan Mahomet in 1453 resulted in the sacking of most churches in the city, and in manuscripts being burned or otherwise destroyed.⁵² This siege marked not only the end of Constantinople but also the end of its literary legacy.⁵³

As the means of destruction became more devastating, the loss of books followed. Countless items, cultural property and books, were lost in the twentieth century.⁵⁴ The Spanish Civil War saw libraries burned and bombed, archives purged, and bookshop owners required to cull their stocks.⁵⁵ During the Holocaust and World War II, The Nazi Regime persecuted authors, systematically burned books and archives, restricted freedom of the press and the confiscation of material, and destroyed vast collections of information.⁵⁶ The book bonfires of May 1933, ordered by Joseph Goebbels, marked the first time any publication used the term “bibliocaust”.⁵⁷ After the bonfires, Goebbels purged all libraries, public and private; prohibit the works of authors; made a list of all condemned artwork, including music and paintings; and lists of cultural artifacts to be confiscated or destroyed.⁵⁸ Goebbels was aided in his crusade by Alfred Rosenberg, the director of the Office for General Supervision of Culture, Ideology, Education, and Instruction.⁵⁹ Not only did the Nazi regime destroy the books within its own Member State, but it also destroyed the libraries and cultural property of all Member States that it invaded or occupied.⁶⁰ Some experts estimate that the loss of books in Poland alone reached nearly fifteen million.⁶¹

Throughout history, the story of censorship and destruction has repeated itself. Some destruction was state-sanctioned; some was by war and conquest; others were self-inflicted; and a large segment of books were destroyed in natural disasters or as a result of conflicts that occurred centuries after the book’s inception.⁶²

Current Situation

The phenomena of censorship, libricide, and the destruction of cultural heritage has not waned with the 21st century. In Iraq, millions of books and artifacts have been stolen or destroyed in the last 15 years by the varying rebel groups and insurgents.⁶³ On 12 April 2003, the Baghdad Archaeological Museum was looted, its galleries destroyed, and more than 14,000 objects were stolen.⁶⁴ On 14 April 2003, a million books in the National Library were burned, and the National Archive, with more than ten million registries from the Ottoman Empire, was also burned.⁶⁵ That same April, libraries at the University of Baghdad, the Awqaf Library, the Museum of Natural History in Basra, the

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ Newth, Mette, “The Long History of Censorship,” *Beacon for Freedom of Expression*, 2010.
http://www.beaconforfreedom.org/liste.html?tid=415&art_id=475, (Accessed June 24, 2016).

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ Báez, Fernando, and Mac Adam Alfred J, *A Universal History of the Destruction of Books: From Ancient Sumer to Modern Iraq*, New York: Atlas, 2008.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁰ Borin, Jacqueline, “Embers of the Soul: The Destruction of Jewish Books and Libraries in Poland during World War II,” *Libraries & Culture*, 28.4, 1993. pp. 445-60.

⁶¹ Báez, Fernando, and Mac Adam Alfred J, *A Universal History of the Destruction of Books: From Ancient Sumer to Modern Iraq*, New York: Atlas, 2008.

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ “The Impact of War on Iraq’s Cultural Heritage,” *Colorado State University: CENTCOM*,
<https://www.cemml.colostate.edu/cultural/09476/iraq08-01enl.html>, (Accessed July 26, 2014).

⁶⁵ Báez, Fernando, and Mac Adam Alfred J, *A Universal History of the Destruction of Books: From Ancient Sumer to Modern Iraq*, New York: Atlas, 2008.

Central Public Library, the University Library, and the Islamic Library were all burned.⁶⁶ In Mosul and Tikrit, the libraries were also looted.⁶⁷

Currently in Syria, all six United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) World Heritage Sites have been destroyed.⁶⁸ These sites include the Ancient City of Damascus, the Ancient City of Bosra, Palmyra, the Ancient City of Aleppo, the Crac des Chevaliers and Qal'at Salah El-Din, and the Ancient Villages of Northern Syria.⁶⁹ The destruction is due to the complicated fighting in Syria and all parties are responsible: the varying factions in the Syrian Civil War, the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS/Daesh), and Member States that are working to combat these parties.⁷⁰ The destruction of cultural sites brings visibility to the groups, and for many of these groups this international visibility is desperately needed to continue functioning at the current level power.⁷¹ Also necessary for function is funding, which the looting and subsequent sale of antiquities provides.⁷² Lastly, destruction as a means of control and power theoretically lends the groups authority as they continue their goal of regional domination and transformation.⁷³ The destruction to Syrian culture is so unprecedented that UNESCO has dedicated multiple resources to be singularly focused on bringing attention to the systematic destruction, and awareness campaigns have been launched.⁷⁴ The destruction is not limited to Syria, however- it includes any territory affected by the scourge of ISIS/Daesh.⁷⁵

Actions Taken By the PBC, International Bodies, and the United Nations

The Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) itself does not have a specific mandate to combat libricide or to specifically protect the cultural heritage of Member States. PBC works directly in six Member States, the Member State-specific configurations of: Burundi, Sierra Leone, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, and the Central African Republic.⁷⁶ The mandate of the PBC, however, allows it to: "bring together all relevant actors to marshal resources and to advise on and propose integrated strategies for post-conflict peacebuilding and recovery" as well as the "development of integrated strategies in order to lay the foundation for sustainable development."⁷⁷ Due to the broad mandate that allows the PBC to offer recommendations and be involved in peacebuilding processes, all initiatives taken by the PBC with an effort to provide and aid stability in a Member State will directly affect that Member States' attempts to protect and preserve cultural heritage and the written word.⁷⁸ Due to a history of colonization, there is very little available record of cultural heritage and a literary history in the six Member States directly under the PBC's agenda today. However, initiatives taken by the PBC to combat other direct problems facing these Member States have no doubt aided in establishing a safer environment where the protection of cultural heritage can thrive.

⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ "6 out of 6: ALL of Syria's UNESCO Heritage Sites Damaged or Destroyed during Civil War," *RT International*, March 15, 2016, <https://www.rt.com/news/335619-syria-unesco-heritage-damage/>, (Accessed July 26, 2016).

⁶⁹ "World Heritage List," *UNESCO World Heritage Centre*, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/>, (Accessed July 26, 2016).

⁷⁰ "6 out of 6: ALL of Syria's UNESCO Heritage Sites Damaged or Destroyed during Civil War," *RT International*, March 15, 2016, <https://www.rt.com/news/335619-syria-unesco-heritage-damage/>, (Accessed July 26, 2016).

⁷¹ Almukhtar, Sarah, "The Strategy Behind the Islamic State's Destruction of Ancient Sites," *The New York Times*, March 28, 2016, http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2015/06/29/world/middleeast/isis-historic-sites-control.html?_r=0, (Accessed August 4, 2016).

⁷² Ibid.

⁷³ Ibid.

⁷⁴ "Safeguarding Syrian Cultural Heritage," *UNESCO*, <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/safeguarding-syrian-cultural-heritage/>, (Accessed August 4, 2016).

⁷⁵ Curry, Andrew, "Here Are the Ancient Sites ISIS Has Damaged and Destroyed," *National Geographic*, September 1, 2015, <http://news.nationalgeographic.com/2015/09/150901-isis-destruction-looting-ancient-sites-iraq-syria-archaeology/>, (Accessed August 4, 2016).

⁷⁶ "The Peacebuilding Commission," *United Nations Peacebuilding Commission*, <http://www.un.org/en/peacebuilding/>, (Accessed August 4, 2016).

⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁸ Ibid.

Until after World War I (WWI), it was very rare to find explicit protection of cultural property in any national or international legislation. It is, however, possible to find allusions to the concept in guides of warfare. In the 1907 Convention (IV) Respecting the Laws and Customs of War on Land and its Annex: Regulations Concerning the Laws and Customs of War on Land (1907 Convention), there are mentions of the destruction of property as a violation of the laws and customs of war.⁷⁹ In Section II (Hostilities), Chapter One, Article 23, section G, the 1907 Convention notes that it is: “forbidden to destroy or seize the enemy’s property, unless such destruction or seizure be imperatively demanded by the necessities of war.”⁸⁰ Article 25 of the same section notes that: “The attack or bombardment, by whatever means, of towns, villages, dwellings, or buildings which are undefended is prohibited.”⁸¹ This indicates that if cultural property is undefended or, is emblemized as protected and thus undefended, to attack it is forbidden under international law.⁸²

The 1907 Convention also discusses territory that has been occupied.⁸³ Provisions in the 1907 Convention include: Article 47, which formally forbids pillage of occupied territory and Article 53, which requires the safeguarding of public property of the occupied territory, and includes the provision that these must be administered in accordance with the rules of usufruct.⁸⁴ The very definition of usufruct is: “the right to enjoy the use and advantages of another’s property short of the destruction or waste of its substance.”⁸⁵ Finally, Article 56 of the 1907 Convention states that: “The property of municipalities, that of institutions dedicated to religion, charity and education, the arts and sciences, even when State property, shall be treated as private property.”⁸⁶ Article 56 goes on to further state that the destruction of any property such as this is forbidden.⁸⁷

One of the pioneers of the movement to protect cultural monuments and creator of international legislation on the subject was Nicholas Roerich.⁸⁸ Roerich was an advocate of culture and of the protection of culture, specifically the obligation of mankind to develop culture and subsequently protect it.⁸⁹ In the early 1930s, Roerich developed a pact for the protection of culture in times of conflict.⁹⁰ This became known as the Treaty on the Protection of Artistic and Scientific Institutions and Historic Monuments (Roerich’s Pact).⁹¹ Roerich’s Pact was first given legislative form on 16 December 1933 at the Seventh International Conference of American States in Montevideo.⁹² Roerich’s Pact recognized cultural property as neutral ground and therefore respected and protected from belligerents.⁹³ In addition, Roerich’s Pact established an identifying sign, a red circle with a triple sphere on a white background, to be displayed on such neutral territories, a concept that would be copied in later cultural protection legislation.⁹⁴ Roerich’s Pact became the basis for the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of an Armed Conflict.⁹⁵

⁷⁹ “Laws of War: Laws and Customs of War on Land (Hague IV),” *Yale Law School: The Avalon Project*, October 18, 1907, http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/hague04.asp, (Accessed August 4, 2016).

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² Ibid.

⁸³ Ibid.

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁸ “Biography,” *Nicholas Roerich Museum: New York*, <http://www.roerich.org/roerich-biography.php>, (Accessed August 4, 2016).

