Political treaty

Abstract

This study is consisting of some of political treaties, conventions, principles and agreements which are registered of united nation (UN).

Agreement on Illicit Traffic by Sea implementing article 17 of the United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances

The Agreement is based on Article 17 of the United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances, done at Vienna on 20 December 1988. It sets up a basis for international co-operation between Parties, defines rules as regard competent authorities, rules governing the exercise of jurisdiction, proceedings, authorised measures, responsibilities for enforcement measures, and other general rules.

Home Work Convention

Home Work Convention, 1996 is an International Labour Organization (ILO) Convention, which came into force in 2000. It offers protection to workers who are employed in their own homes.

It was established in 1996, with the preamble stating:

Noting that the particular conditions characterizing home work make it desirable to improve the application of those Conventions and Recommendations to homeworkers, and to supplement them by standards which take into account the special characteristics of home work, and

The Convention provides protection for home workers, giving them equal rights with regard to workplace health and safety, social security rights, access to training, remuneration, minimum age of employment, maternity protection, and other rights.[1]

Optional Protocol on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women

The Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women is a side-agreement to the Convention which allows its parties to recognise the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women to consider complaints from individuals.[6]

By ratifying the Optional Protocol, a State recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women -- the body that monitors States parties' compliance with the Convention -- to receive and consider complaints from individuals or groups within its jurisdiction.

The Protocol contains two procedures: (1) A communications procedure allows individual women, or groups of women, to submit claims of violations of rights protected under the Convention to the Committee. The Protocol establishes that in order for individual communications to be admitted for consideration by the Committee, a number of criteria must be met, including those domestic remedies must have been exhausted. (2) The Protocol also creates an inquiry procedure enabling the Committee to initiate inquiries into situations of grave or systematic violations of women's rights. In either case, States must be party to the Convention and the Protocol. The Protocol includes an "opt-out clause", allowing States upon ratification or accession to declare that they do not accept the inquiry procedure. Article 17 of the Protocol explicitly provides that no reservations may be entered to its terms.

Principles on the Effective Investigation and Documentation of Torture and Other Cruel Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment

Istanbul Protocol

The Manual on Effective Investigation and Documentation of Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, commonly known as the Istanbul Protocol, is the first set of international guidelines for documentation of torture and its consequences. It became an official United Nations document in 1999.

The Istanbul Protocol is intended to serve as a set of international guidelines for the assessment of persons who allege torture and ill treatment, for investigating cases of alleged torture, and for reporting such findings to the judiciary and any other investigative body.

The Manual on the Effective Investigation and Documentation of Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment contains internationally recognised standards and procedures on how to recognise and

document symptoms of torture so the documentation may serve as valid evidence in court.

As such, the Istanbul Protocol provides useful guidance for doctors and lawyers who want to investigate whether or not a person has been tortured and report the findings to the judiciary and any other investigative bodies.

Protocol of 1988 relating to the International Convention for the Safety of life at Sea (SOLAS)

Objectives: To introduce in the 1974 International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea provisions for survey and certificates harmonised with corresponding other international instruments. Summary of provisions: This Protocol was adopted in the framework of the International Maritime Organisation (IMO), and replaces and abrogates the Protocol of 1978 relating to the Convention (art. I). Parties undertake to give effect to the Protocol and its Annex, which modifies and adds provisions to the Annex of the Convention concerning, inter alia, definition of terms, inspection, surveys and control of ships, and issuance, endorsement and duration of certificates. Parties agree to communicate to the Secretary-General of the IMO, inter alia the measures they have adopted on the various matters within the scope of the Protocol (art. III).

Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention

The Convention concerning the Prohibition and Immediate Action for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour, known in short as the Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, was adopted by the International Labour Organization (ILO) in 1999 as ILO Convention No 182. It is one of 8 ILO fundamental conventions.[2]

By ratifying this Convention No. 182, a country commits itself to taking immediate action to prohibit and eliminate the worst forms of child labour. The Convention is enjoying the fastest pace of ratifications in the ILO's history since 1919.[*citation needed*]

The ILO's International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC) is responsible for assisting countries in this regard as well as monitoring compliance. One of the methods used by IPEC to assist countries in this regard are Time-bound Programmes.

The ILO also adopted the Worst Forms of Child Labour Recommendation No 190 in 1999. This recommendation contains, among others, recommendations

on the types of hazards that should be considered for inclusion within a country-based definition of Worst Form Hazards faced by Children at Work.

Convention on the International Protection of Adults

"This Convention was drawn up by the Hague Conference on Private International Law and unanimously adopted by those of the Member States present at its plenary session on 2 October 1999. Its purpose is to improve the protection in international situations of adults who, by reason of an impairment or insufficiency of their personal faculties, are not able to safeguard their own interests. It does so by laying down rules on jurisdiction, applicable law and international recognition and enforcement of protective measures which are to be respected by all States, thus reducing the potential for confusion and conflict. There is also provision for administrative co-operation to support the workings of the Convention. 'Adult' is defined in Article 2 of the Convention as a person who has reached the age of 18 years." (text from FCO explanatory memorandum)

Agreement on the conservation of African-Eurasian migratory waterbirds

The Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds (AEWA) is an independent international treaty developed under the auspices of the UNEP's Convention on Migratory Species.

The Parties meet every few years. So far there have been five meetings: 7-9 November 1999 in Cape Town, South Africa; 25-27 September 2002 in Bonn, Germany; 23-27 October 2005 in Dakar, Senegal; 15-19 September 2008 in Antananarivo, Madagascar; 14-18 May 2012 in La Rochelle, France

Agreement on the international dolphin conservation program 1998

The Agreement on the International Dolphin Conservation Program (AIDCP) is a legally binding instrument for dolphin conservation and ecosystem management in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean (ETP). The objectives of the Agreement are to reduce incidental dolphin mortalities in the tuna purse-seine fishery through the setting of annual limits, seek alternative means of capturing large yellowfin tunas not in association with dolphins, and ensure the long-term sustainability of tuna stocks and marine resources in the ETP. The AIDCP entered into force on February 15, 1999. To date, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, United States, Vanuatu, and Venezuela have ratified the AIDCP. Bolivia, Colombia, and the European Union are applying the Agreement provisionally.

International Convention on arrest of ships

On 14 September 2011 the International Convention on Arrest of Ships 1999 (the 1999 Convention) came into force amongst its ten acceding states, following the accession by the tenth state Albania six months ago.

The ten states to which the 1999 Convention applies are as follows: Albania, Algeria, Benin, Bulgaria, Ecuador, Estonia, Latvia, Liberia, Spain and the Syrian Arab Republic.

The 1952 Convention remains the dominant convention and is in force in 77 countries.

In the UK, arrest of ships continues to be subject to the Supreme Courts Act 1981.

The 1999 Convention widens the ambit of the 1952 Brussels Convention on the Arrest of Sea-going Ships (the 1952 Convention) by increasing the types of claim giving rise to a right to arrest. In addition, the new convention clarifies the ambiguity of the 1952 Convention by stating that it applies to any vessel. The 1952 Convention is unclear as to its effect on vessels which are not flying the flag of a contracting state.

The additional types of claim for which arrest is permitted under the 1999 Convention (but not the 1952 Convention) include the following:

- outstanding insurance premiums (including P&I calls) commissions, brokerages and agency fees;
- damage, or threat of damage, to the environment (including the clean-up costs and reasonable steps taken to avoid damage);
- wreck removal;
- loss or damage in connection to goods (including luggage) and not just damage to the goods themselves;
- provisions, bunkers and equipment (including containers) which are supplied for the ship's operation or maintenance (these not being specifically provided for in the 1952 Convention);
- port, canal and pilotage dues (affirming that this convention applies to vessels that navigate inland waterways and not just sea-going vessels); and
- disputes arising from a contract for sale of a ship.

The 1999 Convention is a positive step towards a clearer and more all-encompassing approach to ship arrest for marine claims. But claimants should be reminded that its current application is limited to those states listed above. In

addition, it is important to note that each country adopting the 1999 Convention will do so individually and there may be differences as to how the new convention is applied.

Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Biological Diversity in the Mediterranean

By means of enhanced international cooperation to protect and improve the state of the natural and cultural heritage of the Mediterranean through the establishment of specially protected areas and the protection and conservation of threatened species, and to restore the health and integrity of ecosystems. The parties to the Protocol are to cooperate directly or through international organisations for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, identify its components and adopt sectoral programmes.

Regional Convention for the management and conservation of the natural forest ecosystems and the development of forest plantations

Objective: To promote, within Central America, national and regional strategies and procedures for the sustainable management of forests, including the establishment of a homogenous soil classification and the recovery of deforested areas.

Statutes Of The Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission

For 40 years the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) has been the most important international body promoting understanding of ocean processes. Originating from a programme of UNESCO, in 1960 the IOC became a separate unit of UNESCO. The status of the IOC is regulated by Statutes which were substantially revised in 1999. These Statutes define the IOC as a part of UNESCO with functional autonomy limiting the authority of UNESCO bodies to supervise the IOC. This functional autonomy is reflected in the purposes and functions of the IOC, its relations with other international organisations and its own membership regulations. It is also reflected in its organisational structure, which consists of an Assembly, an Executive Council, a Secretariat and subsidiary bodies. The IOC is financed by UNESCO, with additional contributions allocated by Member States. The activities of IOC aim to improve our knowledge of the oceans and are increasingly directed towards the issues of responsible ocean management and sustainable development. The programmes are subdivided into ocean science projects, operational observing

systems and ocean services. A special focus is training and education as well as mutual assistance in the field of ocean sciences as a contribution towards capacity building as a prerequisite for worldwide programmes. In performing its tasks the IOC enjoys partial autonomy under international law. However, its functional autonomy is considerably limited by the fact that programme and budget planning has to be approved by UNESCO, and that the funds and the personnel for the Secretariat are primarily provided by UNESCO. On the other hand it benefits from the facilities and opportunities offered from UNESCO so that the integration into this organisation and, simultaneously, the granting of a functional autonomy, constitutes a viable and economic way of promoting international co-operation with a view to improving our knowledge of the oceans.

Basel protocol on Liability and compensation for damage resulting from transboundary movements of hazardous wastes and their disposal

Objective: To provide for a comprehensive regime for liability and for adequate and prompt compensation for damage resulting from the transboundary movement of hazardous wastes and other wastes and their disposal including illegal traffic in those wastes.

The Basel Protocol on Liability and Compensation was adopted at the Fifth Conference of Parties (COP-5) on10 December 1999. The Protocol talks began in 1993 in response to the concerns of developing countries about their lack of funds and technologies for coping with illegal dumping or accidental spills.

The objective of the Protocol is to provide for a comprehensive regime for liability as well as adequate and prompt compensation for damage resulting from the transboundary movement of hazardous wastes and other wastes, including incidents occurring because of illegal traffic in those wastes.

The Protocol addresses who is financially responsible in the event of an incident. Each phase of a transboundary movement, from the point at which the wastes are loaded on the means of transport to their export, international transit, import, and final disposal, is considered.

Act amending the international convention for the protection of new varieties of plants

UPOV was established by the International Convention for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants. The Convention was adopted in Paris in 1961 and

revised in 1972, 1978 and 1991. The objective of the Convention is the protection of new varieties of plants by an intellectual property right. By codifying intellectual property for plant breeders, UPOV aims to encourage the development of new varieties of plants for the benefit of society.

For plant breeders' rights to be granted, the new variety must meet four criteria under the rules established by UPOV[*citation needed*].

1. The new plant must be novel, which means that it must not have been previously marketed in the country where rights are applied for.
2. The new plant must be distinct from other available varieties.
3. The plants must display homogeneity.
4. The trait or traits unique to the new variety must be stable so that the plant remains true to type after repeated cycles of propagation.

Protection can be obtained for a new plant variety (legally defined) however it has been obtained, e.g. through conventional breeding techniques or genetic engineering.

Energy charter protocol on energy efficiency and related environmental aspects

Energy Charter Protocol on energy efficiency and related environmental aspects is the Annex 3 to the Final Act of the Conference on the European Energy Charter .

This Protocol defines policy principles for the promotion of energy efficiency as a considerable source of energy and for consequently reducing adverse environmental impacts of energy systems. It furthermore provides guidance on the development of energy efficiency programmes, indicates areas of cooperation and provides a framework for the development of cooperative and coordinated action. Such action may include the prospecting for, exploration, production, conversion, storage, transport, distribution, and consumption of energy, and may relate to any economic sector.

The objectives of this Protocol are:

(a) the promotion of energy efficiency policies consistent with sustainable development;
(b) the creation of framework conditions which induce producers and consumers to use energy as economically, efficiently and environmentally

soundly as possible, particularly through the organization of efficient energy markets and a fuller reflection of environmental costs and benefits; and
(c) the fostering of cooperation in the field of energy efficiency.

More details about status of ratification: http://www.encharter.org

Related acts:
Energy Charter Treaty (ECT), Lisbon, 17 December 1994.

Amendment to the trade provisions of the Treaty, adopted by the Conference on the Energy Charter on 24/04/1998.

Rules concerning the conduct of the conciliation of transit disputes adopted by the Energy Charter Conference on 03/12/1998 (OJ L 11/1999).

Energy charter treaty 1994 (modified though amendments since January 21st 2010)

The Energy Charter Treaty (ECT) is an international agreement which establishes a multilateral framework for cross-border co-operation. The treaty covers all aspects of commercial energy activities including trade, transit, investments and energy efficiency. The treaty is legally binding, including dispute resolution procedures.[1]

Originally, the Energy Charter process was based on integrating the energy sectors of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe at the end of the Cold War into the broader European and world markets. Its role however extends beyond East-West cooperation and through legally binding instruments strives to promote principles of openness of energy markets and non-discrimination to stimulate foreign direct investments and cross-border trade.

Awards and Settlements of the international arbitrations put forward by breaking the law of the Energy Charter Treaty are often in hundreds of millions of dollars. Often high-profile law firms are hired to represent investors and the states. Firms reported to be representing a party at court under the ECT include Allen & Overy, DLA Piper[2], Latham & Watkins[3] and other high profile commercial law firms

Protocol on blinding laser weapons (Protocol IV to the 1980 Convention) 13 October 1995

On 13 October 1995, the first Review Conference of the 1980 Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons [1] (CCW) adopted during its first session in Vienna [2] a new fourth Protocol entitled " Protocol on Blinding Laser Weapons " . [3] The 1980 Convention comprises a framework Convention (containing technical provisions such as applicability, entry into force and amendment) and annexed Protocols containing the substantive rules relating to certain weapons. [4] Although many weapons had been discussed during the preparatory stages of this Convention, only three Protocols were adopted in 1980. [5] However, the structure chosen enabled new Protocols to be added in order to accommodate future weapons which needed to be prohibited or otherwise regulated.

The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) was particularly active in the development of the new fourth Protocol. This article outlines the work that the ICRC undertook in order to establish the facts as regards the likely effects of new blinding laser weapons and how the ICRC sought the necessary international support [6] for a new Protocol on these weapons. It then describes the *travaux préparatoires* for the Protocol, namely the discussions during the Review Conference process that led to the wording of each Article of the new Protocol. [7] Finally it comments on the Protocol's likely influence in banning blinding as a method of warfare.

ARTICLE 1: ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL

The following protocol shall be annexed to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects (the Convention) as Protocol IV:

Protocol on Blinding Laser Weapons
(Protocol IV)

Article 1

It is prohibited to employ laser weapons specifically designed, as their sole combat function or as one of their combat functions, to cause permanent blindness to unenhanced vision, that is to the naked eye or to the eye with corrective eyesight devices. The High Contracting Parties shall not transfer such weapons to any State or non-State entity.

Article 2

In the employment of laser systems, the High Contracting Parties shall take all feasible precautions to avoid the incidence of permanent blindness to

unenhanced vision. Such precautions shall include training of their armed forces and other practical measures.

Article 3
Blinding as an incidental or collateral effect of the legitimate military employment of laser systems, including laser systems used against optical equipment, is not covered by the prohibition of this Protocol.

Article 4

For the purpose of this Protocol permanent blindness means irreversible and uncorrectable loss of vision which is seriously disabling with no prospect of recovery. Serious disability is equivalent to visual acuity of less than 20/200 Snellen measured using both eyes.

Protocol on environmental protection to the Antarctic Treaty 1991

The Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty, also known as the Antarctic-Environmental Protocol, or the Madrid Protocol, is part of the Antarctic Treaty System. It provides for comprehensive protection of the Antarctic environment and dependent and associated ecosystems.

The dumping of waste at Bellingshausen, a Russian Base on King George Island, demonstrated the need for environmental regulation in Antarctica

It opened for signature on October 4, 1991 and entered into force in January 14th of 1998. The treaty will be open for review in 2048.

Key Articles of the Treaty

- Article 3 states that protection of the Antarctic environment as a wilderness with aesthetic and scientific value shall be a "fundamental consideration" of activities in the area.
- Article 7 states that "Any activity relating to mineral resources, other than scientific research, shall be prohibited." This provision contrasts with the rejected Convention on the Regulation of Antarctic Mineral Resource Activities, which would have allowed mining under the control and taxation of an international managing body similar to the International Seabed Authority.
- Article 8 requires environmental assessment for all activities, including tourism.
- Article 11 creates a Committee for Environmental Protection for the continent.

- Article 15 calls for member states to be prepared for emergency response actions in the area.
- Articles 18-20 arrange for arbitration of international disputes regarding Antarctica.
- Article 25(5) states that the Article 7 ban on mining may not be repealed unless a future treaty establishes a binding regulatory framework for such activity.

Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines Booby-Traps and Other Devices as amended on 3 May 1996 (Protocol II to the 1980 Convention as amended on 3 May 1996)

Protocol II on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices was amended on May 3, 1996 to strengthen its provisions. It extends the scope of application to cover both international and internal armed conflicts; prohibits the use of non-detectable anti-personnel mines and their transfer; prohibits the use of non-self-destructing and non-self-deactivating mines outside fenced, monitored and marked areas; broadens obligations of protection in favour of peacekeeping and other missions of the United Nations and its agencies; requires States to enforce compliance with its provisions within their jurisdiction; and calls for penal sanctions in case of violation.