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁹¹ “Nicholas (Nikolai Konstantinovich) Roerich (1874 – 1947),” *International Center for the Roerichs*, <http://en.icr.su/family/nkr/>, (Accessed August 4, 2016).

⁹² Ibid.

⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁵ “Protection of Artistic and Scientific Institutions and Historic Monuments,” *International Centre of the Roerichs*,

The first international legislation that focuses solely on the protection of cultural property, including books and libraries, came in the wake of the devastating destruction of cultural property in WWII.⁹⁶ In 1954 the UNESCO agreed upon the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of an Armed Conflict, and in 1956 the Convention went into effect.⁹⁷ The Convention outlines the processes for the protection of cultural property during conflict, both international and otherwise, as well as procedures to follow in peacetime in preparation for impending conflict.⁹⁸ In the same year, 1954, the First Protocol to the Convention was passed.⁹⁹ This Protocol covers the exportation and importation of cultural property into other territories, including procedures for the return of cultural property at the cessation of conflict.¹⁰⁰ It also ensures that cultural property would never be held as reparations in post-World War occurrences.¹⁰¹

A Second Protocol to the Convention was passed in 1999, in response to criminal acts against cultural property in the second half of the twentieth century.¹⁰² This included the siege of Dubrovnik in Croatia and the destruction of Mostar in Bosnia-Herzegovina, both acts occurred in the violent breakup of the former Yugoslavia.¹⁰³ The Second Protocol reaffirms the significance of cultural property as military targets, and directs hostile parties to refrain from using cultural property as military objectives.¹⁰⁴ The Second Protocol also institutes the possibility of “enhanced protection”.¹⁰⁵ Any party that believes a respective cultural property be granted “enhanced protection” status may submit a request for the granting of this status; after review, the status will be granted and the site will be submitted to universal immunity.¹⁰⁶

Though the Second Protocol and the initial Convention apply to international and national conflicts, they do not apply to situations of internal disturbances: “such as riots, isolated and sporadic acts of violence and other acts of similar nature.”¹⁰⁷ Furthermore, the Second Protocol explicitly states that: “Nothing in this Protocol should be invoked as a justification for intervening, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the armed conflict or in the internal or external affairs of the Party in the territory of which that conflict occurs.”¹⁰⁸ This means that a party cannot intervene in a conflict for the reason of protecting cultural property, however devastating the damage. The Second Protocol still did not aid in fixing the significant gaps in international law regarding the protection of cultural property.¹⁰⁹

<http://en.icr.su/evolution/pact/>, (Accessed June 24, 2016).

⁹⁶ "Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict with Regulations for the Execution of the Convention 1954," *UNESCO*, http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13637&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html, (Accessed June 24, 2016).

⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸ Ibid.

⁹⁹ "Protocol to the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict 1954," *UNESCO*, http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=15391&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html, (Accessed June 24, 2016).

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

¹⁰² "Second Protocol to the Hague Convention of 1954 for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict 1999," *UNESCO*, http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=15207&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html, (Accessed June 24, 2016).

¹⁰³ Ibid.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.

The Hague Convention has had an active impact on the international community. In addition to the Committee for the Protection of Cultural Property, the Hague Convention resulted in the founding of the International Committee of the Blue Shield (ICBS) to promote the protection of cultural property.¹¹⁰ The symbol agreed upon by the Hague Convention to designate cultural property became known as the Blue Shield, from which this Committee gets its namesake.¹¹¹ The ICBS promotes the Hague Convention, encourages the protection of cultural property, trains experts on prevention, control, and recovery from conflicts and disasters, advises bodies on the protection of cultural heritage, and consults with various organizations.¹¹² The organization has twenty Blue Shield Committees globally and nineteen more are in formative stages.¹¹³ The Association of National Committees of the Blue Shield (ANCBS) as founded in 2008 to coordinate the growing efforts and is headquartered in The Hague, Netherlands.¹¹⁴ The ICBS actively coordinates the networks of the International Council on Archives (ICA), the International Council of Museums (ICOM), the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA), the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), and the Coordinating Council of Audiovisual Archives Association (CCAAA).¹¹⁵ These organizations create a network that the ICBS uses to collect and share information on threats to cultural property, raise public awareness about damage to cultural heritage, and promote risk management at all levels of government and society.¹¹⁶

In 1970, UNESCO passed the Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property.¹¹⁷ This Convention recognizes that it is: “essential for every State to become increasingly alive to the moral obligations to respect its own cultural heritage and that of all nations.”¹¹⁸ This Convention also makes it clear that the export or transfer of ownership of cultural property is illegal and urges that all signing parties to the Convention form national services for the protection of cultural heritage.¹¹⁹ Furthermore, the Convention establishes another definition for cultural property, more extensive than the first definition by UNESCO.

In 1972, UNESCO adopted the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage.¹²⁰ Whereas the 1956 Hague Convention defines cultural property, the 1972 UNESCO Convention establishes a definition for cultural heritage.¹²¹ In addition, Section III Article 8 of the UNESCO Convention establishes the World Heritage Committee, which is intended to act as an intergovernmental committee for the protection of the cultural and natural heritage of outstanding universal value.¹²² As part of the Convention, all parties were required to submit to the World Heritage Committee a full inventory of any property with cultural or national heritage within its borders that would qualify as having outstanding universal value.¹²³ Per respect of the principles of sovereignty, the inclusion of a site in the World Heritage List requires the consent of its respective

¹¹⁰ “Blue Shield - About ICBs,” *International Committee of the Blue Shield*, <http://www.ancbs.org/cms/en/about-us/about-icbs>, (Accessed June 24, 2016).

¹¹¹ Ibid.

¹¹² Ibid.

¹¹³ Ibid.

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

¹¹⁵ Ibid.

¹¹⁶ Ibid.

¹¹⁷ “Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property 1970,” *UNESCO*, http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13039&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html, (Accessed June 24, 2016).

¹¹⁸ Ibid.

¹¹⁹ Ibid.

¹²⁰ “Recommendation Concerning the Protection, at National Level, of the Cultural and Natural Heritage,” *UNESCO*, http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13087&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html, (Accessed June 24, 2016).

¹²¹ Ibid.

¹²² Ibid.

¹²³ Ibid.

Member State.¹²⁴ In addition to this general inventory of cultural property, the Convention also calls for a “list of World Heritage in Danger”, which specifically highlights areas in immediate danger of disappearance or damage.¹²⁵ Member States can apply for requests of aid and assistance from the Committee and the committee will review the requests and determine an order of priorities for its operations.¹²⁶ Currently, there are 1,031 properties on the World Heritage List, and 48 of these properties are on the World Heritage in Danger list.¹²⁷

Conclusion

While international legislation exists with the intent to protect cultural property, limit censorship, and prevent libricide, it is ubiquitous as a tool for, or the result of, conflict.

Committee Directive

The delegates of the 2016 Peacebuilding Commission should use the research that they have done, in addition to the information presented in this background guide; to comprehensively analyze libricide in today’s society. Using their research, they should present a report that covers past atrocities, lessons learned, and recommendations for future prevention, management, response, and recovery of libraries, culturally significant artifacts and locations, and other items that define the cultural heritage of a region and, by extension, the world.

In addition to their assessment of past atrocities and proposals of new policy, delegates should also fully assess existing legislation, hard and soft, and offer recommendations on future implementation. The PBC Dais recommends that delegates research regional and national initiatives and modify them, where applicable, for an international application.

¹²⁴ Ibid.

¹²⁵ Ibid.

¹²⁶ Ibid.

¹²⁷ “World Heritage List,” *UNESCO World Heritage Centre*, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/>, (Accessed July 26, 2016).

II: Effective Financing for Conflict Resolution and Peacebuilding

Introduction

The United Nations Peace Building Commission (PBC) supports and helps stabilize Member States in post-conflict situations by coordinating international bodies and organizations, mustering aid, and strategizing for the most effective path to recovery and peace.¹²⁸ The body fosters: “coexistence and peaceful resolution of conflict.”¹²⁹ The Commission was founded in ideals of “international peace and security,” “justice and human rights,” and the advancement of “social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom.”¹³⁰ The PBC recognizes the path to sustained peace and reconciliation is a “coordinated, coherent and integrated approach,” whereby Member States collaborate to prevent and end conflict.¹³¹ It is sustained by maintaining and strengthening its financial support structures. In 2014 at the PBC Annual Session, the discussion centered on generating revenue from international and domestic resources as well as previous lessons from the: “Development of national capacities and the sustainability of resources in the context of UN missions’ transitions.”¹³² Specifically, Member States discussed the generation of domestic revenues and maintaining commitment from international monetary bodies and donors in post-conflict societies.¹³³ The 2015 PBC Annual Session once again focused on financing peacebuilding efforts and maintaining consistent financial support for post-conflict societies.¹³⁴ At this session, the Peacebuilding Commission reported: “Unpredictable, inadequate and fragmented financing for peacebuilding is hampering the effectiveness and coherence of international support to post-conflict countries and adds unnecessary burdens to host Governments.”¹³⁵ The maintenance of peace depends upon constant, committed support.¹³⁶

In its mission for financial stability and support, the PBC outlines three prongs. First, the PBC hopes to: “Bring together all relevant actors to marshal resources and to advise on and propose integrated strategies for post-conflict peacebuilding and recovery.”¹³⁷ Thus, the PBC’s goal is to coordinate other agencies and organizations to coalesce and unite to finance stability-building efforts in Member States facing conflict and post-conflict situations. Second, the PBC aims to: “Focus attention on the reconstruction and institution-building efforts necessary for recovery from conflict and to support the development of integrated strategies in order to lay the foundation for sustainable development.”¹³⁸ In this point, the PBC demonstrates its commitment to developing and financing viable solutions and endeavors.

Integrated measures developed by experts and individuals belonging to post-conflict communities, their neighbors, and the world system are key for an initiative to remain.¹³⁹ Further, PBC financial stability sets a steady foundation for conflict-ridden areas. Finally, the PBC hopes: “To ensure predictable financing for early recovery activities and to extend the period of attention given by the international community to post-conflict recovery.”¹⁴⁰ Focusing on predictability and consistency in regards to funding and emphasizing the need for continued support, this third prong

¹²⁸ “The Peacebuilding Commission,” *United Nations Peacebuilding Commission*, <http://www.un.org/en/peacebuilding/>, (accessed April 30, 2016).

¹²⁹ “Preventing a relapse into violent conflict,” *United Nations Peacebuilding Fund*, <http://www.unpbf.org> (accessed April 30, 2016).

¹³⁰ A/47/227, *An Agenda for Peace: Preventive diplomacy, peacemaking, and peacekeeping*, United Nations General Assembly.