Protocol to the Convention on long-range transboundary air pollution on Further Reduction of Sulphur Emissions 1994

To take all possible measures to control and reduce sulphur emissions in order to protect human health and the environment and intensify international cooperation by exchanging technology and information. This Protocol supplements the 1979 Geneva Convention, which aims to protect man and his environment against air pollution and limit and gradually reduce and prevent air pollution including long-range transboundary air pollution.

The Protocol supplements the Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution (1979 Geneva Convention), signed in Geneva on 13/11/1979. It aims at gradually attaining critical loads for acidification and setting long-term targets for reductions in sulphur emissions. It also emphasises energy savings. The EC can fulfil the responsibilities of its Member States on its own behalf, in which case the Member States are not entitled to exercise such rights

individually (alternative exercise of rights EC-Member States according to division of powers).

Convention on supplementary compensation for nuclear damage

The Convention on Supplementary Compensation for Nuclear Damage (CSC) is an international nuclear liability agreement proposed by the International Atomic Energy Agency in 1997. The CSC is an international government-to-government agreement created to help support victim adjudicate claims and channel liability to reactor operators. The CSC establishes a central fund to support the cleanup of a nuclear accident, and defines who would be considered liable for damages.

CSC is open to all countries with a national law that incorporates basic principles of nuclear liability law, and which agree to contribute to an international fund to compensate victims of nuclear damage. Currently there are four countries that have ratified the CSC, Argentina, Morocco, Romania, and the United States. The CSC will enter into force on the 90th day following the date on which at least five countries with a minimum of 400,000 MWe of installed nuclear capacity ratify, accept, or approve it.

International tropical timber Agreement (1994)

International Tropical Timber Agreement, 1994 (ITTA, 1994) was drafted to ensure that by the year 2000 exports of tropical timber originated from sustainably managed sources and to establish a fund to assist tropical timber producers in obtaining the resources necessary to reach this objective. It defined the mandate of the International Tropical Timber Organization.

The agreement was opened for signature on January 26, 1994, and entered into force on January 1, 1997.

It replaced the International Tropical Timber Agreement, 1983, and was superseded by the International Tropical Timber Agreement, 2006.

The 1991 Geneva Protocol concerning the Control of Emissions of Volatile Organic Compounds or their Transboundary Fluxes

In November 1991, the Protocol to the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution on the Control of Emissions of Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs, i.e. hydrocarbons) or Their Transboundary Fluxes, the second major air pollutant responsible for the formation of ground level ozone, was adopted. It has entered into force on 29 September 1997.

This Protocol specifies three options for emission reduction targets that have to be chosen upon signature or upon ratification:

(i) 30% reduction in emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) by 1999 using a year between 1984 and 1990 as a basis. (This option has been chosen by Austria, Belgium, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom with 1988 as base year, by Denmark with 1985, by Liechtenstein, Switzerland and the United States with 1984, and by Czech Republic, Italy, Luxembourg, Monaco and Slovakia with 1990 as base year);

(ii) The same reduction as for (i) within a Tropospheric Ozone Management Area (TOMA) specified in annex I to the Protocol and ensuring that by 1999 total national emissions do not exceed 1988 levels. (Annex I specifies TOMAs in Norway (base year 1989) and Canada (base year 1988));

(iii) Finally, where emissions in 1988 did not exceed certain specified levels, Parties may opt for a stabilization at that level of emission by 1999. (This has been chosen by Bulgaria, Greece, and Hungary).

Convention on the Law of Non-Navigational Uses of International Watercourses

The Convention on the Law of Non-Navigational Uses of International Watercourses is a document adopted by the United Nations on May 21, 1997 pertaining to the uses and conservation of all waters that cross international boundaries, including both surface and groundwater. Mindful of increasing demands for water and the impact of human behavior, the UN drafted the document to help conserve and manage water resources for present and future generations. To enter force, the document required ratification by 35 countries, but as of 2008 received less than half that number, with ratification by 16.[1] Though unratified, the document is regarded as an important step towards arriving at an international law governing water.

In autumn of 2008, the UN began reviewing a law proposed by the International Law Commission to serve similar purpose to the unratified document, but was considering adopting the proposal as guideline rather than immediately attempting to draft it into law.[3]

Background

The International Law Commission (ILC) was requested by the United Nations in 1970 to prepare viable international guidelines for water use comparable to The Helsinki Rules on the Uses of the Waters of International Rivers, which had

been approved by the International Law Association in 1966 but which failed to address aquifers that were not connected to a drainage basin.[4][5] After the ILC completed its project in 1994, the UN Sixth Committee drafted the Convention on the Law of Non-Navigational Uses of International Watercourses based on their proposal.[6] The General Assembly adopted the document on May 21, 1997 with only three dissenting in a vote of 106.[5]

Provisions

The document sought to impose upon UN member states an obligation to consider the impact of their actions on other states with an interest in a water resource and to equitably share the resource, mindful of variant factors such as population size and availability of other resources.

Had the document been ratified, each member state that shares in a resource would have been required to provide information to other sharing states about the condition of the watercourse and about their planned uses for it, allowing sufficient time for other sharing states to study the use and object if the use is perceived to be harmful. The document permitted a state with urgent need to immediately utilize a watercourse, providing that it notifies sharing states both of the use and the urgency. In the event that a use is perceived to be harmful, it would have required members states to negotiate a mutually acceptable solution, appealing for arbitration as necessary to uninvolved states or international organizations such as the International Court of Justice.

It also would have required states to take reasonable steps to control damage, such as caused by pollution or the introduction of species not native to the watercourse, and imposed an obligation on states that damage a shared water resource to take steps to remedy the damage or to compensate sharing states for the loss. It includes provisions for managing natural damage to waterways, such as caused by drought or erosion, and mandated that sharing states notify others immediately of emergency conditions related to the watercourse that may affect them, such as flooding or waterborne diseases.

Agreement for the establishment of the Indian Ocean tuna Commission 1993

Through the creation, within the FAO framework, of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC), to promote international cooperation among its members with a view to ensuring the conservation and optimum utilisation of tuna and tuna-like species in the Indian Ocean and encouraging sustainable development of fisheries based on such stocks.

Convention on nuclear safety

The Convention on Nuclear Safety was adopted in Vienna on 17 June 1994. The Convention was drawn up during a series of expert level meetings from 1992 to 1994 and was the result of considerable work by Governments, national nuclear safety authorities and the Agency's Secretariat. Its aim is to legally commit participating States operating land-based nuclear power plants to maintain a high level of safety by setting international benchmarks to which States would subscribe.

The obligations of the Parties are based to a large extent on the principles contained in the IAEA Safety Fundamentals document "Fundamental Safety Principles (SF-1)". These obligations cover for instance, siting, design, construction, operation, the availability of adequate financial and human resources, the assessment and verification of safety, quality assurance and emergency preparedness.

The Convention is an incentive instrument. It is not designed to ensure fulfillment of obligations by Parties through control and sanction but is based on their common interest to achieve higher levels of safety which will be developed and promoted through regular meetings of the Parties. The Convention obliges Parties to submit reports on the implementation of their obligations for "peer review" at meetings of the Parties to be held at the IAEA. This mechanism is the main innovative and dynamic element of the Convention.

International Convention on liability and compensation for damage in connection with the carriage of hazardous and noxious substances by sea

The HNS Convention was adopted in 1996 to make it possible for up to 250 million SDR to be paid out in compensation to victims of accidents involving HNS, such as chemicals. The Convention is based on the two-tier system established under the CLC and Fund Conventions. However, it goes further in that it covers not only pollution damage but also the risks of fire and explosion, including loss of life or personal injury as well as loss of or damage to property.

HNS are defined by reference to lists of substances included in various IMO Conventions and Codes. These include oils; other liquid substances defined as noxious or dangerous; liquefied gases; liquid substances with a flashpoint not exceeding 60°C; dangerous, hazardous and harmful materials and substances carried in packaged form; and solid bulk materials defined as possessing chemical hazards. The Convention also covers residues left by the previous carriage of HNS, other than those carried in packaged form.

The Convention defines damage as including loss of life or personal injury; loss of or damage to property outside the ship; loss or damage by contamination of the environment; the costs of preventative measures and further loss or damage caused by them.

The Convention introduces strict liability for the shipowner and a system of compulsory insurance and insurance certificates.

A lack of ratifications meant that the 1996 Convention was failing to come into force and as a result, a Protocol was developed to address practical problems that had prevented many States from ratifying the original Convention.

The 2010 Protocol to the International Convention on Liability and Compensation for Damage in Connection with the Carriage of Hazardous and Noxious Substances by Sea, 1996 (HNS Convention), was adopted by consensus by a Diplomatic Conference convened by IMO in April 2010.

Limits of liability under the 2010 Protocol
Under the 2010 Protocol, if damage is caused by bulk HNS, compensation would first be sought from the shipowner, up to a maximum limit of 100 million Special Drawing Rights (SDR).

Where damage is caused by packaged HNS, or by both bulk HNS and packaged HNS, the maximum liability for the shipowner is 115 million SDR.

Once this limit is reached, compensation would be paid from the second tier, the HNS Fund, up to a maximum of 250 million SDR (including compensation paid under the first tier).

The Fund will have an Assembly, consisting of all States Parties to the Convention and Protocol, and a dedicated secretariat. The Assembly will normally meet once a year.

International Convention on Salvage

The Convention replaced a convention on the law of salvage adopted in Brussels in 1910 which incorporated the '"no cure, no pay" principle under which a salvor is only rewarded for services if the operation is successful.

Although this basic philosophy worked well in most cases, it did not take pollution into account. A salvor who prevented a major pollution incident (for example, by towing a damaged tanker away from an environmentally sensitive

area) but did not manage to save the ship or the cargo got nothing. There was therefore little incentive to a salvor to undertake an operation which has only a slim chance of success.

The 1989 Convention seeks to remedy this deficiency by making provision for an enhanced salvage award taking into account the skill and efforts of the salvors in preventing or minimizing damage to the environment.

Special compensation
The 1989 Convention introduced a "special compensation" to be paid to salvors who have failed to earn a reward in the normal way (i.e. by salving the ship and cargo).

Damage to the environment is defined as "substantial physical damage to human health or to marine life or resources in coastal or inland waters or areas adjacent thereto, caused by pollution, contamination, fire, explosion or similar major incidents."

The compensation consists of the salvor's expenses, plus up to 30% of these expenses if, thanks to the efforts of the salvor, environmental damage has been minimized or prevented. The salvor's expenses are defined as "out-of-pocket expenses reasonably incurred by the salvor in the salvage operation and a fair rate for equipment and personnel actually and reasonably used".

The tribunal or arbitrator assessing the reward may increase the amount of compensation to a maximum of 100% of the salvor's expenses, "if it deems it fair and just to do so".

If, on the other hand, the salvor is negligent and has consequently failed to prevent or minimize environmental damage, special compensation may be denied or reduced. Payment of the reward is to be made by the vessel and other property interests in proportion to their respective salved values.

Protocol of 1992 to Amend the International Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage

The Protocol of 1992 changed the entry into force requirements by reducing from six to four the number of large tanker-owning countries that were needed for entry into force.

The compensation limits were set as follows:

- For a ship not exceeding 5,000 gross tonnage, liability is limited to 3 million SDR
- For a ship 5,000 to 140,000 gross tonnage: liability is limited to 3 million SDR plus 420 SDR for each additional unit of tonnage
- For a ship over 140,000 gross tonnage: liability is limited to 59.7 million SDR.

The 1992 protocol also widened the scope of the Convention to cover pollution damage caused in the exclusive economic zone (EEZ) or equivalent area of a State Party. The Protocol covers pollution damage as before but environmental damage compensation is limited to costs incurred for reasonable measures to reinstate the contaminated environment. It also allows expenses incurred for preventive measures to be recovered even when no spill of oil occurs, provided there was grave and imminent threat of pollution damage.

The Protocol also extended the Convention to cover spills from sea-going vessels constructed or adapted to carry oil in bulk as cargo so that it applies apply to both laden and unladen tankers, including spills of bunker oil from such ships.

Under the 1992 Protocol, a shipowner cannot limit liability if it is proved that the pollution damage resulted from the shipowner's personal act or omission, committed with the intent to cause such damage, or recklessly and with knowledge that such damage would probably result.

From 16 May 1998, Parties to the 1992 Protocol ceased to be Parties to the 1969 CLC due to a mechanism for compulsory denunciation of the "old" regime established in the 1992 Protocol. However, there are a number of States which are Party to the 1969 CLC and have not yet ratified the 1992 regime - which is intended to eventually replace the 1969 CLC.

The 1992 Protocol allows for States Party to the 1992 Protocol to issue certificates to ships registered in States which are not Party to the 1992 Protocol, so that a shipowner can obtain certificates to both the 1969 and 1992 CLC, even when the ship is registered in a country which has not yet ratified the 1992 Protocol. This is important because a ship which has only a 1969 CLC may find it difficult to trade to a country which has ratified the 1992 Protocol, since it establishes higher limits of liability.

Protocol of 1992 to amend the International Convention on the Establishment of an International Fund for compensation for oil pollution damage (FUND PROT 1992)

As was the case with the 1992 Protocol to the CLC Convention, the main purpose of the Protocol was to modify the entry into force requirements and increase compensation amounts. The scope of coverage was extended in line with the 1992 CLC Protocol.

The 1992 Protocol established a separate, 1992 International Oil Pollution Compensation (IOPC) Fund, known as the 1992 Fund, which is managed in London by a Secretariat.

Under the 1992 Protocol, the maximum amount of compensation payable from the Fund for a single incident, including the limit established under the 1992 CLC Protocol, is 135 million SDR.

However, if three States contributing to the Fund receive more than 600 million tonnes of oil per annum, the maximum amount is raised to 200 million SDR.

Protocol on the Prevention of Pollution of the Mediterranean Sea by Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal

Objectives: To set out measures to control transboundary movements of hazardous wastes in the Mediterranean with a view to the protection of its environment.

Summary of provisions: Parties agree to take appropriate measures to: prevent, abate and eliminate pollution of the area covered by the Protocol which can be caused by transboundary movements and disposal of hazardous wastes. They undertake to reduce to a minimum, and where possible eliminate, the generation of hazardous wastes and the transboundary movement of hazardous wastes, and if possible to eliminate such movement in the Mediterranean, They are to prohibit the export and transit of hazardous wastes to developing countries and Parties which are not Member States of the European Community and Monaco (arts.5.1-4).

The Protocol contains provisions concerning the control of transboundary movements of hazardous wastes and required notification procedures that take into account provisions of the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal (art.6). Modalities for dealing with illegal traffic are addressed by article9. Provisions are made for the exchange of information on the implementation of the Protocol (art.11), the public's access to relevant information and an opportunity for them

to participate in relevant procedures (art.12) as well as verification with regard to Parties' compliance with the Protocol (art.13).

Parties undertake to cooperate inter alia in taking appropriate measures to implement the precautionary approach (art.8.3), in formulating and implementing programmes of financial and technical assistance to developing countries for the implementation of the Protocol (art.10) as well as in setting out appropriate guidelines for the evaluation of the damage as well as rules and procedures in the field of liability and compensation for damage resulting from the transboundary movement and disposal of hazardous wastes (art.14).

International Sugar Agreement

Through the International Sugar Organisation (ISO), to ensure enhanced international cooperation in connection with world sugar matters and provide a forum for intergovernmental consultations on sugar so as to improve the world sugar economy, to facilitate trade by collecting and providing information on the world sugar market and to encourage increased demand for sugar, particularly for non-traditional uses.

Vienna Convention on succession of States in respect of treaties

The Vienna Convention on Succession of States in respect of Treaties is an international treaty promulgated in 1978 to set rules on succession of states. It was adopted partly in response to the "profound transformation of the international community brought about by the decolonization process".

Among its provisions it establishes that newly independent post-colonial states are subject to the "clean slate" rule, such that the new state does not inherit the treaty obligations of the colonial power (article 16).

This treaty has proven to be controversial largely because it distinguishes between "newly independent states" (a euphemism for former colonies) and "cases of separation of parts of a state" (a euphemism for all other new states).

Article 16 states that newly independent states receive a "clean slate", whereas article 34(1) states that all other new states remain bound by the treaty obligations of the state from which they separated. Moreover, article 17 states that newly independent states may join multilateral treaties to which their former colonizers were a party without the consent of the other parties in most circumstances, whereas article 9 states that all other new states may only join

multilateral treaties to which their predecessor states were a part with the consent of the other parties.

Agreement Establishing the South Pacific Regional Environment Program (SPREP)

OBJECTIVES: To establish the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) as an intergovernmental organisation. Summary of provisions: Parties to the Agreement agree that the purposes of the SPREP are to promote co-operation and co-ordination in the South Pacific region, to provide assistance in order to protect and improve the environment and to ensure sustainable development (art. 2). To this end, Parties members of the SPREP undertake to adopt an Action Plan setting the strategies and objectives of the Programme. The Action Plan is to include, inter alia, monitoring and assessing the state of the environment, protecting the atmosphere and terrestrial, freshwater coastal and marine ecosystems and species, ensuring sustainable use of resources, reducing pollution and increasing educational and training awareness activities. Institutional mechanisms: A SPREP Meeting and a Secretariat are established (art. 1).

Agreement relating to the implementation of part XI of the United Nations Convention on the law of the sea

Objectives: To implement Part XI of the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. Summary of provisions: Parties undertake to implement Part XI of the Convention in accordance with the provisions of the Agreement (art. I), which are to prevail in the event of any inconsistency with Part XI (art. II). Section I deals with the work of the International Seabed Authority (the Authority) whose functions are to organise and control activities in the Area established in Part XI, particularly with a view to administering its resources. Section 1 also defines the procedure for the approval of a plan of work for exploration, and provides for the costs of the Authority. Section 2 concerns the Enterprise and its initial deep seabed mining operations through joint ventures. Section 3 deals with decision-making within the Authority, whose general policies are to be established by the Assembly in collaboration with the Council. Section 4 provides that provisions relating to the Review Conference in art. 155, paragraphs 1, 3 and 4 of the Convention are not to apply, but that the Assembly, on the recommendation of the Council, may undertake at any time a review of the matters referred to in paragraph 1 of art. 155. Sections 5 to 8 define the

principles governing: - transfer of technology for the purposes of Part XI, - the production policy of the Authority, - its policy to give economic assistance to certain countries, - and the establishment of rules, regulations and procedures for financial terms of contracts. Mechanisms for the settlement of disputes are also provided for. Parties to the Agreement further agree that a certain number of provisions of the Convention are not to apply. Institutional mechanisms: A Finance Committee is established (Section 9). The early functions of the Authority upon entry into force of the Convention are to be carried out by the Assembly, the Council, the Secretariat, the Legal and Technical Commission, and the Finance Committee. The functions of the Economic Planning Commission are to be performed by the Legal and Technical Commission until such time as the Council decides otherwise or until the approval of the first plan of work for exploitation.