¹³¹ S/Res/1645, *Resolution 1645 (2005)*, United Nations Security Council, December 20, 2005.

¹³² “Peacebuilding Commission, Annual Session 2015 Predictable financing for peacebuilding: Breaking the silos 23 June 2015,” *United Nations Peacebuilding Commission*, <http://www.un.org/en/peacebuilding/statements/150709%20PBC%20Annual%20Session%20Chair's%20summary-FINAL.pdf> (accessed April 30, 2016).

¹³³ Ibid.

¹³⁴ Ibid.

¹³⁵ Ibid.

¹³⁶ “PBF at a Glance,” *United Nations Peacebuilding Fund*, http://www.unpbf.org/wp-content/uploads/PBF-Brochure-2014-FINAL-PDF-in-English_july_2015.pdf (accessed April 30, 2016).

¹³⁷ “Resolution 1645,” *United Nations Peacebuilding Commission*, [http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1645%20\(2005\)](http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1645%20(2005)) (accessed 30, 2016).

¹³⁸ Ibid.

¹³⁹ Ibid.

¹⁴⁰ “Mandate of the Peacebuilding Commission,” *United Nations Peacebuilding Commission*, <http://www.un.org/en/peacebuilding/mandate.shtml>, (accessed April 30, 2016).

links conflict resolution with rapid financial support and long-term support and commitment.¹⁴¹ Determining predictability and consistency is done by evaluating the leverage of financial resources along with how well the peacebuilding process facilitates peace.¹⁴²

Maintaining Financial Support for Peacebuilding Efforts

The PBC utilizes the United Nations Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) and the United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) to maintain and advance its three-pronged agenda of coordination, mobilization, and strategy.¹⁴³ Established in 2006, the PBF currently supports 222 projects and programs in 22 Member States.¹⁴⁴ Between 2006 and 2015, the PBF provided more than 623 million USD to 33 Member States for 120 projects to build and sustain peace.¹⁴⁵ Since 2011, the PBF has spent the most, nearly 80 million USD, on funding democratic nationalization.¹⁴⁶

As of January 2016, the PBC had already committed 40 million USD to Member States such as: Sri Lanka, Burundi, Somali, South Sudan, and Guatemala.¹⁴⁷ The effectiveness of financing peacebuilding efforts through the PBC rests upon two key points: one, maintaining constant, stable financial support from UN bodies and multilateral partners, and two, ensuring the funds provided to countries in post-conflict states is adequately used to address both short term and long term needs.¹⁴⁸ For example, in Liberia, the PBSO coordinated with the EU to create the “New Deal Dashboard” (NDD) to track total financing and aid.¹⁴⁹ Beginning in 2011 and finally being implemented in 2013, the EU funded this 700,000 USD project as a means to evaluate peacebuilding efforts.¹⁵⁰ Over time the online tool will be able to collect data and donor reviews, set priorities for where funding should be allocated, and maintain accountability over the long-haul.¹⁵¹ Online databases such as the NDD will prove beneficial as the PBC continues to support and evaluate peacebuilding in various Member States.¹⁵²

In one example of the impact of the PBF, in coordination with UN Women, more than 5,000 women in Burundi served as mediators to counteract local conflicts.¹⁵³ This funding deescalated an electoral crisis in 2015 by directly supporting “519 mediators across 129 municipalities and 17 provinces” of Burundi.¹⁵⁴ In a second example, in 2015, as Liberia was declared Ebola-free, the PBC revamped and refocused its peacebuilding goals in order to coordinate better with the overall agenda of the Member States and UN support structures in the wake of a post-Ebola order.¹⁵⁵ With the aid of the PBF, Liberia is once again focusing on its priorities, which include: “strengthening rule of law, supporting security sector reform, and promoting national reconciliation.”¹⁵⁶ As in the case of Liberia, the PBC closely monitors and adjusts its support and structures, especially as the situation within the Member State changes.¹⁵⁷ Sri Lanka demonstrates a final example of PBF impact and monitored success having

¹⁴¹ Ibid.

¹⁴² Ibid.

¹⁴³ “The Peacebuilding Commission,” *United Nations Peacebuilding Commission*, <http://www.un.org/en/peacebuilding/>, (accessed April 30, 2016).

¹⁴⁴ “Preventing a relapse into violent conflict,” *United Nations Peacebuilding Fund*, <http://www.unpbf.org>, (accessed April 30, 2016).

¹⁴⁵ Ibid.

¹⁴⁶ “What we fund,” *United Nations Peacebuilding Fund*, <http://www.unpbf.org/what-we-fund/>, (accessed April 30, 2016).

¹⁴⁷ “Donor briefings,” *United Nations Peacebuilding Funds*, <http://www.unpbf.org/donors/donor-briefings/>, (accessed April 30, 2016).

¹⁴⁸ “Peacebuilding Fund Update,” *United Nations*, <http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:1zOS2rv-vBYJ:www.un.org/en/peacebuilding/pbf/PBF%2520Update%2520for%2520PBC%252020%2520Dec%25202013.ppt+&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us&client=safari>, (Accessed April 30, 2016).

¹⁴⁹ Ibid.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid.

¹⁵¹ Ibid.

¹⁵² Ibid.

¹⁵³ “Burundi Overview,” *United Nations Peacebuilding Fund*, <http://www.unpbf.org/countries/burundi/>, (accessed April 30, 2016).

¹⁵⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵⁵ PBC/9/LBR/2, *Outcome of the fourth review of the implementation of the statement of mutual commitments on peacebuilding in Liberia*, July 6, 2015.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid.

ended a civil war in 2009 and undergone a peaceful election in January 2015.¹⁵⁸ As Sri Lanka stabilizes post-conflict, the PBF continues to support “national consultations and technical assistance towards a credible and effective transitional justice mechanisms that meet international standards...”¹⁵⁹ With PBF financial support, Liberia has already reached its first benchmark by: “taking immediate actions to address the core grievances of minorities and IDPs through the resettlement of IDPs on released land that was occupied by the military.”¹⁶⁰

Case Studies: Peacebuilding Plans in Guinea, Liberia, and Burundi

In 2013, the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) reported to the PBC on the state of the PBF.¹⁶¹ The report discusses Member State programs funded for the 2013 Fiscal Year (FY).¹⁶² For Member States receiving support, each must set forth a plan of action whereby they outline for what the funding they are granted will be used for.¹⁶³

Case Study: Guinea

In 2011, Guinea became the first and only Member State to request to be on the PBC agenda.¹⁶⁴ Guinea proposed a two-part plan, where part one of the plans aimed to “address political crisis around legislative elections” and to provide support for its election.¹⁶⁵ This included political dialogue, election monitoring, mediation, and youth employment.¹⁶⁶ The PBSO ensured peaceful legislative elections by supporting local women’s organizations that monitored the situation “to ensure their peaceful conduct.”¹⁶⁷ The elections were deemed successful.¹⁶⁸ Guinea’s success with supporting women as monitors of peace during the election was later used as an example for Guinea-Bissau in its 2014 elections.¹⁶⁹ The total cost for the first part of the plan was 5.5 million USD.¹⁷⁰ Part two continues to focus on political dialogue and youth unemployment while additionally supporting employment for women and the parliament.¹⁷¹ This proposal is projected to cost 15.3 million USD and its implementation and evaluation is ongoing.¹⁷²

Case Study: Liberia

In 2013, Liberia requested 15 million USD to complete the “Government’s Agenda for Transformation.”¹⁷³ Previously, Liberia focused on developing five “regional justice and security hubs.”¹⁷⁴ Even during the midst of the Ebola crisis, Liberia continued to focus on peacebuilding by unveiling three of its five regional justice and security hubs and increasing services to resolve land disputes in the interior of the Member State.¹⁷⁵ The main critique of this program included moving the Joint Steering Committee (JSC) Secretariat Funds from the Liberian Peacebuilding Office to the UN.¹⁷⁶ Post-Ebola and aligned with Liberia’s National Roadmap for Reconciliation, the

¹⁵⁸ “Sri Lanka Overview,” *United Nations Peacebuilding Fund*, <http://www.unpbf.org/countries/sri-lanka/>, (accessed July 25, 2016)

¹⁵⁹ Ibid.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid.

¹⁶¹ “Peacebuilding Fund Update,” *United Nations*, <http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:1zOS2rv-BYJ:www.un.org/en/peacebuilding/pbf/PBF%2520Update%2520for%2520PBC%252020%2520Dec%25202013.ppt+&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us&client=safari>, (Accessed April 30, 2016).

¹⁶² Ibid.

¹⁶³ Ibid.

¹⁶⁴ “PBSO Annual Report 2013,” *United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office*, http://www.un.org/en/peacebuilding/pbso/pdf/2013_PBSO%20Annual%20Report-WEB%20FINAL.pdf, (Accessed July 25, 2016).

¹⁶⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid.

¹⁷¹ Ibid.

¹⁷² Ibid.

¹⁷³ “Liberia Overview,” *United Nations Peacebuilding Fund*, <http://www.unpbf.org/countries/liberia/>, (accessed July 25, 2016).

¹⁷⁴ Ibid.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid.

Member State's next steps support: "Land commission, national human rights commission, playahuts, national youth programme extension, national resource management in collaboration with the World Bank, and women's economic empowerment."¹⁷⁷

Case Study: Burundi

Burundi provides necessary information on its successful implementation of prior funding. As Burundi continued to discuss and implement peacebuilding strategies, it created a "Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper" (PRSP), as a transition into its pre-election 3rd Priority Plan.¹⁷⁸ This plan supported: "Social cohesion/national dialogue, youth participation, human rights, and resolution of land disputes."¹⁷⁹ With the support of the UN, Burundi's 2nd Priority Plan was able to accomplish the following: "strengthening of government's capacity to coordinate and plan activities in the area of reintegration and reduction of tensions and increase of social cohesion."¹⁸⁰ This was accomplished by the: "peaceful resolution of 305 land conflicts, access to revenue for 540 vulnerable persons through community work, finalization of construction of 202 houses for reintegration, equipment of 3 youth centers, and training of returnees and ex-combatants in entrepreneurship."¹⁸¹ With Burundi's clear outline set forth and a detailed report of progress and goals, the UN PBSO will be able to report on where Burundi is succeeding and focus on areas in need of more support in the future.¹⁸²

Transparency and Accountability

With commitment comes responsibility. The PBC, the multilateral institutions with which it collaborates, and the recipients of its aid must be committed to transparency and financial prudence. Multilateral Member States deliver more than half of all Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) aid to Member States experiencing conflict or extreme poverty.¹⁸³ However, in twelve African Member States, aid revenue exceeds tax revenue, which undermines the PBC's initiative to help Member States become self-sustaining and stable.¹⁸⁴ Policy options exist to allay these concerns and address the discrepancies. While transparency and accountability may at first appear to be obvious components, implementing measures to ensure they are achieved is of the utmost importance.