Basic Principles on the Independence of the Judiciary

The Basic Principles on the Independence of the Judiciary were formulated to assist United Nations Member States in their task of securing and promoting the independence of the judiciary should be taken into account and respected by governments within the framework of their national legislation and practice and be brought to the attention of judges, lawyers, members of the executive and the legislature and the public in general. The principles describe the role of judges in relation to the system of justice and to the importance of their selection, training and conduct.

Convention on Protection of Children and Co-operation in respect of Inter country adoption

The Hague Convention on Protection of Children and Co-operation in Respect of Intercountry Adoption (or Hague Adoption Convention) is an international convention dealing with international adoption, child laundering, and child trafficking. It was concluded on 29 May 1993 and entered into force on 1 May 1995.[1]

Recognizing some of the difficulties and challenges associated with international adoption, and in an effort to protect those involved from the corruption and exploitation which sometimes accompanies it, the Hague Conference on Private International Law developed the Convention.[2] The main objectives of the Convention are:

- to establish safeguards to ensure that intercountry adoptions take place in the best interests of the child and with respect for his or her fundamental rights as recognized in international law;
- to establish a system of co-operation amongst Contracting States to ensure that those safeguards are respected and thereby prevent the abduction, the sale of, or traffic in children;
- to secure the recognition in Contracting States of adoptions made in accordance with the Convention.

As of April 2012, this Convention has been ratified by 89 countries. Haiti, Nepal and The Russian Federation are signatories, but have not ratified.[3]

The following is a quotation from the convention:

> Intercountry adoptions shall be made in the best interests of the child and with respect for his or her fundamental rights. To prevent the abduction, the sale of, or traffic in children each State should take, as a matter of priority, appropriate measures to enable the child to remain in the care of his or her family of origin.

International Convention on oil pollution preparedness response and co-operation

International Convention on Oil Pollution Preparedness, Response and Co-operation (OPRC) is an international maritime convention establishing measures for dealing with marine oil pollution incidents nationally and in co-operation with other countries.[1]

OPRC Convention was drafted within the framework of the International Maritime Organization (IMO) and adopted in 1990 entering into force in 1995. In 2000 a Protocol to the Convention relating to hazardous and noxious substances was adopted.

In accordance with this Convention and its Annex, States-Parties to the 1990 Convention undertake, individually or jointly, to take all appropriate measures to prepare for and respond to oil pollution incidents.

The Convention applies to:

- vessels of any type whatsoever operating in the marine environment including hydrofoil boats, air-cushion vehicles, submersibles, and floating craft of any type;

- fixed or floating offshore installations or structures engaged in gas or oil exploration, exploitation or production activities, or loading or unloading of oil; and
- sea ports and oil handling facilities (those facilities which present a risk of an oil pollution incident, including, *inter alia*, sea ports, oil terminals, pipelines and other oil handling facilities)[2].

The Convention does not apply to warships, naval auxiliary or other ships owned or operated by a State and used only on government non-commercial service. However, Parties to the Convention ensure by the adoption of appropriate measures that such ships act in a manner consistent with the Convention.

In July 1989, a conference of leading industrial nations in Paris called upon IMO to develop further measures to prevent pollution from ships. This call was endorsed by the IMO Assembly in November of the same year and work began on a draft convention aimed at providing a global framework for international co-operation in combating major incidents or threats of marine pollution.

Parties to the International Convention on Oil Pollution Preparedness, Response and Co-operation (OPRC) are required to establish measures for dealing with pollution incidents, either nationally or in co-operation with other countries.

Ships are required to carry a shipboard oil pollution emergency plan. Operators of offshore units under the jurisdiction of Parties are also required to have oil pollution emergency plans or similar arrangements which must be co-ordinated with national systems for responding promptly and effectively to oil pollution incidents.

Ships are required to report incidents of pollution to coastal authorities and the convention details the actions that are then to be taken. The Convention calls for the establishment of stockpiles of oil spill combating equipment, the holding of oil spill combating exercises and the development of detailed plans for dealing with pollution incidents.
Parties to the convention are required to provide assistance to others in the event of a pollution emergency and provision is made for the reimbursement of any assistance provided.

The Convention provides for IMO to play an important co-ordinating role.

A Protocol to the OPRC relating to hazardous and noxious substances (OPRC-HNS Protocol) was adopted in 2000.

Convention on the conservation and management of Pollock resources in the central Bering Sea

Convention Area: High seas of the Bering Sea beyond 200 nautical miles from the baselines from which the breath of the territorial sea of the coastal States of the Bering Sea is measured.

Objectives of the Convention:

The objectives of this Convention shall be:

1. to establish an international regime for conservation, management, and optimum utilization of Pollock resources in the Convention area;
2. to restore and maintain the Pollock resources in the Bering Sea at levels which will permit their maximum sustainable yield;
3. to cooperate in the gathering and examining of factual information concerning Pollock and other living marine resources in the Bering Sea; and
4. to provide, if the Parties agree, a forum in which to consider the establishment of necessary conservation and management measures for living marine resources other than Pollock in the Convention Area as may be required in the future.

The first Annual Conference of the Parties was held in Moscow in November 1996 and every year since then; on a rotating venue of each of the six Parties to the Convention.

The agenda of the Annual Conferences addresses items for conservation and management of Pollock resources in the Central Bering Sea. Since the establishment of the Convention, the Pollock resources in the Convention Area have been below the level that would have triggered an establishment of an Annual Harvest Level for the Convention Area as defined by terms of the Convention.

Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization

To raise standards of living; ensure full employment and a large and steadily growing volume of real income and effective demand; expand the production of and trade in goods and services in accordance with the objectives of sustainable development and environmental protection and taking into account the needs of developing countries; to make optimal use of the world's resources by establishing the World Trade Organisation (WTO).

This agreement established the World Trade Organisation (WTO) as a common institutional framework within which to conduct international trade relations. However, the new trade system the WTO represents dates from almost half a century earlier, as its rules were provided in 1948 by the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

It did not take long for the General Agreement to give birth to an unofficial, de facto international organisation, also known informally as GATT. Over the years GATT evolved through several rounds of negotiations. The last and most important of the GATT rounds, the Uruguay Round, lasted from 1986 to 1994 and led to the founding of the WTO. Whereas GATT had mainly dealt with trade in goods, the WTO and its agreements now cover trade in services, and in traded inventions, creations and designs (intellectual property). The multilateral trade talks of the Uruguay Round have produced a daunting list of some 60 agreements, annexes, decisions and understandings. In contrast to its predecessor (the GATT), the WTO is a permanent organisation that benefits from a legal personality and its attributes. All members of the GATT by rights became original members of the WTO on 1 January 1995. Since that date, applicants wishing to join have had to follow the accession procedure set out in the Agreement establishing the WTO.

The Agreement Establishing the WTO (or the WTO Agreement) serves as an umbrella agreement. Annexed to it are the Agreements on goods, services and intellectual property (see the list of annexed agreements below), dispute settlement, trade policy review mechanism and the plurilateral agreements. The schedules of commitments also form part of the Uruguay Round agreements.

The Agreement on the WTO provides that the Agreements and legal instruments contained in the first three Annexes form an integral part of the Agreement and are binding on all members. Accordingly, the members did not have to sign each of these agreements to become parties thereto. As for the multilateral agreements of Annex 4, they will be binding only on members who have accepted them. The Agreement on the WTO also describes the functions, structure and status of the WTO, the decision-making process, the amendment procedure, and the accession and withdrawal process.

Agreements annexed to the Agreement Establishing the WTO:

- Annex 1: Agreements for the three broad areas of trade:goods, services and intellectual property [Annex 1A (Multilateral Agreements on Trade in Goods); Annex 1B (Services Agreement); Annex 1C (Intellectual Property Agreement)]
- Annex 2: Dispute Settlement Understanding
- Annex 3: Government Trade Policy Review Mechanism
- Annex 4: This annex used to be made up of 4 agreements, also known as "plurilateral agreements". These concerned trade in civil aircraft, government procurement, dairy and bovine meat respectively. The bovine meat and dairy agreements were terminated in 1997. These 4 agreements had originally been negotiated in the Tokyo Round but, after the conclusion of the Uruguay Round, had been applied to a narrower group of signatories.

Convention for the conservation of Southern blue fin tuna

The southern bluefin tuna, *Thunnus maccoyii*, is a tuna of the family Scombridae found in open southern hemisphere waters of all the world's oceans mainly between 30°S and 50°S, to nearly 60°S. At up to 2.5 m (8.2 ft) and weighing up to 400 kg (882 lbs) it is among the larger bony fishes.

The southern bluefin tuna is a large, streamlined, fast swimming fish with a long, slender caudal peduncle and relatively short dorsal, pectoral and anal fins. The body is completely covered in small scales.

The body color is blue-black on the back and silver-white on the flanks and belly, with bright yellow caudal keels in adult specimens. The first dorsal fin colour is grey with a yellow tinge, the second dorsal is red-brown, and the finlets are yellow with a darker border.

Southern bluefin tuna, like other pelagic tuna species, are part of a group of bony fishes that can maintain their body core temperature up to 10 degrees above the ambient temperature. This advantage enables them to maintain high metabolic output for predation and migrating large distances. The southern bluefin tuna is an opportunistic feeder, preying on a wide variety of fish, crustaceans, cephalopods, salps, and other marine animals.

Protocol for the protection of the Mediterranean Sea against pollution resulting from exploration and exploitation of the continental shelf and the seabed and its subsoil

Objectives: To protect the Mediterranean Sea from pollution resulting from exploration and exploitation activities.

Summary of provisions: Parties agree to take all appropriate measures to prevent, abate, combat and control pollution in the Protocol Area resulting from activities concerning exploration and exploitation of the resources (activities) (art.3). All activities in the Protocol Area are to be subject to the prior written authorisation for exploration or exploitation from the competent authority (art.4.1). Each Party undertakes to prescribe sanctions to be imposed for breach of obligations arising out of the Protocol, for non-observance of the national laws and regulations implementing the Protocol, or for non-fulfilment of the specific conditions attached to the authorisation (art.7). Parties undertake to impose a general obligation upon operators to use the best available, environmentally effective and economically appropriate techniques and to observe internationally accepted standards regarding wastes, as well as the use, storage and discharge of harmful or noxious substances and materials (art.8). A Party may regulate, limit or prohibit the use of chemicals for the activities in accordance with guidelines to be adopted by the Parties (art.9.2). Parties further undertake to formulate and adopt common standards for the disposal of oil and oily mixtures from installations, and for the use and disposal of drilling fluids and drill cuttings, into the Protocol Area (art. 10, 1-2). They are to carry out strict control of discharge of sewage (arts.11, 12, 13).

The Protocol also contains provisions concerning inter alia safety measures to protect human life and the environment (art.15), monitoring of and reporting on the effects of the activities on the environment (art.19), protection of the areas defined in the Protocol concerning Mediterranean Specially Protected Areas (art.21) and measures concerning transboundary pollution (art.26).

Finally, Parties undertake to cooperate inter alia in developing international rules, standards and recommended practices and procedures (art.23.1) in providing scientific and technical assistance to developing countries (art.24) and in formulating and adopting appropriate rules and procedures for the determination of liability and compensation from damage resulting from the activities dealt with in the Protocol (art.27).

Protocol to the International Convention on the Establishment of an International Fund for compensation for oil pollution damage (FUND PROT 1976)

Objectives: To amend the 1971 International Convention on the Establishment of an International Fund of Compensation for Oil Pollution Damage. Summary of provisions: Amounts referred to in the Convention, wherever they appear, are to be amended as provided in Article III of the Protocol. Article 1 paragraph 4 of the Convention is replaced to give a new definition of 'Unit of Account' and 'Monetary Unit'.

Statute of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, Security Council resolution S/RES/955 (1994)

Statute of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan citizens responsible for genocide and other such violations committed in the territory of neighbouring States, between 1 January 1994 and 31 December 1994, 8 November 1994.
A series of Resolutions in which the Security Council condemned the systematic, widespread and flagrant violations of international humanitarian law committed in Rwanda, culminated in the establishment of an international Tribunal. Determining that the situation constituted a threat to international peace and security, the Security Council stated that it was determined to put an end to such crimes and to take effective measures to bring to justice the persons who are responsible for them. The Security Council further stated that in the particular circumstances of Rwanda, it was convinced that the establishment of an international tribunal would enable this aim to be achieved and would contribute to the process of national reconciliation and to the restoration and maintenance of peace. The tribunal was established for the sole purpose of prosecuting persons responsible for genocide and other violations of international humanitarian law committed in the territory of Rwanda and Rwandan citizens responsible for genocide and other such violations committed in the territory of neighbouring States, between 1 January 1994 and 31 December 1994. Thus, the Security Council adopts, by its resolution 955 (1994) of 8 november 1994, the Statute of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda.

Statutes of the International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology

Objectives: To promote international cooperation in developing and applying peaceful uses of genetic engineering and biotechnology in particular for developing countries, to assist developing countries in strengthening their

scientific and technological capabilities in that field, and to develop applications to solve problems of development.

Summary of provisions: An International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology is established (art.1) Article 2 details the objectives of the Centre. Its functions include inter alia, carrying out research and development, training scientific and technological personnel, providing advisory services to Members and promoting networks of national and international institutions as appropriate (art. 3). Issues related to Publications and Rights to Intellectual Property are governed by article 14.

Institutional mechanisms: The Board of Governors, the Council of Scientific Advisers and the Secretariat are the organs of the Centre (art. 5- 8). The Centre is also to develop and promote a system of Affiliated Centres and Networks (art. 9)

Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women 1993

The Declaration on the Elimination of Violence Against Women was adopted without vote[1] by the United Nations General Assembly in its resolution 48/104 of 20 December 1993. Contained within it is the recognition of "the urgent need for the universal application to women of the rights and principles with regard to equality, security, liberty, integrity and dignity of all human beings".[2] The resolution is often seen as complementary to, and a strengthening of, the work of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women[3] and Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action[4]. It recalls and embodies the same rights and principles as those enshrined in such instruments as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Articles 1 and 2 provide the most widely used definition of violence against women.[5] As a consequence of the resolution, in 1999, the General Assembly, led by the representative from the Dominican Republic, designated 25 November as the International Day for the Elimination of Violence against Women.

The international recognition that women have a right to a life free from violence is a recent one. Historically, their struggles with violence, and with the impunity that often protects the perpetrators, is linked with their fight to overcome discrimination. Since its founding the United Nations has concerned itself with the advancement of women's rights,[6] but did not specifically target the high rates of female targeted violence until 1993. One of the aims of the resolution was to overturn the prevailing governmental stance that violence against women was a private, domestic matter not requiring state intervention.

To mark International Women's Day on 8 March 1993, General Secretary, Boutros Boutros-Ghali, issued a statement in preparation of the declaration explicitly outlining the UN's role in the 'promotion' and 'protection' of women's rights:

"The struggle for women's rights, and the task of creating a new United Nations, able to promote peace and the values which nurture and sustain it, are one and the same. Today - more than ever - the cause of women is the cause of all humanity."[7]

Protocol to the International Convention for the Safety of Fishing Vessels

The 1993 Torremolinos Protocol was adopted in April 1993, and will enter into force one year after 15 States with at least an aggregate fleet of 14,000 vessels of 24 metres in length and over, have ratified the Protocol.
The Protocol updates, amends and absorbs the parent Convention, taking into account technological evolution in the intervening years and the need to take a pragmatic approach to encourage ratification of the instrument.
The Protocol applies to fishing vessels of 24 metres in length and over including those vessels also processing their catch.

The Protocol takes into account the trend to exploit deep water fishing grounds on a large scale and to conduct fishing operations in distant waters, resulting in the building of a new generation of more sophisticated fishing vessels. To be successful in their operations, these vessels have to be fitted with advanced fishfinding and navigation equipment. Fishing vessels must also be equipped to carry out environment-friendly trawling, introduced to preserve fishing resources as well as the seabed.

The general trend in modern designed fishing vessels, if they are to be economically profitable, must include improvements in machinery and fishing gear, improvements in safety features as a whole and better working conditions for fishermen.

The safety provisions addressed by the Protocol, incorporating and amending the 1977 Convention, are included in an Annex consisting of ten Chapters. The provisions include automatically controlled machinery spaces, improved life-saving appliances, immersion suits and thermal protective aids, satellite communication systems and other components of the global maritime distress and safety system.

Statute of the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, Security Council resolution S/RES/ 827 (1993)

On 6 October 1992, amid accounts of widespread violations of international humanitarian law and fundamental human rights in the conflicts engulfing the former Yugoslavia, the Security Council passed resolution 780 (1992), calling on the Secretary-General to establish an impartial Commission of Experts to provide conclusions on these accounts. A number of Security Council resolutions adopted in the course of 1992 had already affirmed the principle of individual responsibility for crimes under international law. Notable in this respect were resolutions 764 (1992) of 13 July 1992 and 771 (1992) of 13 August 1992.

The Commission of Experts' first interim report of 9 February 1993 concluded that the establishment of an *ad hoc* international tribunal to try the perpetrators of atrocities in the former Yugoslavia "would be consistent with the direction of its work". A report by the Secretary-General also conveyed the support of the Co-Chairmen of the International Conference on the former Yugoslavia for the establishment of just such an international tribunal to deal with grave breaches of humanitarian law.

Draft proposals for a statute for the prospective *ad hoc* tribunal were subsequently forwarded by Rapporteurs appointed by the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, as well as by commissions of jurists from France and Italy. Using these drafts as a resource, on 22 February 1993, the Secretary-General presented a report to the Security Council. Having determined pursuant to Article 39 of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations that the situation in the former Yugoslavia constituted a threat to international peace and security, the Security Council decided to establish an international tribunal as an effective measure to deter the commission of crimes, bring those responsible to justice, and contribute to the restoration and maintenance of peace. In resolution 827 (1993) of 25 May 1993, the Security Council unanimously approved under Chapter VII both the report of the Secretary-General and the appended Statute of the International Tribunal (Statute).