When financial flow lacks transparency, Member States are unable to monitor, tax, and regulate trade. For example, Illicit Financial Flows (IFFs) are the transfer of money into or out of a state illegally and thus untaxed.¹⁸⁵ When Member States find efficient and thorough means of preempting this sort of crime, they in turn save themselves by finding more income to tax.¹⁸⁶ Specific measures to undermine IFFs include the Kimberley Process Certification Scheme for illicit diamond sales and trade and the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative for natural resources.¹⁸⁷ Furthermore, the Stolen Asset Recovery Initiative (StAR) is in place to curb and stop IFFs related to natural resources.¹⁸⁸ Another method of enforcing a more structured and transparent international system of trade is through banking privacy laws, which would require verification of funds transferred into and out of designated post-

¹⁷⁷ "Peacebuilding Fund Update," *United Nations*, <http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:1zOS2rv-BYJ:www.un.org/en/peacebuilding/pbf/PBF%2520Update%2520for%2520PBC%252020%2520Dec%25202013.ppt+&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us&client=safari>, (Accessed April 30, 2016).

¹⁷⁸ "PBSO Annual Report 2013," *United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office*, http://www.un.org/en/peacebuilding/pbso/pdf/2013_PBSO%20Annual%20Report-WEB%20FINAL.pdf, (Accessed July 25, 2016).

¹⁷⁹ Ibid.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid.

¹⁸¹ Ibid.

¹⁸² Ibid.

¹⁸³ "Sustainable Support for Peacebuilding: The Domestic and International Perspective: Background," *United Nations Peacebuilding Commission*, <http://www.un.org/en/peacebuilding/pdf/Background%20paper%20Annual%20Session%20-%20PBSO.pdf> (accessed April 30, 2016).

¹⁸⁴ Ibid.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid.

¹⁸⁶ Ibid.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid.

conflict Member States.¹⁸⁹ Technical, easily accessible systems that provide support and advice for Member States during and after conflict would assist both the Member States and international monetary organizations and donors in monitoring and tracking IFFs.¹⁹⁰

Conclusion

The purpose of the PBC is to coordinate, organize, and support efforts to prevent conflict and peacebuild in post-conflict societies. With the financial support of the PBF as well as the organizational support of the PBSO, the PBC can better respond to conflict. So long as governments are transparent in their use of aid, allowing donors to see the direct impact their support is having on Member States, this should enhance the additional funds search for peacebuilding efforts through the PBC.¹⁹¹ The coordinated and intertwined effect of “accountability, transparency, participation, and inclusion” will underlie a committed support of peace.¹⁹² Member States begin this process of transparency by setting forth a plan of action and reporting its status back to the PBC. As the Member State reaches each benchmark, it can then work with the PBSO to outline secondary and tertiary phases of action to be funded by the PBF. This process of communication, planning, and evaluation is essential for maintaining long-term efforts towards peace and for holding Member States accountable.

Committee Directive

Ideally in preparing for this topic, delegates will gain a deeper knowledge of the PBC and its financial architecture. Combining the need for continued commitment to peacebuilding by donors and other organizations with the need for transparency and a transition to self-sustainment, students should present a multifaceted approach on ways to increase commitment of Member States and funding sources. The delegates shall investigate the response time and methodology of the PBC to conflict as well as the report structure between Member States and the PBC to determine whether systematic procedure exists for communication and whether one is necessary. Further, delegates should determine how the PBC—and the Member States reporting to it—determine timely response, success, and additional need. Finally, delegates shall further investigate methods and structures to: 1) hold Member States accountable for their funds and actions, 2) maintain transparency between Member States, the PBC, and funders, 3) include multiple bodies and organizations to coordinate on peacebuilding efforts, and 4) maintain international support and participation in the peacebuilding process. It is our hope that the delegates will explore the complexities and processes of supporting, funding, and maintaining peacebuilding as well as investigate paths to increase accountability, transparency, inclusion, and participation.

¹⁸⁹ “Sustainable Support for Peacebuilding: The Domestic and International Perspective: Chair’s Summary,” *United Nations Peacebuilding Commission*, <http://www.un.org/en/peacebuilding/pdf/140710%20PBC%20Annual%20Session%20-%20Chair's%20summary-FINAL.pdf>, (accessed April 30, 2016).

¹⁹⁰ Ibid.

¹⁹¹ Thomas Carothers and Saskia Brechenmacher, “Accountability, Transparency, Participation, and Inclusion: A New Development Consensus?” *Carnegie Endowment for Peace*, October 2014, <http://carnegieendowment.org/2014/10/20/accountability-transparency-participation-and-inclusion-new-development-consensus>, (accessed April 30, 2016).

¹⁹² Ibid.

Technical Appendix Guides: TAGs

Topic I: Peacebuilding Efforts in Response to Censorship, Libricide, and the Destruction of Cultural Heritage

Johnson, Elmer Douglas. *A History of Libraries in the Western World*. New York: Scarecrow, 1965.