The drafters of the Statute had explicitly declined to make it a self-contained criminal code. They instead granted the Tribunal jurisdiction over a set of very broadly defined crimes, the specific content of which was to be found in customary international law. Though the Tribunal recognizes that binding conventional law could also provide basis for its jurisdiction, it has in practice always determined that the treaty provisions in question are also declaratory of

custom. As a consequence of this approach, articles 2, 3, 4 and 5 of the Statute list the crimes within the Tribunal's jurisdiction in very general terms.

Treaty of the Southern African development Community 1992

Objectives: To establish the Southern African Development Community (SADC). Summary of provisions: The objectives of SADC are, inter alia, to achieve sustainable utilisation of natural resources and effective protection of the environment, achieve development and economic growth, alleviate poverty, and defend peace and security (art. 5). To this end, SADC is to, inter alia, harmonise policies of Member States, promote international co-operation, and create appropriate institutions and mechanisms for the implementation of SADC programmes. Parties agree to, inter alia, conclude such Protocols as may be necessary in each area of co-operation (art. 21). Institutional mechanisms: A Summit of Heads of State or Government is established under the Treaty, as well as a Council of Ministers, Commissions, a Standing Committee of Officials, a Secretariat, and a Tribunal (art. 9).

Protocol for the suppression of unlawful acts against the safety of fixed platforms located on the continental shelf

Concern about unlawful acts which threaten the safety of ships and the security of their passengers and crews grew during the 1980s, with reports of crews being kidnapped, ships being hi-jacked, deliberately run aground or blown up by explosives. Passengers were threatened and sometimes killed.

In November 1985 the problem was considered by IMO's 14th Assembly and a proposal by the United States that measures to prevent such unlawful acts should be developed by IMO was supported.

The Assembly adopted resolution A.584(14) Measures to prevent unlawful acts which threaten the safety of ships and the security of their passengers and crew, then in 1086 the Maritime Safety Committee (MSC) issued a Circular (MSC/Circ.443) on Measures to prevent unlawful acts against passengers and crews on board ships.

In November 1986 the Governments of Austria, Egypt and Italy proposed that IMO prepare a convention on the subject of unlawful acts against the safety of maritime navigation 'to provide for a comprehensive suppression of unlawful acts committed against the safety of maritime navigation which endanger innocent human lives, jeopardize the safety of persons and property, seriously

affect the operation of maritime services and thus are of grave concern to the international community as a whole."

In March 1988 a conference in Rome adopted the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation.The main purpose of the Convention is to ensure that appropriate action is taken against persons committing unlawful acts against ships. These include the seizure of ships by force; acts of violence against persons on board ships; and the placing of devices on board a ship which are likely to destroy or damage it.

The Convention obliges Contracting Governments either to extradite or prosecute alleged offenders.

Important amendments to the 1988 Convention and its related Protocol, were adopted by the Diplomatic Conference on the Revision of the SUA Treaties held from 10 to 14 October 2005. The amendments were adopted in the form of Protocols to the SUA treaties (the 2005 Protocols).

Convention for the suppression of unlawful acts against the safety of maritime navigation 1988

The International Maritime Organization states, “The main purpose of the convention is to ensure that appropriate action is taken against persons committing unlawful acts against ships. These include the seizure of ships by force; acts of violence against persons on board ships; and the placing of devices on board a ship which are likely to destroy or damage it.

The convention obliges Contracting Governments either to extradite or prosecute alleged offenders.”

It was adopted on March 10, 1988 and entered into force on March 1, 1992. Protocols were added in 2005.

2005 Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Maritime Navigation

1988 Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms Located on the Continental Shelf

2005 Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms Located on the Continental Shelf

Hague Convention of 1970

The Hague Convention that compels Contracting States to recognize divorces and legal separations obtained legally in another contracting state is the Hague Convention on the Recognition of Divorces and Legal Separations concluded on 1 June 1970 and entered into force 24 August 1975. Article 1 of the Convention states, " The present Convention shall apply to the recognition in one Contracting State of divorces and legal separations obtained in another Contracting State which follow judicial or other proceedings officially recognized in that State and which are legally effective there."[7] The Convention makes clear that it does not apply to any determinations about property or child custody that may accompany a divorce. Only the state of being divorced or legally separated must be recognized.[7] There are certain exceptions. According to the Convention a divorce need not be recognized if both parties were nationals of a state which did not provide for divorce at the time of the divorce (Article 7), if the respondent in a divorce proceeding was not given an adequate chance to present his or her case (Article 8), if to do so would be "incompatible" with a previous determination as to the status of the spouses in the State where they are seeking recognition (Article 9), or if to recognize such a divorce would be manifestly incompatible with the state's public policy (Article 10).[7] In addition, Article 20 of the Constitution allows a Contracting State to file a reservation stating that that state will not recognize a divorce if at the date of the divorce, "one of the spouses was a national of a state whose laws did not provide for divorce."[7]

There are 17 states that have ratified the Convention.[8] Many states, including the United States, which is not a Contracting State to the Convention, recognize divorces obtained abroad through the above-mentioned legal principle of comity.[9]

Property Issues

As the Convention on the Recognition of Divorces and Legal Separations does not deal with matrimonial property in a divorce, the Hague Conference concluded a separate convention on 14 March 1978. The Convention on the Law Applicable to Matrimonial Property Regimes, which entered into force on 1 September 1992, allows spouses in a marriage to decide which jurisdiction's laws will apply to their property. The Convention provides that they may select the laws of any State of which one of the spouses is a national of at the time of selection, the laws of any state in which one of the spouses has his or her "habitual residence" at the time of selection, or the law of the first state in which

one of the spouses establishes a new habitual residence after the marriage.[10] If no such selection is made, the laws of the first state in which the couple had their habitual residence after marriage govern the property.[10]

The convention has only been ratified by three states (France, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands) and signed by another two (Austria and Portugal).[11] As such, international divorce cases that take place outside of the authority of the convention are not clear-cut. For instance, questions arise when assets are held in trust in a country that neither spouse has an actual connection to through residence or nationality and neither the state in which the trust is located nor the state in which suit is brought (the state of nationality or residence) is a member of the Convention. Some courts have found ways around the jurisdictional issue at hand (i.e. that they have no jurisdiction in another country) especially if the assets are marital and under the control of only one spouse. Such was the case in the New York case of Riechers v. Riechers. In this case the husband had used marital assets to fund a Cook Islands trust; even though the New York court had no jurisdiction over the trust money, they ordered the wife's share of that money paid from other assets.[12]

Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities

This Declaration recognizes that all States shall protect the existence and the national or ethnic, cultural, religious and linguistic identity of minorities within their respective territories and shall encourage conditions for the promotion of that identity.

Joint Protocol Relating to the Application of the Vienna Convention and the Paris Convention 1988

The purpose of this Joint Protocol is to establish a link between the Vienna Convention and the Paris Convention by mutually extending the benefit of the special regime of civil liability for nuclear damage set forth under each convention. It also seeks to eliminate conflicts arising from the simultaneous applications of both to a nuclear incident.

The 1986 accident at Chernobyl provided a major impetus for broadening the geographical scope of application of the international nuclear liability regime. The Paris Convention is primarily adhered to by Western European countries while the Vienna Convention is primarily adhered to by Eastern European countries. In spite of the similarity between the Paris and Vienna Conventions, their existence does not provide a single uniform third party liability regime for

all countries which are parties to either convention. The two conventions operated in isolation from each other, so that each convention benefited only victims within the territory of its own contracting parties.

In 1988, the adoption of the Joint Protocol relating to the Application of the Vienna Convention and Paris Convention created a "bridge" between the two conventions. Since its entry into force on 27 April 1992, states party to either the Paris Convention or the Vienna Convention as well as to the Joint Protocol receive the benefits of both conventions. Thus, where a nuclear incident occurs for which an operator in a Paris Convention/Joint Protocol state is liable and damage is suffered by victims in a Vienna Convention/Joint Protocol state, those victims will be able to claim compensation for their damage against the liable operator in essentially the same manner and to the same extent as if they were victims in a Paris Convention State; the reverse is equally true.

The Joint Protocol ensures that only one of the two conventions will apply to any particular nuclear incident and both the liable operator and the amount of its liability are determined by the convention to which the state, in whose territory the liable operator's installation is situated is a party. The Joint Protocol applies not only to the original Paris and Vienna conventions but also to any amendments to either convention which are in force for a contracting party to the Joint Protocol.

The Director-General of the International Atomic Energy Agency is depositary for the Joint Protocol.

United Nations Convention on the carriage of goods by sea 1978

1978 - United Nations Convention on the Carriage of Goods by Sea - the "Hamburg Rules"

Adopted by a diplomatic conference on 31 March 1978, the Convention establishes a uniform legal regime governing the rights and obligations of shippers, carriers and consignees under a contract of carriage of goods by sea. The Convention entered into force on 1 November 1992.

Adopted by the General Assembly on 11 December 2008, the Convention establishes a uniform and modern legal regime governing the rights and

obligations of shippers, carriers and consignees under a contract for door-to-door carriage that includes an international sea leg. The Convention builds upon, and provides a modern alternative to, earlier conventions relating to the international carriage of goods by sea, in particular, the International Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules of Law relating to Bills of Lading (Brussels, 25 August 1924) ("the Hague Rules"), and its Protocols ("the Hague-Visby Rules"), and the United Nations Convention on the Carriage of Goods by Sea (Hamburg, 31 March 1978) ("the Hamburg Rules").

Convention concerning Employment Promotion and Protection against Unemployment

Employment Promotion and Protection against Unemployment Convention, 1988 is an International Labour Organization Convention to promote employment especially vocational guidance, training and rehabilitation, offer the best protection against the adverse effects of involuntary unemployment, but that involuntary unemployment nevertheless exists and that it is therefore important to ensure the social security systems should promote employment assistance and economic support to those who are involuntary unemployed.

It was established in 1988, with the preamble stating:

Having decided upon the adoption of certain proposals with regard to employment promotion and social security which is the fifth item on the agenda of the session with a view, in particular, to revising the Unemployment Provision Convention, 1934, and Emphasising the importance of work and productive employment in any society not only because of the resources which they create for the community, but also because of income which they bring towards the social role whoch they confer and feeling of self-esteem which workers derive from them, and...[1]

Convention on Celebration and Recognition of the Validity of Marriages

The Hague Convention on Celebration and Recognition of the Validity of Marriages or Hague Marriage Convention is a multilateral treaty developed by the Hague Conference on Private International Law that provides the recognition of marriages. The convention was signed in 1978 by the Portugal, Luxembourg and Egypt, and later by Australia, Finland and the Netherlands. It entered into force more than 10 years after opening for signature after ratification by Australia, the Netherlands (for its European territory only)[1] and Luxembourg, and no countries have acceded to the convention since.[2]

Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention

Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 is an International Labour Organization Convention, also known as ILO-convention 169, or C169. It is the major binding international convention concerning indigenous peoples, and a forerunner of the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

It was established in 1989, with the preamble stating:

Noting the international standards contained in the Indigenous and Tribal Populations Convention and Recommendation, 1957, and

Recalling the terms of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the many international instruments on the prevention of discrimination, and

Considering that the developments which have taken place in international law since 1957, as well as developments in the situation of indigenous and tribal peoples in all regions of the world, have made it appropriate to adopt new international standards on the subject with a view to removing the assimilationist orientation of the earlier standards, and

Recognising the aspirations of these peoples to exercise control over their own institutions, ways of life and economic development and to maintain and develop their identities, languages and religions, within the framework of the States in which they live, and

Noting that in many parts of the world these peoples are unable to enjoy their fundamental human rights to the same degree as the rest of the population of the States within which they live, and that their laws, values, customs and perspectives have often been eroded, and..

International convention relating to Stowaways

The Convention on Facilitation of International Maritime Traffic, 1965, as amended, (The FAL Convention), define stowaway as "A person who is secreted on a ship, or in cargo which is subsequently loaded on the ship, without the consent of the shipowner or the Master or any other responsible person and who is detected on board the ship after it has departed from a port, or in the cargo while unloading it in the port of arrival, and is reported as a stowaway by the master to the appropriate authorities".

Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights aiming at the abolition of the death penalty

The Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty is a side agreement to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. It was created on 15 December 1989, and entered into force on 11 July 1991. Currently, the Optional Protocol has 74 states parties. In addition, 3 states (Guinea-Bissau, Poland, and São Tomé and Príncipe) have signed, but not yet ratified the Protocol.[1]

The Optional Protocol commits its members to the abolition of the death penalty within their borders, though Article 2.1 allows parties to make a reservation allowing execution for grave crimes in times of war (Brazil and Chile). Cyprus, Malta and Spain initially made such reservations, and subsequently withdrew them. Azerbaijan and Greece still retain this reservation on their implementation of the protocol, despite both having banned the death penalty in all circumstances.

Basic Principles on the Role of Lawyers

The UN Basic Principles on the Role of Lawyers provide a concise description of international norms relating to the key aspects of the right to independent counsel. The Basic Principles were unanimously adopted by the Eighth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders in Havana, Cuba on 7 September 1990. Subsequently, the UN General Assembly "welcomed" the Basic Principles in their 'Human rights in the administration of justice' resolution, which was adopted without a vote on 18 December 1990 in both the session of the Third Committee and the plenary session of the General Assembly.

One of the main purposes of the Basic Principles is to assist States in their task of promoting the proper role of lawyers and ensuring lawyers' functioning without any improper interference. It follows from the drafting process of the Basic Principles that the Basic Principles were considered essential to the efforts aimed at strengthening the international and regional cooperation in the fight against crime. More specifically, the Basic Principles are considered a fundamental pre-condition to fulfilling the requirement that all persons have effective access to legal services.

The Basic Principles were generally met with considerable approval during the Regional Preparatory Meetings. After being discussed during the regional meetings and being reviewed by the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control during its eleventh session, a final draft of the Basic Principles was presented to the Eighth Congress, which unanimously adopted the Basic Principles. Consequently, the UN General Assembly adopted the Basic

Principles without a vote, while inviting "Governments to respect them and to take them into account within the framework of their national legislation and practice". The Basic Principles have not been explicitly endorsed to date by the General Assembly.

Status

The preamble to the Basic Principles notes that Basic Principles should be brought to the attention of not only lawyers, but also other persons and bodies, such as judges, prosecutors, members of the executive and the legislature and the public in general.

The Basic Principles are considered to be a "soft-law" instrument (as opposed to "hard law"): they are not legally binding. However, the Basic Principles are held in high regard and are broadly accepted. For instance, the United Nations, several non-governmental organisations and (regional) courts of justice refer to the Basic Principles. Furthermore, some consider that the Basic Principles can be qualified as a material source of law, or even as a reflection of international customary law.

The rights included in the Basic Principles are also largely included in binding international or regional human rights treaties, for instance the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Convention Against Torture, and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the European Convention on Human Rights, the US Convention on Human Rights and the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights.

Basic Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms by Law Enforcement Officials

Law enforcement officials (including military) are often trained in 'how' to fire a weapon. These principles provide the basis for 'when' to use a weapon, and more importantly when not to use a weapon. They were adopted by the UN Crime Congress in 1990.

Cairo Declaration on Human Rights in Islam

The Cairo Declaration on Human Rights in Islam (CDHRI) is a declaration of the member states of the Organisation of the Islamic Conference adopted in Cairo in 1990,[1] which provides an overview on the Islamic perspective on human rights, and affirms Islamic Shari'ah as its sole source. CDHRI declares its purpose to be "general guidance for Member States [of the OIC] in the Field

of human rights". This declaration is usually seen as an Islamic response to the post-World War II United Nations' Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) of 1948.

Predominantly Muslim countries, such as Sudan, Iran, and Saudi Arabia, frequently criticized the Universal Declaration of Human Rights for its perceived failure to take into account the cultural and religious context of non-Western countries.[2] In 1981, the post-revolutionary Iranian representative to the United Nations Said Rajaie-Khorassani articulated the position of his country regarding the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, by saying that the UDHR was "a secular understanding of the Judeo-Christian tradition", which could not be implemented by Muslims without trespassing the Islamic law.[3] The CDHRI was adopted in 1990 by members of the Organisation of the Islamic Conference and in 1992 the CDHRI was presented to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, where it was strongly condemned by the International Commission of Jurists.

International Convention against the Recruitment Use Financing and Training of Mercenaries

This Convention was adopted on 4 December 1989 by Resolution 44/34 of the United Nations General Assembly. Two texts concerning mercenaries adopted prior to that date are worth noting: Article 47 of Additional Protocol I of 1977 to the 1949 Geneva Conventions and the Convention on the "Elimination of Mercenarism in Africa" adopted by the Organization of African Unity in Libreville on 3 July 1977. Comprising 21 articles, the 1989 Convention pursues steps previously taken by Third World countries, seconded at the time by socialist countries, to fight against mercenarism throughout the world. The definition of a mercenary is derived from Article 47 of Protocol I, but goes further by applying to "armed conflict" (Article 1, paragraph 1) and also to "any other situation" (Article 1, paragraph 2). Any of the activities cited in the Convention is considered an offence regardless of whether perpetrated by the mercenaries themselves (Article 3) or by any other person (Article 2). Attempts and complicity to commit any of the offences set forth are also considered an offence (Article 4). As with other instruments of international criminal law, States Parties undertake to try or to extradite suspected offenders as stipulated by the Convention (Articles 9 to 12). Concerning relations between the Convention of 1989 and international humanitarian law, it reserves the "right" of each State Party to invite the ICRC to communicate with and visit alleged offenders in violation of this Convention held on its territory (Article 10,

paragraph 4). Article 16 b) includes a safeguard clause applicable to international humanitarian law.

United Nations Rules for the Protection of Juveniles Deprived of their Liberty General Assembly resolution 45/113 of 14 December 1990

Adopted and proclaimed by General Assembly resolution 45/113 of 14 December 1990

III. JUVENILES UNDER ARREST OR AWAITING TRIAL

(a) Juveniles should have the right of legal counsel and be enabled to apply for free legal aid, where such aid is available, and to communicate regularly with their legal advisers. Privacy and confidentiality shall be ensured for such communications;

IV. THE MANAGEMENT OF JUVENILE FACILITIES

J. Contacts with the wider community

60. Every juvenile should have the right to receive regular and frequent visits, in principle once a week and not less than once a month, in circumstances that respect the need of the juvenile for privacy, contact and unrestricted communication with the family and the defence counsel.

Protocol concerning marine pollution resulting from exploration and exploitation of the continental shelf (to the Kuwait regional convention)

Objective: To set out measures to prevent and control marine pollution from exploration and exploitation of the continental shelf.

Summary of provisions: Parties agree to require that all appropriate measures are taken to prevent, abate and control marine pollution from offshore operations (operations conducted for exploration of oil or natural gas or for exploiting those resources) in those parts of the continental shelf covered by the Protocol within their respective jurisdictions, and to take, individually or jointly, all appropriate steps to combat such pollution (art. II). The Protocol contains provisions concerning licensing of offshore operations by each Party, including requirements of environmental impact assessment before licensing (Art. III and IV). Each Party undertakes to endeavour to ensure that offshore operation within its jurisdiction does not cause unjustifiable interference with lawful navigation, fishing or any other activities concerned (art. V.1). Furthermore, each Party agrees to take practicable measures to ensure safety and preparedness for dealing with accidental pollution at every offshore installation, (Art. VI, VII and VIII), to control the discharge and disposal into the Sea from offshore

installations and its operations (Art. IX and X), to regulate the use of chemicals at offshore installations (Art. XI) and the collection and disposal of all unwanted substances or articles from offshore operations (Art. XI) as well as the maintenance and removal of offshore installations (Art. XIII).

Convention concerning safety in the use of asbestos

1. The ILO position on asbestos is governed by the international instruments (relevant Conventions and Recommendations, and International Labour Conference resolutions) adopted by the Organization, as well as ILO codes of practice. These international instruments provide solid legal bases as well as practical guidance for comprehensive preventive measures at the national and enterprise levels in order to protect workers and prevent asbestos-related diseases.

2. The ILO Asbestos Convention, 1986 (No. 162), provides for the measures to be taken for the prevention and control of, and protection of workers against, health hazards due to occupational exposure to asbestos. Key provisions of Convention No. 162 concern:

– replacement of asbestos or of certain types of asbestos or products containing asbestos with other materials or products evaluated as less harmful,

– total or partial prohibition of the use of asbestos or of certain types of asbestos or products containing asbestos in certain work processes,

– measures to prevent or control the release of asbestos dust into the air and to ensure that the exposure limits or other exposure criteria are complied with and also to reduce exposure to as low a level as is reasonably practicable.

3. The Occupational Cancer Convention, 1974 (No. 139), provides for the measures to be taken for the control and prevention of occupational hazards caused by carcinogenic substances and agents. Key provisions of Convention No. 139 concern:

– periodically determining the carcinogenic substances and agents to which occupational exposure shall be prohibited or made subject to authorization or control;

– making every effort to have carcinogenic substances and agents to which workers may be exposed in the course of their work replaced by non-carcinogenic substances or agents or by less harmful substances or agents;

– reducing the number of workers exposed to carcinogenic substances or agents and the duration and degree of such exposure to the minimum.

4. A Resolution concerning asbestos was adopted by the International Labour Conference at its 95th Session in 2006. Noting that all forms of asbestos, including chrysotile, are classified as human carcinogens by the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), and expressing its concern that workers continue to face serious risks from asbestos exposure, particularly in asbestos removal, demolition, building maintenance, ship breaking and waste handling activities, it calls for:

– the elimination of the future use of asbestos and the identification and proper management of asbestos currently in place as the most effective means to protect workers from asbestos exposure and to prevent future asbestos-related diseases and deaths.

The Resolution also underlined that the ILO Convention on Safety in the Use of Asbestos, No. 162, should not be used to provide a justification for, or endorsement of, the continued use of asbestos.

In light of the instructions of the Governing Body following the Resolution, the Office has been:

– continuing to encourage member States to ratify and give effect to Conventions Nos. 162 and 139;

– promoting the elimination of the future use of all forms of asbestos and asbestos-containing materials;

– promoting the identification and proper management of all forms of asbestos currently in place; and

– encouraging and helping ILO member States to include measures in their national programmes on occupational safety and health to protect workers from exposure to asbestos.

Principles on the Effective Prevention and Investigation of Extra-legal Arbitrary and Summary Executions

manual, medical personnel, NGO staff, death penalty, extra-judicial killings, right to life, torture, Principles on the effective prevention and investigation of extra-legal, arbitrary and summary executions, African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights, European Committee for the Prevention of Torture (CPT), Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, UN Commission on Human

Rights, UN Committee Against Torture, UN Human Rights Committee, UN Special Rapporteur on summary or arbitrary executions, UN Special Rapporteur on Torture.

This guide provides a brief overview of the relevant and available institutions and forums where state compliance with international human rights standards can be subjected to monitoring and implementation procedures. Its purpose is to supplement the "Principles on the effective prevention and investigation of extra-legal, arbitrary and summary executions", adopted by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1989/65 of 24 May 1989, on the recommendation of the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control, at its tenth session, held in Vienna, from 5 to 16 February 1990.

Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts of Violence at Airports Serving International Civil Aviation supplementary to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation

Extends the provisions of the Montreal Convention to encompass terrorist acts at airports serving international civil aviation.

Protocol to the Athens Convention relating to the carriage of passengers and their luggage by sea (PAL PROT 1976)

A Conference, convened in Athens in 1974, adopted the Athens Convention Relating to the Carriage of Passengers and Their Luggage by Sea, 1974.

The Convention is designed to consolidate and harmonize two earlier Brussels conventions dealing with passengers and luggage and adopted in 1961 and 1967 respectively.

The Convention establishes a regime of liability for damage suffered by passengers carried on a seagoing vessel. It declares a carrier liable for damage or loss suffered by a passenger if the incident causing the damage occurred in the course of the carriage and was due to the fault or neglect of the carrier.

However, unless the carrier acted with intent to cause such damage, or recklessly and with knowledge that such damage would probably result, he can limit his liability. For the death of, or personal injury to, a passenger, this limit of liability is set at $US 55,000 per carriage.

As far as loss of or damage to luggage is concerned, the carrier's limit of liability varies, depending on whether the loss or damage occurred in respect of cabin luggage, of a vehicle and/or luggage carried in or on it, or in respect of other luggage.

Protocol to the Athens Convention relating to the Carriage of Passengers and their Luggage by Sea, 1974

The Athens Convention also used the 'Poincare franc', based on the 'official' value of gold, as the applicable unit of account.

A Protocol to the Convention, with the same provisions as in the Protocols to the 1971 Fund Convention and the 1969 Liability Convention, was accordingly adopted in November 1976.

The main aim of the Protocol is to raise the amount of compensation available in the event of deaths or injury at around $US 225,000. Other limits are $US 2,322 for loss of or damage to cabin luggage and $US 12,900 for loss of or damage to vehicles.

The Protocol also makes provision for the "tacit acceptance" procedure to be used to amend the limitation amounts in the future.

Convention on civil liability for damage caused during carriage of dangerous goods by road rail and inland navigation vessels (CRTD)

The CRTD Convention was prepared by the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law (UNIDROIT) and adopted by the Inland Transport Committee of the Economic Commission for Europe at its fifty-first session, held in Geneva, from 2 to 10 October 1989.

2.The CRTD was opened for signature on 1 February 1990.

3.Germany and Morocco have signed the Convention. Liberia deposited its instruments of accession to the CRTD.

4.At the request of the Inland Transport Committee, the secretariat sent a questionnaire (English, French, Russian) to all heads of delegations to the Committee with a view to identifying what difficulties would prevent accession to the CRTD.

5.Several delegations replied to the questionnaire.

6.At its seventy-first session (Geneva, 5-9 November 2001), the Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods, having considered the conclusions of the ad hoc group of experts on the basis of the questionnaire on the CRTD Convention, recommends to the Inland Transport Committee to establish an ad hoc meeting of experts on the CRTD, which would meet twice in 2002 and twice in 2003, with the following mandate:

(a)to consult experts from all sectors concerned by the CRTD (e.g. legal experts on liability, insurance industry, consignors, carriers) in order to determine how to eliminate the obstacles -such as those related to the limit of liability and compulsory insurance- to the entry into force of the CRTD;

(b)to propose, on the basis of these consultations and of proposals by Governments, modifications to the existing articles of the CRTD which would provide a better basis for application of the CRTD to the various modes of transport;

(c)to report to the Inland Transport Committee at its 2003 session on progress made and difficulties encountered;

(d)to submit to the Inland Transport Committee a reviewed text of the CRTD incorporating the modifications mentioned above for possible adoption as a new convention at its 2004 session.

Agreement establishing the Caribbean environmental health Institute

The Caribbean Environmental Health Institute (CEHI) is a Technical Institute of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM). CEHI was established in 1979 by Governments of the Caribbean, to address environmental concerns and further the sustainable development of the region. The Institute's environmental health mandate focuses on the impacts of human activity on the environment and the consequent effects on human health and the socio-economic development of CARICOM States.

CEHI is headquartered in St. Lucia and works throughout the Caribbean region providing technical and advisory services to its 16 member states. The Institute works with the public sector, private sector, development agencies and civil society and remains dedicated to finding cost effective solutions to environmental problems in the Caribbean.

Athens Convention relating to the carriage of passengers and their luggage by sea (PAL 1974)

The Convention was adopted at a Conference, convened in Athens in 1974 and was designed to consolidate and harmonize two earlier Brussels conventions dealing with passengers and luggage and adopted in 1961 and 1967 respectively.

The Convention establishes a regime of liability for damage suffered by passengers carried on a seagoing vessel. It declares a carrier liable for damage or loss suffered by a passenger if the incident causing the damage occurred in the course of the carriage and was due to the fault or neglect of the carrier.

However, unless the carrier acted with intent to cause such damage, or recklessly and with knowledge that such damage would probably result, he can limit his liability. For the death of, or personal injury to, a passenger, this limit of liability is set at 46,666 Special Drawing Rights (SDR) per carriage. The 2002 Protocol, when it enters into force, will introduce compulsory insurance to cover passengers on ships and substantially raise those limits to 250,000 SDR per passenger on each distinct occasion. .

As far as loss of or damage to luggage is concerned, the carrier's limit of liability varies, depending on whether the loss or damage occurred in respect of cabin luggage, of a vehicle and/or luggage carried in or on it, or in respect of other luggage.

The 1976 Protocol made the unit of account the Special Drawing Right (SDR), replacing the "Poincaré franc", based on the "official" value of gold, as the applicable unit of account.

The 1990 Protocol was intended to raise the limits set out in the convention but it did not enter into force and was superseded by the 2002 Protocol.

Convention on the regulation of Antarctic mineral resource activities

Convention on the Regulation of Antarctic Mineral Resource Activities June 1988 this Convention is a part of the Antarctic Treaty System, comprising the Antarctic Treaty System, the measures in effect under that Treaty, and its associated separate legal instruments, the prime purpose of which is to ensure that Antarctica shall continue forever to be used exclusively for peaceful purposes and shall not become the scene or object of international conflict. The Parties provide through this Convention, the principles it establishes, the rules it prescribes, the institutions it creates and the decisions adopted pursuant to it.

The Convention has not entered into force and has been effectively replaced by the 1991 Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty (Madrid Protocol).

International Agreement on olive oil and table olives, 1986

The first International Agreement on Olive Oil and Table Olives was signed in 1956 under the auspices of the UN, more particularly UNCTAD. The International Olive Oil Council (IOOC) was created in 1959 as the organisation in charge of the administration of the Agreement.

The IOOC is also the reference body for the definition and quality of olive oil for marketing.

On 29 April 2005 the Member States adopted a new agreement in Geneva to regulate the market until 31 December 2014.

It replaces the 4° Olive Oil Agreement - signed in 1986 – which was for an initial five years period and was later amended in 1993 for subsequent five years. The Agreement was extended a first time in 1998 for two years until 31 December 2000 and a second time until 31 December 2002. Finally, at its 91st session (Madrid, 29 November – 2 December 2004) the International Olive Oil Council (IOOC) decided to extend the Agreement for a period of twelve months up to 31 December 2005 (OJ C24, 29/01/2005) until the new 2005 agreement entered into force.

The new 2005 agreement, entitled the International Agreement on Olive Oil and Table Olives, 2005, provides international protection for the geographical indications agreed on by members, thereby filling a gap in the previous text. It also puts relationships with professionals on an institutional footing and provides for international cooperation with representatives of the olive-products sector. Environmental protection is strengthened.

Moreover, the Council is given the task of organising the transfer of technology from members that are highly advanced in olive cultivation, olive oil extraction and table olive processing techniques to the developing countries that are members of the Council.

The new agreement is also aimed at improving the quality of the sector's products and is intended to back up the advertising campaigns on the properties and benefits of olive oil and table olives - that is, their organoleptic and chemical characteristics and their nutritional and therapeutic properties.

The 2005 Agreement also introduces changes in its implementation. In particular, where consensus cannot be reached, decisions are to be taken by a qualified majority of at least 50% of the members accounting for 82% of the participation shares. These shares are calculated each year on the basis of average production and average exports in the six previous olive crop years.

Amendment to article XI to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora

Amendments to the Convention must be supported by a two-thirds majority who are "present and voting" and can be made during an extraordinary meeting of the COP if one-third of the Parties are interested in such a meeting. The Gaborone Amendment (1983) allows regional economic blocs to accede to the treaty. Reservations (Article XXIII) can be made by any Party with respect to any species, which considerably weakens the treaty (see [1] for current reservations). Trade with non-Party states is allowed, although permits and certificates are recommended to be issued by exporters and sought by importers.

Convention on assistance in the case of a nuclear accident or radiological emergency

Adopted in 1986 following the Chernobyl nuclear plant accident, the *Convention on Assistance in the Case of a Nuclear Accident or Radiological Emergency* sets out an international framework for co-operation among States Parties and with the IAEA to facilitate prompt assistance and support in the event of nuclear accidents or radiological emergencies. It requires States to notify the IAEA of their available experts, equipment, and other materials for providing assistance. HDK ;L; IH FN,K ID] ICDKI HD HIn case of a request, each State Party decides whether it can render the requested assistance as well as its scope and terms. Assistance may be offered without costs taking into account inter alia the needs of developing countries and the particular needs of countries without nuclear facilities. The IAEA serves as the focal point for such cooperation by channelling information, supporting efforts, and providing its available services.

The Convention on Assistance in Case of a Nuclear Accident or Radiological Emergency and the Convention on Early Notification of a Nuclear Accident (Emergency Conventions) are the prime legal instruments that establish an international framework to facilitate the exchange of information and the prompt provision of assistance in the event of a nuclear accident or radiological emergency. They place specific obligations on the Parties and the IAEA, with the aim of minimizing consequences for health, property and the environment. more

Convention on Early Notification of a Nuclear Accident

This Convention aims to strengthen international co-operation in order to provide relevant information about nuclear accidents as early as necessary in order that transboundary radiological consequences can be minimized. States Party commit that, in the event of a nuclear accident that may have transboundary radiological consequences, they will notify countries that may be affected and the IAEA, and provide relevant information on the development of the accident The IAEA in turn forthwith informs States Parties, Member States, other States that may be physically affected and relevant international organizations of a notification received and promptly provides other information on request. Each State Party and the Agency have identified 24-hour warning points to which a notification can be directed, as well as competent authorities who are authorized to send notifications and verify information provided. The Agency maintains an up-to-date list of such authorities and warning points and provides it to States Parties, Member States and relevant international organizations. latest status

Convention on Assistance in the Case of a Nuclear Accident or Radiological Emergency

This Convention requires that States Parties cooperate between themselves and with the IAEA to facilitate prompt assistance in the event of a nuclear accident or radiological emergency to minimize its consequences and to protect life, property and the environment from the effects of radioactive releases. The IAEA is charged with using its best endeavours to promote, facilitate and support the cooperation between the States Parties. In the event of a nuclear accident or radiological emergency, the IAEA's functions are to: make available to a State Party or a Member State requesting assistance appropriate resources for the purpose of conducting an initial assessment of the accident; transmit requests for assistance and relevant information to States Parties that may possess the necessary resources; offer its good offices to the States Parties or Member States; liaise with relevant international organizations to obtain and exchange relevant information; and, on request, co-ordinate the assistance at the

international level that becomes available. Each State Party and the Agency have identified 24-hour warning points to which a request for assistance can be directed, as well as Competent Authorities who are authorized to send requests and to arrange for the provision of assistance. The Agency maintains an up-to-date list of such authorities and warning points and provides it to States Parties, Member States and relevant international organizations. latest status

Requirements No. GS-R-2

Under the terms of Article III of its Statute, the IAEA is authorized to establish standards of safety for protection of health, life and property against ionizing radiation. The IAEA's safety standards are not legally binding on Member States but may be adopted by them, at their own discretion, for use in national regulations. They are binding on the IAEA in relation to its own operations and on States in relation to operations assisted by the IAEA. In 2002 the IAEA Board of Governors approved the document "Preparedness and Response for a Nuclear or Radiological Emergency" to be published as Requirements in the IAEA Safety Standards series (No. GS-R-2). This publication is co-sponsored by FAO, IAEA, ILO, OECD/NEA, PAHO, OCHA and the WHO. Compliance with these requirements will make for greater consistency between the emergency response criteria and arrangements of different States and thereby facilitate the emergency response at the regional and international level. The IAEA General Conference in resolution GC(46)/RES/9 has encouraged Member States to implement the Safety Requirements.

With respect to the international response system, GS-R-2 establishes requirements for international notification and information exchange in the case of a 'transnational emergency', i.e. a nuclear or radiological emergency of actual, potential or perceived radiological significance for more than one State. This includes:

- A significant transboundary release of radioactive material
- A 'general emergency' at a facility or other events that could result in a transboundary release of radioactive material
- Discovery of the loss or illicit removal of a dangerous source that has been transported across or is suspected of having been transported across a national border
- An emergency resulting in significant disruption to international trade or travel
- An emergency warranting the taking of protective actions for foreign nationals or embassies in the State in which it occurs

- An emergency resulting in or potentially resulting in severe deterministic effects and involving a fault and/or problem (such as in equipment or software) that could have serious implications for safety internationally
- An emergency resulting in or potentially resulting in great concern among the population of more than one State owing to the actual or perceived radiological hazard

Convention on early notification of a nuclear accident

Adopted in 1986 following the Chernobyl nuclear plant accident, the *Convention on Early Notification of a Nuclear Accident* establishes a notification system for nuclear accidents which have the potential for international transboundary release that could be of radiological safety significance for another State. It requires States to report the accident's time, location, radiation releases, and other data essential for assessing the situation. Notification is to be made to affected States directly or through the IAEA, and to the IAEA itself. Reporting is mandatory for any nuclear accident involving facilities and activities listed in Article 1. Pursuant to Article 3, States may notify other accidents as well. The five nuclear-weapon States (China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and United States) have all declared their intent also to report accidents involving nuclear weapons and nuclear weapons tests.