Elmer Johnson explores an extensive network of libraries, including a short history of them, extending from Babylon to modern times. Johnson is unique in his extension of library study from solely Europe to America, including segments for private libraries, public libraries, government libraries, and school libraries, the latter of which are extended theoretically to represent cultural heritage and property. He includes artifacts held within libraries as part of the libraries, offering the assumption that the destruction of libraries is also destruction of cultural heritage. Useful for these approaches.

Knuth, Rebecca. *Burning Books and Leveling Libraries: Extremist Violence and Cultural Destruction*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2006.

In this book, her second on the study of libricide, Knuth focuses on extremist violence and cultural destruction. She discusses the struggles extremists have over local power, where destruction is most imminent; she discusses specific case studies in regards to these local struggles; and she examines the fate of libraries and culture after conflict, during the inevitable power vacuum. Like Baez, she ends with a discussion of Iraq in 2003. Useful as a theoretical extension from libricide to cultural heritage, whereas other texts usually approach the topic from the opposite lens.

Richardson, Ernest Cushing. *The Beginnings of Libraries*, 1914.

Ernest Richardson offers a complete history of libraries, and adds to the conversation a theoretical discussion about what constitutes a library. He begins with antediluvian libraries and extends to such libraries as mnemonic and memory libraries. Useful as a resource for the beginnings of libraries and ancient libraries, and unique in its approach to the material of the field.

Polastron, Lucien X., and Jon E. Graham. *Books on Fire: The Destruction of Libraries throughout History*. Rochester, VT: Inner Traditions, 2007.

Lucien Polastron explores the destruction of books through history, beginning in ancient times with the Library of Alexandria and extending to a study of the conceptual difficulty of digitalizing knowledge and books. Useful as a theoretical extension of the concept of libricide.

Topic II: Effective Financing for Conflict Resolution and Peacebuilding

“About,” *Kimberly Process*, <https://www.kimberleyprocess.com/en/about>.

Due to violence being financed by illicit diamond sales, Southern African Member States met in May 2000 to discuss means to undermine the “conflict diamond” trade. In December 2000, the UN General Assembly created a certification process for rough diamonds in order to control production and trade, ultimately leading to the creation of the Kimberly Process Certification Scheme (KPCS) in November of 2002. There are 81 Member States committed to the KPCS. Members are required to monitor imports, exports, and trade related to rough diamonds as well as to provide statistical data regarding trade. Members of the KPCS only trade with other members who have met the same legislative and transparency requirements.

“About Us,” *Stolen Asset Recovery Initiative: The World Bank and UNODC*, <http://star.worldbank.org/star/about-us/our-vision>.

The UN Office on Drugs and Crime along with the World Bank use the Stolen Asset Recovery Initiative (StAR) to collaborate against money laundering and facilitate the return of stolen assets. Through training and capacity building, StAR helps Member States by strengthening and developing their legal framework as well as their asset

recovery capabilities. Additionally, StAR serves Member States through policy analysis and knowledge building. When aiding in the recovery of stolen assets, StAR may use mutual legal assistance, the seizure and confiscation of assets, and the facilitation of international cooperation. The initiative uses measures of diplomacy to engage international parties. Ultimately, StAR is founded on empowerment, partnerships, innovation, and international standards.

“About,” *EITI*, <https://eiti.org/about/who-we-are>.

The Extractive Industry Transparency Initiative (EITI) promotes accountable usage and management of natural resources such as oil, gas, and coal. Its goal is to undermine conflict and corruption by monitoring natural resources revenue and by ensuring the revenue benefits the citizenry. The EITI Standard monitors contracts and licenses, production, revenue collection, revenue allocation, and social and economic spending. An international board upholds the EITI Standard. Currently, 51 Member States are implementing the EITI Standard, while 31 Member States are already compliant with its measures. Over 1.9 million USD have already been reported in EITI Standard Reports.

“The Peacebuilding Commission,” *Global Policy Forum*,
<https://www.globalpolicy.org/un-reform/un-reform-topics/the-peacebuilding-commission.html>.

UN Member States decided to establish the Peacebuilding Commission in 2005 at the Millennium +5 Summit. The PBC was intended to be an “advisory subsidiary organ” for the General Assembly and the Security Council. The PBC consists of 31 Member States and was established on December 20, 2005, as an arm of the Security Council. The Peacebuilding Fund was created on October 11, 2006. The UN planned for the PBF to begin with 250 million USD, which would be provided by “voluntary contributions.”

“Organizational Committee Members,” *United Nations Peacebuilding Commission*,
<http://www.un.org/en/peacebuilding/orgcommittee.shtml>.

The PBC is composed of 31 Member States. Seven are Members selected by the General Assembly: Colombia, Egypt, El Salvador, Kenya, Malaysia, Montenegro, and Morocco. Seven are Members from the Security Council: Angola, China, France, Russia, United Kingdom, United States, and Venezuela. Seven are members from ECOSOC: Brazil, Georgia, Italy, Kazakhstan, Republic of Korea, South Africa, Trinidad, and Tobago. The top five Member States that provide military personnel and civilian police are included: Bangladesh, Ethiopia, India, Nigeria, and Pakistan. Additionally, the top five monetary contributors to the UN are on the PBC: Canada, Germany, Japan, The Netherlands, and Sweden. Furthermore, the EU, IMF, Organization of Islamic Cooperation, and World Bank are represented on the PBC as well.