Convention on limitation of liability for maritime claims

Objectives: To determine certain uniform rules relating to the limitation of liability for maritime claims. Summary of provisions: This Convention was adopted in the framework of the International Maritime Organisation (IMO). Chapter I defines persons entitled to limit liability, claims subject to limitation and claims excepted from it, conduct barring limitation, and counter claims. Chapter II sets the general financial limits of liability, provides a special limit for passenger claims, and deals with aggregation of claims. Chapter III concerns the limitation fund which may be constituted by any person liable under the Convention. Chapter IV defines the scope of application of the Convention, providing an option for Parties to exclude wholly or partially persons liable under the Convention from its application if certain conditions are met.

The Convention replaced the International Convention Relating to the Limitation of the Liability of Owners of Seagoing Ships, which was signed in Brussels in 1957, and came into force in 1968.

Under the 1976 Convention, the limit of liability for claims covered is raised considerably, in some cases up to 250-300 per cent. Limits are specified for two types of claims - claims for loss of life or personal injury, and property claims (such as damage to other ships, property or harbour works).

The limits under the 1976 Convention were set at 333,000 SDR for personal claims for ships not exceeding 500 tons plus an additional amount based on tonnage. For other claims, the limit of liability was fixed under the 1976 Convention at 167,000 SDR plus additional amounts based on tonnage on ships exceeding 500 tons.

The Convention provides for a virtually unbreakable system of limiting liability. Shipowners and salvors may limit their liability, except if "it is proved that the loss resulted from his personal act or omission, committed with the intent to cause such a loss, or recklessly and with knowledge that such loss would probably result".

Protocol to Amend the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat

Objectives: To render the Convention more effective.

Summary of provisions: (a) article 1 provides for the inclusion in the Convention of an article 10 bis which defines a mechanism for amending the Convention; (b) Article 2 provides for the deletion of the words "in any case of divergency, the English text prevailing" from the testimonium following article 12; (c) Article 3 states that the revised text of the original French version of the Convention is reproduced in the annex to the Protocol.

The South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty

The Treaty of Rarotonga is the common name for the South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty, which formalizes a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the South Pacific. The treaty bans the use, testing, and possession of nuclear weapons within the borders of the zone.[1][2][3]

The South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone (SPNFZ) Treaty, known as the Treaty of Rarotonga, bans the manufacture, possession, stationing, and testing of any nuclear explosive device in Treaty territories for which the parties are internationally responsible; it also bans the dumping of radioactive waste at sea. Three Protocols extend the Treaty's provisions to states outside the zone: Protocol I requires states with territories in the region to apply the prohibitions on manufacture, stationing, and testing of nuclear explosive devices to their territories; Protocol II commits the five declared nuclear weapons states not to use or threaten to use any nuclear explosive device against Parties to the Treaty or Protocol Parties' territories within the zone; and Protocol III commits the five nuclear weapon states not to test any nuclear explosive device within the zone.

Protocols binding other states

There are three protocols to the treaty, which have been signed by the five declared nuclear states, with the exception of Protocol 1 for China and Russia who have no territory in the Zone.

1. no manufacture, stationing or testing in their territories within the Zone
2. no use against the Parties to the Treaty, or against territories where Protocol 1 is in force
3. no testing within the Zone

In 1996 France and the United Kingdom signed and ratified the three protocols. The USA signed them the same year but never ratified them. China signed and ratified protocols 2 and 3 in 1987. Russia has also ratified protocols 2 and 3 with reservations.

United Nations Convention on conditions for registration of ships

The United Nations Convention on Conditions for Registration of Ships, signed in Geneva on 7 February 1986 was adopted mainly in order to stop the phenomenon of registration of ships in foreign States merely for financial purposes through flags of convenience, by strengthening the linkage requirement between the vessel and its flag State. Another objective is to ensure a better control of the flag State over the vessels that are registered under its jurisdiction. The Convention sets minimal norms, and States retain the power to adopt more exacting ones under domestic law. The Convention applies to any self-propelled vessel over 500 gross registered tons used in international seaborne trade for the transport of goods and/or passengers.

Every State, coastal or land-locked, has the right to sail ships flying its flag on the high seas. By virtue of the Convention, a ship shall sail under the flag of one State only at a time, and this State must have entitled it to do so.

The Convention contains provisions relating to the role of national maritime administrations, which are responsible for the implementation of international standards. Emphasis is put on State collecting appropriate information necessary for identification and accountability concerning ships flying a State's flag and their owners and in having this information accessible ; also, ships should have on board documents containing such information. The Convention lists the type of information that must mandatorily appear in a State's register.

Two series of conditions are set up to reinforce the vessel-flag State link; at least one of both series must be wholly respected in order to allow registration of a ship. The first series deals with ownership of the vessel: domestic law must demand a level of ownership of the vessel by the State or its nationals sufficient to permit the flag State to exercise effective control over the vessel. The second series deals with the nationality or domicile of the ship's officers and crew: domestic law must ensure that a satisfactory part of the ship's complement (officers and crew) be nationals of the flag State or lawfully reside or be domiciled in that State.

In order to be registered in a State, the ship-owning company must be established, have its principal business place or have a national representative or management person domiciled in the registration State. It is the States' responsibility to ensure respect of these norms, again with a view to a better accountability, so that the representative or manager should be in a position to meet the financial obligations that may arise from the operation of a ship. Also, some form of guarantee must be provided to secure payment of wages to seafarers employed on the ship.

The Convention takes into account different practices in the shipping industry. Registration may be granted to a bareboat charterer, in which case the Convention must be fully complied with. Also, the Convention urges State Parties to promote joint venture between shipowners of different countries.

Finally, one must mention that the Convention provides for the implementation of measures to safeguard the interest of labour-supplying countries (see resolution 1 annexed) and allows the conclusion of bilateral agreements between flag States and labour supplying countries concerning the employment of seafarers of the latter. Also, some measures have been adopted to minimize

the adverse economic impact for developing countries of complying with the requirements of the Convention (see resolution 2 annexed).

Declaration on the Human Rights of Individuals Who are not Nationals of the Country in which They Live

The Declaration on the Human Rights of Individuals who are not Nationals of the Country in Which They Live was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly Resolution A/RES/40/144 on 13 December 1985.

Article 5

1. Aliens shall enjoy, in accordance with domestic law and subject to the relevant international obligations of the State in which they are present, in particular the following rights:

    (f) The right to retain their own language, culture and tradition;

International convention on maritime search and rescue

The 1979 Convention, adopted at a Conference in Hamburg, was aimed at developing an international SAR plan, so that, no matter where an accident occurs, the rescue of persons in distress at sea will be co-ordinated by a SAR organization and, when necessary, by co-operation between neighbouring SAR organizations.

Although the obligation of ships to go to the assistance of vessels in distress was enshrined both in tradition and in international treaties (such as the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS), 1974), there was, until the adoption of the SAR Convention, no international system covering search and rescue operations. In some areas there was a well-established organization able to provide assistance promptly and efficiently, in others there was nothing at all.

The technical requirements of the SAR Convention are contained in an Annex, which was divided into five Chapters. Parties to the Convention are required to ensure that arrangements are made for the provision of adequate SAR services in their coastal waters.Parties are encouraged to enter into SAR agreements with neighbouring States involving the establishment of SAR regions, the pooling of facilities, establishment of common procedures, training and liaison visits. The Convention states that Parties should take measures to expedite entry into its territorial waters of rescue units from other Parties.

The Convention then goes on to establish preparatory measures which should be taken, including the establishment of rescue co-ordination centres and subcentres. It outlines operating procedures to be followed in the event of emergencies or alerts and during SAR operations. This includes the designation of an on-scene commander and his duties.

International tropical timber Agreement (1983)

The International Tropical Timber Agreement (ITTA, 1983) is an agreement to provide an effective framework for cooperation between tropical timber producers and consumers and to encourage the development of national policies aimed at sustainable utilization and conservation of tropical forests and their genetic resources. The International Tropical Timber Organization was established under this agreement.

Protocol concerning regional co-operation in combating pollution by oil and other harmful substances in cases of emergency

Objective: To enhance existing measures for responding to pollution emergencies.

Summary of provisions: The Parties undertake to cooperate in maintaining and promoting their contingency plans and means for combating pollution and protecting the coastline and related interests (art. II). Each Contracting Party agrees to inform the other Parties and the Marine Emergency Mutual Aid Centre of its relevant legislation, contingency plans and technical research and developments (arts. V- VIII). Any Party faced with a marine emergency is to make an assessment of the nature and extent of the emergency, take appropriate measures to combat pollution and inform the other Parties of the measures it has taken or intends to take (art. X). Any Party may call for assistance from the others and from the Centre (art. XI).

Institutional mechanisms: A Marine Emergency Mutual Aid Centre is established (art. III). Each Party is to establish and maintain an appropriate authority to carry out its obligations under this Protocol (art. XII).

Agreement governing the activities of states on the moon and other celestial bodies

The Moon Agreement was considered and elaborated by the Legal Subcommittee from 1972 to 1979. The Agreement was adopted by the General Assembly in 1979 in resolution 34/68. It was not until June 1984, however, that the fifth country, Austria, ratified the Agreement, allowing it to enter into force in July 1984. The Agreement reaffirms and elaborates on many of the provisions of the Outer Space Treaty as applied to the Moon and other celestial bodies, providing that those bodies should be used exclusively for peaceful purposes, that their environments should not be disrupted, that the United Nations should be informed of the location and purpose of any station established on those bodies. In addition, the Agreement provides that the Moon and its natural resources are the common heritage of mankind and that an international regime should be established to govern the exploitation of such resources when such exploitation is about to become feasible.

The treaty would apply to the Moon and to other celestial bodies within the Solar System, other than the Earth, including orbits around or other trajectories to or around them.[*citation needed*]

The treaty makes a declaration that the Moon should be used for the benefit of all states and all peoples of the international community. It also expresses a desire to prevent the Moon from becoming a source of international conflict. To those ends the treaty:[*citation needed*]

- Bans any military use of celestial bodies, including weapon testing or as military bases.
- Bans all exploration and uses of celestial bodies without the approval or benefit of other states under the common heritage of mankind principle (article 11).
- Requires that the Secretary-General must be notified of all celestial activities (and discoveries developed thanks to those activities).
- Declares all states have an equal right to conduct research on celestial bodies.
- Declares that for any samples obtained during research activities, the state that obtained them must consider making part of it available to all countries/scientific communities for research.
- Bans altering the environment of celestial bodies and requires that states must take measures to prevent accidental contamination.
- Bans any state from claiming sovereignty over any territory of celestial bodies.
- Bans any ownership of any extraterrestrial property by any organization or person, unless that organization is international and governmental.
- Requires all resource extraction and allocation be made by an international regime.

•

International Convention on Standards of Training Certification and Watch keeping for Fishing Vessel Personnel (STCW)

The International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Fishing Vessel Personnel, 1995 (STCW-F 1995), is set to enter into force on 29 September 2012, after the required 15 ratifications were reached on 29 September 2011, with ratification by the Republic of Palau.

The 1995 STCW-F Convention sets the certification and minimum training requirements for crews of seagoing fishing vessels of 24 metres in length and above. The Convention consists of 15 Articles and an annex containing technical regulations.

The STCW-F Convention is the first to establish basic requirements on training, certification and watchkeeping for Fishing Vessel Personnel on an international level. The Convention prescribes minimum standards relating to training, certification and watchkeeping for Fishing Vessel Personnel, which countries are obliged to meet or exceed.

Presently, it is estimated that annually more than 24.000 lives are lost world-wide during fishing operations which is a most deploring record indeed. The IMO recognises the need for a response to the safety crisis in the fishing industry and has a number of instruments addressing the issue. One of these instruments is the International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Fishing Vessel Personnel (STCW-F), which was adopted by IMO in 1995, and is expected to bring considerable benefits and advantages to the fishing industry i.e. improving the quality of education and training provided to personnel employed in fishing vessels; and enhancing the standard of training and safety in the fishing industry and fishing vessel fleets.

The STCW-F Convention will contribute to the reduction of casualties, and will go a long way to improve the present poor safety record of the global fishing industry. The STCW-F Convention will apply to crew onboard seagoing fishing vessels of 24 metres in length and above. It sets the regulatory framework for the training and certification of personnel employed on board fishing vessels with a view to improve the safety of life and property at sea in the fishing industry. This is the first attempt to establish international mandatory training standards for crew manning and operating fishing vessels and we all hope that it will indeed have the desired impact and effect. However, it is important to note and bear in mind that the STCW-F Convention does not

actually deal with manning issues as such, which is crucial and should make ratification and implementation easier for all concerned.
The STCW-F Convention is comparatively short and consists of 15 Articles and an annex containing technical regulations in four chapters:

Chapter I contains General Provisions;
Chapter II deals with Certification of Skippers, Officers, Engineer Officers and Radio Operators;
Chapter III deals with basic safety training for all fishing vessel personnel; and
Chapter IV deals with watchkeeping

Protocol amending the International Convention Relating to the Limitation of the Liability of Owners of Sea-going Ships

Objectives: To amend the 1957 International Convention Relating to the Limitation of the Liability of Owners of Sea-going Ships. Summary of provisions: Parties agree to replace Article 3 paragraph (1) and Article 3 paragraph (6) of the Convention with new ones to amend the calculation of the amounts to which the owner of a ship may limit his liability under Article 1 of the Convention. Article 3 paragraph 7 is to be renumbered Article 3 paragraph (9).

Protocol to amend the International Convention for the unification of certain rules of law relating to bills of lading signed at Brussels on 25th August 1924, as amended by the Protocol of 23rd February 1968, 1979

The Hague-Visby Rules are a set of international rules for the international carriage of goods by sea. The official title is "International Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules of Law relating to Bills of Lading" and was drafted in Brussels in 1924. After being amended by the Brussels Amendments (officially the "Protocol to Amend the International Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules of Law Relating to Bills of Lading") in 1968, the Rules became known as the Hague-Visby Rules. A final amendment was made in the SDR Protocol in 1979.

The premise of the Hague-Visby Rules (and of the earlier English Common Law) is that a carrier has far greater bargaining power than the shipper; and that to protect the interests of the shipper/cargo-owner, the law should impose minimum obligations upon the carrier.

Convention concerning Equal Opportunities and Equal Treatment for Men and Women Workers: Workers with Family Responsibilities

With the aim of creating effective equality of opportunity and treatment for men and women workers, the convention requires ratifying states to make it a goal of national policy to enable persons with family responsibilities who are engaged or wish to engage in employment to exercise their right to do so without being subject to discrimination and, to the extent possible, without conflict between their employment and family responsibilities. The convention also requires governments to take account of the needs of workers with family responsibilities in community planning and to develop or promote community services, public or private, such as childcare and family services and facilities.

Full equality of opportunity and treatment between men and women workers also requires the promotion of equality with regard to workers with family responsibilities.

The Workers with Family Responsibilities Convention (No. 156) and Recommendation (No. 165), 1981 aim at creating equality of opportunity and treatment in employment and occupation between men and women workers with families, and establishing equality of opportunity and treatment in employment and occupation between men and women workers with family responsibilities and those without such responsibilities. The Convention is applicable to all workers with family responsibilities in all sectors of activity. It requires ratifying States to make equality of opportunity and treatment for workers with family responsibilities the objective of national policy, to be promoted by appropriate measures. The supplementing Recommendation stipulates more detailed policies and appropriate measures regarding vocational training, employment and employment conditions, and contains additional provisions on family and childcare services and institutions as well as social security.

Convention concerning a conduct code of liner conferences

the Convention on a **Code of Conduct for Liner Conferences**, which strengthened the ability of developing countries to maintain national merchant fleets.

Director-in-Charge of the United Nations Conference of Plenipotentiaries, and former Director of the Division for Invisibles of UNCTAD.

Convention concerning Occupational Safety and Health and the Working Environment

This paper grouped together recent ILO conventions relevant to occupational safety and health (OSH) in order to clarify their characteristics and form an overview. There are 13 such conventions adopted by ILO during the period 1960-1993. Each of these conventions have distinct goals to cover respective areas of OSH, which was contrasted with each other. Conventions are subject to ratification, thus the ratification status of Japan was statistically compared to that of ILO and OECD member states. As at June 1993, Japan ratified three of such conventions, which was slightly higher than the average number ratified by all ILO member states and ranked 11th among 24 OECD member states. The relative ratification status of Japan on ILO Conventions fared better with those relevant to OSH than others. ILO Conventions are inter-related by reference and note, thus ratification of basic conventions such as C. 155 (Occupational Safety and Health Convention) and C. 148 (Working Environment Convention), neither of which is ratified by Japan, should be prioritized to further promote ratification status in the OSH area.

Convention on long-range transboundary air pollution

The Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution is one of the central means for protecting our environment. It has, over the years, served as a bridge between different political systems and as a factor of stability in years of political change. It has substantially contributed to the development of international environmental law and has created the essential framework for controlling and reducing the damage to human health and the environment caused by transboundary air pollution. It is a successful example of what can be achieved through intergovernmental cooperation.

The history of the Convention can be traced back to the 1960s, when scientists demonstrated the interrelationship between sulphur emissions in continental Europe and the acidification of Scandinavian lakes. The 1972 United Nations Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm signalled the start for active international cooperation to combat acidification. Between 1972 and 1977 several studies confirmed the hypothesis that air pollutants could travel several thousands of kilometres before deposition and damage occurred. This also implied that cooperation at the international level was necessary to solve problems such as acidification.

In response to these acute problems, a High-level Meeting within the Framework of the ECE on the Protection of the Environment was held at ministerial level in November 1979 in Geneva. It resulted in the signature of the

Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution by 34 Governments and the European Community (EC). The Convention was the first international legally binding instrument to deal with problems of air pollution on a broad regional basis. Besides laying down the general principles of international cooperation for air pollution abatement, the Convention sets up an institutional framework bringing together research and policy.

Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction

The **Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction,** or **Hague Abduction Convention** is a multilateral treaty developed by the Hague Conference on Private International Law that provides an expeditious method to return a child internationally abducted by a parent from one member nation to another. Proceedings on the Convention concluded 25 October 1980 and the Convention entered into force between the signatory nations on 1 December 1983. The Convention was drafted to ensure the prompt return of children who have been abducted from their country of habitual residence or wrongfully retained in a contracting state not their country of habitual residence.[1]

The primary intention of the Convention is to preserve whatever status quo child custody arrangement existed immediately before an alleged wrongful removal or retention thereby deterring a parent from crossing international boundaries in search of a more sympathetic court. The Convention applies only to children under the age of 16.

International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution From Ships 1973 as modified by the Protocol of 1978 MARPOL 73/78

Marpol 73/78 is the **International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution From Ships, 1973 as modified by the Protocol of 1978**. ("Marpol" is short for marine pollution and 73/78 short for the years 1973 and 1978.)

Marpol 73/78 is one of the most important international marine environmental conventions. It was designed to minimize pollution of the seas, including dumping, oil and exhaust pollution. Its stated object is: to preserve the marine environment through the complete elimination of pollution by oil and other harmful substances and the minimization of accidental discharge of such substances.

The original MARPOL Convention was signed on 17 February 1973, but did not come into force. The current Convention is a combination of 1973 Convention and the 1978 Protocol. It entered into force on 2 October 1983. As

of 31 December 2005, 136 countries, representing 98% of the world's shipping tonnage, are parties to the Convention.

All ships flagged under countries that are signatories to MARPOL are subject to its requirements, regardless of where they sail and member nations are responsible for vessels registered under their respective nationalities.[1]

Protocol on non-detectable fragments (Protocol I of The Convention 1980 on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons) 1980

Protocol I on Non-Detectable Fragments prohibits the use of any weapon the primary effect of which is to injure by fragments which are not detectable in human body by X-rays.

Protocol on prohibitions or restrictions on the use of incendiary weapons (Protocol III to the Convention of 1980 on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons) 1980

Protocol III on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Incendiary Weapons prohibits, in all circumstances, making the civilian population as such, individual civilians or civilian objects, the object of attack by any weapon or munition which is primarily designed to set fire to objects or to cause burn injury to persons through the action of flame, heat or a combination thereof, produced by a chemical reaction of a substance delivered on the target. The protocol also prohibits the use of incendiary weapons against military targets near concentration of civilians, which may otherwise be allowed by the principle of proportionality. Protocol III lists certain munition types like smoke shells which, even if they contain White Phosphorus, only have a secondary incendiary effect; these munition types are not considered to be incendiary weapons.

Protocol on prohibitions or restrictions on the use of mines booby-traps and other devices (Protocol II to the Convention of 1980 on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons) 1980

Protocol II on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices was amended on May 3, 1996 to strengthen its provisions. It extends the scope of application to cover both international and internal armed conflicts; prohibits the use of non-detectable anti-personnel mines and their transfer; prohibits the use of non-self-destructing and non-self-deactivating mines outside fenced, monitored and marked areas; broadens obligations of

protection in favour of peacekeeping and other missions of the United Nations and its agencies; requires States to enforce compliance with its provisions within their jurisdiction; and calls for penal sanctions in case of violation.

Protocol relating to Intervention on the high seas in cases of marine pollution by substances other than oil

Tthe 1973 London Conference on Marine Pollution therefore adopted the Protocol relating to Intervention on the High Seas in Cases of Marine Pollution by Substances other than Oil. This extended the regime of the 1969 Intervention Convention to substances which are either listed in the Annex to the Protocol or which have characteristics substantially similar to those substances.

The 1973 Protocol entered into force in 1983 and was amended in 1996 and 2002 to update the list of substances attached to it.

Protocol for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution from Land-Based Sources

Objectives: To prevent, abate, combat and control pollution of the Mediterranean Sea area by discharges from rivers, coastal establishments or outfalls, or emanating from any other land-based sources.

Summary or provisions: Parties undertake to establish programmes and measures, particularly including emission standards and standards for using and discharging substances listed in annexes I and II or wastes containing such substances (arts. 5-7). They are to assess the levels of pollution along their coasts and to evaluate the effects of measures taken under the Protocol. Parties agree to cooperate as far as possible in scientific and technological fields (arts. 9 and 10) as well as in the case of conflicts (arts. 11 and 12). They also agree to convene ordinary and extraordinary meetings to review the implementation of the Protocol and consider the efficacy of the measures adopted and the' advisability of any other measures (art. 14).

Agreement concerning cooperation in the management of fisheries of common interest

The **Nauru Agreement Concerning Cooperation In The Management Of Fisheries Of Common Interest**, or **The Nauru Agreement** is an Oceania subregional agreement between the Federated States of Micronesia, Kiribati, the

Marshall Islands, Nauru, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands and Tuvalu.[2] The eight signatories collectively control 25-30% of the world's tuna supply and approximately 60% of the western and central Pacific tuna supply.[3]

Historically, the Nauru Agreement and other joint fishery management Arrangements made by the Parties to the Nauru Agreement (usually referred to as *PNA*) have been concerned mainly with the management of tuna purse-seine fishing in the tropical western Pacific.

Convention on the conservation of Antarctic marine living resources

The **Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources**, also **Commission on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources**, and **CCAMLR**, is part of the Antarctic Treaty System. The Convention was opened for signature on 1 August 1980 and entered into force on 7 April 1982 by the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources, headquartered in Tasmania, Australia. The goal is to preserve marine life and environmental integrity in and near Antarctica.

It was established in large part to concerns that an increase in krill catches in the Southern Ocean could have a serious impact on populations of other marine life which are dependent upon krill for food

International Convention on Tonnage Measurement of Ships

The Convention, adopted by IMO in 1969, was the first successful attempt to introduce a universal tonnage measurement system.
Previously, various systems were used to calculate the tonnage of merchant ships. Although all went back to the method devised by George Moorsom of the British Board of Trade in 1854, there were considerable differences between them and it was recognized that there was a great need for one single international system.
The Convention provides for gross and net tonnages, both of which are calculated independently.
The rules apply to all ships built on or after 18 July 1982 - the date of entry into force - while ships built before that date were allowed to retain their existing tonnage for 12 years after entry into force, or until 18 July 1994.

This phase-in period was intended to ensure that ships were given reasonable economic safeguards, since port and other dues are charged according to ship tonnage. At the same time, and as far as possible, the Convention was drafted to ensure that gross and net tonnages calculated under the new system did not differ too greatly from those calculated under previous methods.

Gross tonnage and net tonnage

The Convention meant a transition from the traditionally used terms gross register tons (grt) and net register tons (nrt) to gross tonnage(GT) and net tonnage (NT).

Gross tonnage forms the basis for manning regulations, safety rules and registration fees. Both gross and net tonnages are used to calculate port dues. The gross tonnage is a function of the moulded volume of all enclosed spaces of the ship. The net tonnage is produced by a formula which is a function of the moulded volume of all cargo spaces of the ship. The net tonnage shall not be taken as less than 30 per cent of the gross tonnage.

Principles of Medical Ethics relevant to the Role of Health Personnel particularly Physicians in the Protection of Prisoners and Detainees against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment

The UN Principles of Medical Ethics relevant to the Role of Health Personnel, particularly Physicians, in the Protection of Prisoners and Detainees against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (UN.1982) applies specifically to medical and other health workers but it has no implementation mechanism to ensure enforcement. It is up to state, provincial, and national bodies to enforce the standards in the document.

This treaty declares that medical professionals have an ethical duty to treat prisoners with the same care as those not imprisoned.

Act amending the international convention for the protection of new varieties of plants

The purpose of the Convention is to recognise and to ensure an intellectual property right to the breeder of a new plant variety. To be eligible for protection varieties have to belong to one of the botanical genera or species on the national list of those eligible for protection, be distinct from commonly known varieties and be sufficiently homogeneous and stable.

Convention concerning minimum standards in merchant ships

Having decided upon the adoption of certain proposals with regard to substandard vessels, particularly those registered under flags of convenience,..

The term **flag of convenience** describes the business practice of registering a merchant ship in a sovereign state different from that of the ship's owners, and flying that state's civil ensign on the ship. Ships are registered under flags of convenience to reduce operating costs or avoid the regulations of the owner's country. The closely related term **open registry** is used to describe an organization that will register ships owned by foreign entities.

The term "flag of convenience" has been in use since the 1950s and refers to the civil ensign a ship flies to indicate its country of registration or flag state. A ship operates under the laws of its flag state, and these laws are used if the ship is involved in an admiralty case.

Convention concerning Protection of the Right to Organize and Procedures for Determining Conditions of Employment in the Public Service

The International Labour Organisation has as one of its major concerns the freedom of association and the right to organize. This concern is often perceived as being primarily focussed on the right of workers to form trade unions. In fact, as a consequence of the tripartite organization of ILO, any statements made in principle give equal weight to workers and to employers organizations. This is clear in the major ILO instrument on this matter adopted in 1948 - the Convention concerning Freedom of Association and the Right to Organise (in force 4 July 1950), which by 1st January 1986 had been signed by 97 states. The text is given below (1). Other conventions, on more specialized aspects of the question also exist: the 1921 Convention concerning the Rights of Association and Combination of Agricultural Workers (2), the 1947 Convention concerning the Right of Association and the Settlement of Labour Disputes in Non-Metropolitan Territories (3), the 1949 Convention concerning the Application of the Principles of the Right to Organise and to Bargain Collectively (4), the 1971 Convention concerning Protection and Facilities to be Afforded to Workers' Representatives in the Undertaking (5), the 1975 Convention concerning Organisations of Rural Workers and their Role in Economic and Social Development (6), the 1978 Convention concerning Protection of the Right to Organise and Procedures for Determining Conditions of Employment in the Public Service (7).

The Governing Body of ILO, at its 117th Session (November 1951), in fact set up a Committee on Freedom of Association which continues to meet regularly

to hear complaints relating to infringements of the principles of the various conventions. The complaints and results are reported in the ILO Official Bulletin.

Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief

The United Nations General Assembly passed the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief in 1981. Although not endowed with the force of international law, this resolution was the first international legal instrument devoted exclusively to the freedom of religion.

In furtherance of the goals of the 1981 resolution and in support the general evolution of the freedom of religion as a human right, the United Nations Commission on Human Rights established the "Special Rapporteur on Religion Intolerance." In 2000 the Commission on Human Rights changed the mandate title of the position to "Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Religion or Belief", in order that the position's name may more accurately capture the need for the Special Rapporteur to protect individuals's right to change religion or abstain from religious belief.

Protocol of 1978 relating to the International Convention for Safety of Life at Sea

Objectives: To improve further the safety of ships, particularly tankers. Summary of provisions: The Protocol was adopted under the SOLAS Convention in the framework of the International Maritime Organisation (IMO). Regulations of Chapter I are amended to provide for, inter alia, inspections and surveys of ships and passenger ships, surveys of life-saving appliances and other equipment of cargo ships for the purpose of ensuring that they comply fully with the requirements of the Convention and the Protocol and, where applicable, the International Regulations for Preventing Collision at Sea in force, surveys of hull, machinery and equipment of cargo ships, including intermediate surveys of tankers of ten years of age and over, and maintenance of conditions after surveys. Regulations of Chapter II are amended to, inter alia, add definitions, apply regulations relating to machinery and electrical installations to tankers, and modify existing fire safety measures and cargo tank protection measures to include 'new tankers' as defined in the Protocol. Finally, Chapter V is amended to modify provisions relating to shipborne navigational

equipment, use of the automatic pilot, operation of steering gear in areas where navigation demands special caution, and steering gear for testing and drilling.

International Agreement for the Establishment of the University for Peace

The creation of the University for Peace was set in motion by resolution 34/111 of 14 December 1979 of the United Nations General Assembly. By this Resolution, the UN General Assembly established an international commission which, in collaboration with the Government of Costa Rica, was requested to prepare the organization, structure and setting in motion of the University for Peace. Thereafter, by Resolution 35/55 of 5 December 1980[1] , the UN General Assembly approved the establishment of the University for Peace by adopting the International Agreement for the Establishment of the University for Peace (UPEACE) along with the Charter of the University for Peace[2] . The University has the unique status of not only being a dedicated institution for higher education in Peace and Conflict studies, but also an international treaty body organization mandated by the United Nations General Assembly.

Agreement concerning the protection of the waters of the Mediterranean shores

Objectives: To maintain cooperation between the three coastal States in preventing pollution and improving the quality of the waters of the Mediterranean shores, in the coastal region between 6° l' longitude east and longitude 9° 8' east.

Summary of provisions/Institutional mechanism: An international commission is established (arts. 1 and 2). It is to be responsible for research into the nature, importance and sources of pollution, and to propose measures to the parties to protect the waters of the Mediterranean shores (art. 3) and to establish relations as necessary with other organisations concerned with water pollution (art. 9).

International Convention on safety of life at sea (SOLAS)

The SOLAS Convention in its successive forms is generally regarded as the most important of all international treaties concerning the safety of merchant ships. The first version was adopted in 1914, in response to the Titanic disaster, the second in 1929, the third in 1948, and the fourth in 1960. The 1974 version includes the tacit acceptance procedure - which provides that an amendment shall enter into force on a specified date unless, before that date, objections to the amendment are received from an agreed number of Parties.

As a result the 1974 Convention has been updated and amended on numerous occasions. The Convention in force today is sometimes referred to as SOLAS, 1974, as amended.

Technical provisions
The main objective of the SOLAS Convention is to specify minimum standards for the construction, equipment and operation of ships, compatible with their safety. Flag States are responsible for ensuring that ships under their flag comply with its requirements, and a number of certificates are prescribed in the Convention as proof that this has been done. Control provisions also allow Contracting Governments to inspect ships of other Contracting States if there are clear grounds for believing that the ship and its equipment do not substantially comply with the requirements of the Convention - this procedure is known as port State control. The current SOLAS Convention includes Articles setting out general obligations, amendment procedure and so on, followed by an Annex divided into 12 Chapters.

Havana Charter

Havana Charter was the charter of the defunct International Trade Organization (ITO). It was signed by 53 countries on March 24, 1948. It allowed for international cooperation and rules against anti-competitive business practices. The charter ultimately failed because the Congress of the United States rejected it. Elements of it would later become part of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

The charter, proposed by John Maynard Keynes, was to establish the ITO and a financial institution called the International Clearing Union (ICU), and an international currency; the bancor. The Havana Charter institutions were to stabilize trade by encouraging nations to 'net zero,' with trade surplus and trade deficit both discouraged. This negative feedback was to be accomplished by allowing nations overdraft equal to half the average value of the country's trade over the preceding five years, with interest charged on both surplus and deficit.

1 .c Agreement on most-favoured-nation treatment for areas of Western Germany under military occupation*
Geneva, 14 September 1948
Entry into force: 14 October 1948, in accordance with article V
Registration : 14 October 1948, No. 296
Full Text: 🕮
Details

Note : The Agreement and Memorandum of Understanding (1 (c) and 1 (d)) were concluded within the framework of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The Contracting Parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade which were signatories of the Agreement of 14 September 1948 met informally at Geneva on 16 October 1951. At that meeting, it was recommended that all signatories to the latter Agreement who wished to do so should, if possible, notify their withdrawal from it by depositing a notice of intention of withdrawal with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on the same date, such notices to cover also the Memorandum of understanding. The date of 14 December 1951 was generally considered as appropriate for such an action, the withdrawal to take effect on 15 June 1952. For the States which were parties to the Agreement and the Memorandum of understanding,

International Opium Convention

The International Opium Convention, signed at The Hague on January 23, 1912 during the First International Opium Conference, was the first international drug control treaty. It was registered in League of Nations Treaty Series on January 23, 1922.[1] The United States convened a 13-nation conference of the International Opium Commission in 1909 in Shanghai, China in response to increasing criticism of the opium trade. The treaty was signed by Germany, the United States, China, France, the United Kingdom, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Persia, Portugal, Russia, and Siam. The Convention provided that "The contracting Powers shall use their best endeavours to control, or to cause to be controlled, all persons manufacturing, importing, selling, distributing, and exporting morphine, cocaine, and their respective salts, as well as the buildings in which these persons carry such an industry or trade."

The Convention was implemented in 1915 by the United States, Netherlands, China, Honduras, and Norway. It went into force globally in 1919 when it was incorporated into the Treaty of Versailles.

A revised International Opium Convention was signed at Geneva on February 19, 1925, which went into effect on September 25, 1928, and was registered in

League of Nations Treaty Series on the same day.[2][3] It introduced a statistical control system to be supervised by a Permanent Central Opium Board, a body of the League of Nations. Egypt, with support from China and United States, recommended that a prohibition on hashish be added to the Convention, and a sub-committee proposed the following text:

The use of Indian hemp and the preparations derived therefrom may only be authorized for medical and scientific purposes. The raw resin (charas), however, which is extracted from the female tops of the cannabis sativa L, together with the various preparations (hashish, chira, esrar, diamba, etc.) of which it forms the basis, not being at present utilized for medical purposes and only being susceptible of utilisation for harmful purposes, in the same manner as other narcotics, may not be produced, sold, traded in, etc., under any circumstances whatsoever.

India and other countries objected to this language, citing social and religious customs and the prevalence of wild-growing cannabis plants that would make it difficult to enforce. Accordingly, this provision never made it into the final treaty. A compromise[4] was made that banned exportation of Indian hemp to countries that have prohibited its use, and requiring importing countries to issue certificates approving the importation and stating that the shipment was required "exclusively for medical or scientific purposes." It also required Parties to "exercise an effective control of such a nature as to prevent the illicit international traffic in Indian hemp and especially in the resin." These restrictions still left considerable leeway for countries to allow production, internal trade, and use of cannabis for recreational purposes.[5]

The Convention was superseded by the 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs.

1946 Lake Success Protocol

The Protocol Amending the Agreements, Conventions and Protocols on Narcotic Drugs concluded at The Hague on 23 January 1912, at Geneva on 11 February 1925 and 19 February 1925, and 13 July 1931, at Bangkok on 27 November 1931 and at Geneva on 26 June 1936 was a treaty, signed on December 11, 1946 at Lake Success, that shifted the drug control functions previously assigned to the League of Nations to the United Nations. As the Protocol's official title suggests, it modifies the provisions of the:

- 1912 and 1925 International Opium Conventions,

- 1931 Convention for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, and the
- 1936 Convention for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs.

Under this Protocol, the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, appointed by the UN Economic and Social Council, took over drug policymaking from the League of Nations' Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium and Other Dangerous Drugs. In an important precedent, the Supervisory Body that was created to administer the estimate system (which required nations to keep within their predetermined estimates of necessary narcotics production, imports, exports, etc.) was appointed by:

- The World Health Organization (two members)
- The Commission on Narcotic Drugs (one member)
- The Permanent Central Board (one member).

The Supervisory Body's successor, the International Narcotics Control Board, also had 3 of its 13 members nominated by the World Health Organization, with the rest nominated by UN members, with nominations subject to approval by the UN Economic and Social Council. No doubt in both cases, lobbying by the pharmaceutical industries influenced the inclusion of a requirement to place some scientific and medical experts on the board. However, the influence of Harry J. Anslinger and his Canadian counterpart Charles Henry Ludovic Sharman, both narcotics control officials, could be seen in the decision to allow the Commission to select somemembers (thus allowing law enforcement officials to be appointed to the Supervisory Body).

In accordance with the provisions of the drug control treaties, the revisions instituted by the Protocol did not require ratification to enter into force. For each Party, the treaty entered into force immediately upon their (a) signature without reservation as to approval, (b) signature subject to approval followed by acceptance or (c) acceptance. Since there were far fewer independent nations in the 1940s than there are today, the Protocol's 40 Parties – including populous empires and unions such as the United Kingdom and Soviet Union – encompassed the vast majority of the world's population.

The Protocol was terminated by the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, except as it affected the 1936 Convention for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs. However, the Protocol's influence can be plainly seen in the power structure established by the Single Convention, which remains in force.

Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others

The Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others is a resolution of the UN General Assembly. The preamble states:

"Whereas prostitution and the accompanying evil of the traffic in persons for the purpose of prostitution are incompatible with the dignity and worth of the human person and endanger the welfare of the individual, the family and the community"

It was approved by the General Assembly on 2 December 1949 [1] and came into effect on 25 July 1951. In 2007, seventy-four states were party to the convention (see map). Additionally, five states had signed the convention but had not yet ratified it.

The Convention [2] requires state signatories to punish any person who "procures, entices or leads away, for purposes of prostitution, another person, even with the consent of that person", "exploits the prostitution of another person, even with the consent of that person", run brothels or rent accommodations for prostitution purposes. It also prescribes procedures for combating international traffic for the purpose of prostitution, including extradition of offenders.

Furthermore, Member States are required to abolish all regulations that subject prostitutes "to special registration or to the possession of a special document or to any exceptional requirements for supervision or notification".

The Centre for Human Rights, specifically the secretariat of the Working Group on Slavery, in close co-operation with the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs of the Department of International Economic and Social Affairs actively monitors this resolution.

The definition of trafficking of this convention was departed from in the Trafficking protocol to the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime

1921 International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children

The 1921 International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children was international legislation ratified by members of the League of Nations, to address the problem of international trafficking of women and children.

Background

The growth of the social Reform movement during the late 19th century gave momentum to international efforts by women's rights groups, social hygiene activists, and others, to address trafficking in women and children and its role in prostitution and labour exploitation. Previous international conventions had been ratified by 34 countries in 1901 and 1904.[1] The League of Nations, formed in 1919, quickly became the organization coordinating international efforts to study and attempt to end the practice.

League of Nations

When it was established, the League of Nations at first did not include women's rights groups, who protested their exclusion and canvassed politicians for support. Ultimately, United States President Woodrow Wilson and France's Prime Minister Georges Clemenceau supported the participation of women's rights groups, who they argued were best suited to give a voice to women's issues. The League held the International Conference on White Slave Traffic in 1921, and agreed the 1921 International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children.[2]

In 1933 it passed the International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women of Full Age.

Impact

The 1921 Convention set new goals for international efforts to stem human trafficking, primarily by giving the anti-trafficking movement further official recognition, as well as a bureaucratic apparatus to research and fight the problem. The Advisory Committee on the Traffic of Women and Children was a permanent advisory committee of the League. Its members were nine countries, and several non-governmental organizations. An important development was the implementation of a system of annual reports of member countries. Member countries formed their own centralized offices to track and report on trafficking of women and children.[3]

The advisory committee also worked to expand its research and intervention program beyond the United States and Europe. In 1929, a need to expand into

the Near East (Asia Minor), the Middle East, and Asia was acknowledged. An international conference of central authorities in Asia was planned for 1937, but no further action was taken during the late 1930s.[4]

Subsequent international law

The League of Nations disbanded with World War II, and was succeeded by the United Nations. The 1921 Convention was replaced by the 1947 Protocol to amend the 1921 Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children, legislation tabled by the United Nations Secretary General. The 1947 Protocol was ultimately ratified by 46 countries. This Protocol was superseded by the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others (1950), again tabled by the United Nations Secretary General.[5]

International legislation

History of international legislation

International pressure to address trafficking in women and children became a growing part of the social Reform movement in the United States and Europe during the late 19th century. International legislation against the trafficking of women and children began with the ratification of an international convention in 1901, followed by ratification of a second convention in 1904. These conventions were ratified by 34 countries. The first formal international research into the scope of the problem was funded by American philanthropist John D. Rockefeller, through the American Bureau of Social Hygiene. In 1923, a committee from the bureau was tasked with investigating trafficking in 28 countries, interviewing approximately 5,000 informants and analyzing information over two years before issuing its final report. This was the first formal report on trafficking in women and children to be issued by an official body.[56]

The League of Nations, formed in 1919, took over as the international coordinator of legislation intended to end the trafficking of women and children. An international Conference on White Slave Traffic was held in 1921, attended by the 34 countries that ratified the 1901 and 1904 conventions.[57] Another convention against trafficking was ratified by League members in 1922, and like the 1904 international convention, this one required ratifying countries to submit annual reports on their progress in tackling the problem. Compliance with this requirement was not complete, although it gradually improved: in 1924, approximately 34% of the member countries submitted reports as required, which rose to 46% in 1929, 52% in 1933, and 61% in 1934.[58]

1933 International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women of the Full Age

The 1933 International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women of the Full Age ('1933 Convention') was employed under the League of Nations and recapped the wish to more completely secure the suppression of trafficking in women and children. This convention followed up on the recommendations contained in the Report to the Council of the League of Nations by the Traffic in Women and Children Committee on the Work of its Twelfth Session.

Article 1 of the 1933 Convention extends the punishable requirements of trafficking to include 'attempted offences, and within the legal limits, acts preparatory to the offences in question'. Additionally, the term 'country' is widened to include the colonies and protectorates of the parties concerned, as well as the territories under them.

International Agreement for the suppression of the "White Slave Traffic"

Paris, 18 May 1904

Entry into force: 18 July 1905, in accordance with article 8

Registration : 7 September 1920, No. 11 [1]

Note : The Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others, concluded at Lake Success, New York of 21 March 1950 consolidates the Protocols, Conventions and Agreements listed in the present chapter under Nos. 1 to 10. Furthermore, the Convention of 21 March 1950 supercedes the provisions of the above-referenced instruments in the relations between the Parties thereto and shall terminate such instruments when all the Parties thereto shall have become Parties to the Convention of 21 March 1950, in accordance with its article 28.

International Convention for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, signed at Paris on 4 May 1910, amended by the Protocol signed at Lake Success, New York, 4 May 1949

Lake Success, New York, 4 May 1949

Entry into force: 14 August 1951, the date on which the amendments set forth in the annex to the Protocol of 4 May 1949 entered into force, in accordance with the second paragraph of article 5 of the Protocol

General Act for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes

General multilateral convention concluded in Geneva on September 26, 1928. It went into effect on August 16, 1929 and was registered in League of Nations Treaty Series on the same day.[1]

Terms of the act

This act provided a framework for disputes between parties, including the establishment of a conciliation commission, an arbitration tribunal, and the opportunity to take failed disputes to the Permanent Court of International Justice.[original research?]

Further developments

The 1928 act was replaced in 1949 by a revised act drafted by the United Nations Organization.[2] It also served as the basis for the European Convention for the Peaceful Settlement of Disputes, concluded in 1957.[3]

Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties between States and International Organizations or Between International Organizations

The Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties between States and International Organizations or Between International Organizations (VCLTIO) is an extension of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties which deals with treaties between States. It was developed by the International Law Commission and opened for signature on March 21, 1986.

Article 85 of the Convention provides that it enters into force after the ratification by 35 states (international organizations may ratify, but their ratification does not count towards the number required for entry into force). On 13 August 2011, the UN Treaty Database listed 41 parties to the Convention, but only 29 states. As a result the Convention is not yet in force.[1]

Convention on Special Missions

The Convention on Special Missions governs the sending of a special mission from one state to another state. The special mission may be sent from one state to another state with consent of the latter to address a specific question or perform a specific task.

Convention on special missions

New York, 8 December 1969

Entry into force: 21 June 1985, in accordance with article 53(1)

Registration : 21 June 1985, No. 23431

Status : Signatories : 12. Parties : 38

Note : The present Convention was opened for signature by all States Members of the United Nations or of the International Atomic Energy Agency or Parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice, and by any other State invited by the General Assembly of the United Nations to become a Party to the Convention, from 16 December 1969 until 31 December 1970 at United Nations Headquarters in at New York.

article 1. use of terms article 2. sending of a special mission article 3. functions of a special mission article 4. sending of the same special mission to two or more states article 5. sending of a joint special mission by two or more states article 6. sending of special missions by two or more states in order to deal with a question of common interest article 7. non-existence of diplomatic or consular relations article 8. appointment of the members of the special mission article 9. composition of the special mission article 10. nationality of

the members of the special mission article 11. notifications article 12. persons declared "non grata" or not acceptable article 13. commencement of the functions of a special mission article 14. authority to act on behalf of the special mission article 15. organ of the receiving state with which official business is conducted article 16. rules concerning precedence article 17. seat of the special mission article 18. meeting of special missions in the territory of a third state article 19. right of the special mission to use the flag and emblem of the sending state article 20. end of the functions of a special mission article 21. status of the head of state and persons of high rank article 22. general facilities article 23. premises and accommodation article 24. exemption of the premises of the special mission from taxation article 25. inviolability of the premises article 26. inviolability of archives and documents article 27. freedom of movement article 28. freedom of communication article 29. personal inviolability article 30. inviolability of the private accommodation article 31. immunity from jurisdiction article 32. exemption from social security legislation article 33. exemption from dues and taxes article 34. exemption from personal services article 35. exemption from customs duties and inspection article 36. administrative and technical staff article 37. service staff article 38. private staff article 39. members of the family article 40. nationals of the receiving state and persons permanently resident in the receiving state article 41. waiver of immunity article 42. transit through the territory of a third state article 43. duration of privileges and immunities article 44. property of a member of the special mission or of a member of his family in the event of death article 45. facilities to leave the territory of the receiving state and to remove the archives of the special mission article 46. consequences of the cessation of the functions of the special mission article 47. respect for the laws and regulations of the receiving state and use of the premises of the special mission article 48. professional or commercial activity article 49. non-discrimination article 50. signature article 51. ratification article 52. accession article 53. entry into force article 54. notifications by the depositary article 55. authentic texts

1975 Vienna Convention on the Representation of States in their Relations with International Organizations of a Universal Character
Date & Place of Adoption: 14 March 1975 in Vienna, Austria Date of Entry into Force: Not yet in force (as of 25 January 2011) Depository: United Nations

Secretary-General Secretariat / Relevant Authority: United Nations Subject Classification: Diplomatic Relations & Immunities/International Organizations Keywords: Conciliation Commission General Status (Parties): 34 Parties as of 20 January 2011

The Convention was adopted by the United Nations Conference on the Representation of States in their Relations with International Organizations in Vienna, Austria, from 4 February to 14 March 1975. It remained open for signature at the UN Headquarters until 30 March 1976.

Vienna Convention on Succession of States in Respect of State Property, Archives and Debts. Vienna, 8 April 1983.

In 1967, the International Law Commission ('the Commission') began work on the topic of the succession of States in respect of State property, archives and debt. In 1981, the Commission submitted to the United Nations General Assembly a final set of draft articles on the topic with a recommendation that the Assembly should convene a conference of plenipotentiaries to study the draft articles and conclude a convention on the subject. The General Assembly adopted resolutions 36/113 of 10 December 1981 and 37/11 of 15 November 1982 to this effect by which it accordingly decided to convene a United Nations Conference on Succession of States in respect of State Property, Archives and Debt ('the Conference') to be held at Vienna from 1 March to 8 April 1983. On 7 April 1983, the Conference adopted the Vienna Convention on the Succession of States in respect of State Property, Archives and Debts ('the 1983 Convention').

Some twenty-six years after its adoption, however, the 1983 Convention has yet to enter into force. The 1983 Convention requires only fifteen States to consent to be bound by it to enter into force, but, as of 5 August 2009, only seven States have so consented. Although six States signed the 1983 Convention before the 1984 deadline for signature, they have not yet ratified it in accordance with its relevant provisions. Since then, nothing happened until 1991 to 2002 during which time six other States expressed their consent to be bound: Croatia, Estonia, Georgia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Slovenia and Ukraine (in 2005, Liberia also expressed its consent to be bound). The six States may have seen the 1983 Convention as relevant to the settlement of their own succession issues, but only three of the former republics of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRY) thought it worth expressing their consent to be bound (we will see below how their problems were actually resolved). The weaknesses of what became the 1983 Convention were evident at the

Conference that lead up to its adoption. The Conference was not able to improve much on the final draft articles produced by the Commission in 1981, as was demonstrated by the vote on adoption: 54 to 11, with 11 abstentions.

Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes Against Humanity

The Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes Against Humanity was adopted and opened for signature, ratification and accession by United Nations General Assembly resolution 2391 (XXIII) of 26 November 1968. Pursuant to the provisions of its Article VIII (90 days following the deposit of the tenth ratification), it came into force on 11 November 1970.

The Convention provides that no signatory state may apply statutory limitations to:

- War crimes as they are defined in the Charter of the Nürnberg International Military Tribunal of 8 August 1945.
- Crimes against humanity, whether committed in time of war or in time of peace, as defined in the Charter of the Nürnberg International Military Tribunal, eviction by armed attack or occupation, inhuman acts resulting from the policy of apartheid, and the crime of genocide as defined in the 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.

As of July 2007, 51 UN member states were parties to the Convention.

International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid. New York, 30 November 1973.

The crime of apartheid is defined by the 2002 Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court as inhumane acts of a character similar to other crimes against humanity "committed in the context of an institutionalized regime of systematic oppression and domination by one racial group over any other racial group or groups and committed with the intention of maintaining that regime."

On 30 November 1973, the United Nations General Assembly opened for signature and ratification the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid.[1] It defined the crime of apartheid as "inhuman acts committed for the purpose of establishing and maintaining domination by one racial group of persons over any other racial group of persons and systematically oppressing them."

History

The term apartheid, from Afrikaans for "apartness," was the official name of the South African system of racial segregation which existed after 1948. Complaints about the system were brought to the United Nations as early as 12 July 1948 when Dr. Padmanabha Pillai, the representative of India to the United Nations, circulated a letter to the Secretary-General expressing his concerns over treatment of ethnic Indians within the Union of South Africa.[2] As it became more widely known, South African apartheid was condemned internationally as unjust and racist and many decided that a formal legal framework was needed in order to apply international pressure on the South African government.

In 1971, the USSR and Guinea together submitted early drafts of a convention to deal with the suppression and punishment of apartheid.[3] In 1973, the General Assembly of the United Nations agreed on the text of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid (ICSPCA).[1] The Convention has 31 signatories and 107 parties.

"As such, apartheid was declared to be a crime against humanity, with a scope that went far beyond South Africa. While the crime of apartheid is most often associated with the racist policies of South Africa after 1948, the term more generally refers to racially based policies in any state."[4]

Seventy-six other countries subsequently signed on, but a number of nations have neither signed nor ratified the ICSPCA, including Canada, France, Germany, Israel, Italy, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand and the United States.[5] In explanation of the US vote against the convention, Ambassador Clarence Clyde Ferguson Jr. said: "[W]e cannot...accept that apartheid can in this manner be made a crime against humanity. Crimes against humanity are so grave in nature that they must be meticulously elaborated and strictly construed under existing international law..."[6]

In 1977, Addition Protocol 1 to the Geneva Conventions designated apartheid as a grave breach of the Protocol and a war crime. There are 169 parties to the Protocol.[7]

The International Criminal Court provides for individual criminal responsibility for crimes against humanity,[8] including the crime of apartheid.[9]

The International Criminal Court (ICC) came into being on 1 July 2002, and can only prosecute crimes committed on or after that date. The Court can generally only exercise jurisdiction in cases where the accused is a national of a state party, the alleged crime took place on the territory of a state party, or a situation is referred to the Court by the United Nations Security Council. The ICC exercises complimentary jurisdiction. Many of the member states have provided their own national courts with universal jurisdiction over the same offenses and do not recognize any statute of limitations for crimes against humanity.[10] As of July 2008, 106 countries are states parties (with Suriname and Cook Islands set to join in October 2008), and a further 40 countries have signed but not yet ratified the treaty.[11] However, many of the world's most populous nations, including China, India, the United States, Indonesia, and Pakistan are not parties to the Court and therefore are not subject to its jurisdiction, except by Security Council referral.

International Convention against Apartheid in Sports New York, 10 December 1985.

New York, 10 December 1985

Entry into force: 3 April 1988, in accordance with article 18(1)

Registration : 3 April 1988, No. 25822

Status : Signatories : 72. Parties : 60

Note : The Convention was adopted by resolution 40/64 G[1]of 10 December 1985 at the fortieth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

a system of institutionalized racial segregation and discrimination for the purpose of establishing and maintaining domination by one racial group in sports activities, whether organized on a professional or an amateur basis

United Nations

In 1980, the United Nations began compiling a "Register of Sports Contacts with South Africa".[2] This was a list of sportspeople and official who had participated in events within South Africa.[2] It was compiled mainly from reports in South African newspapers.[2] Being listed did not itself result in any punishment, but was regarded as a moral pressure on athletes.[2] Some sports bodies would discipline athletes based on the register.[2] Athletes could have their names deleted from the register by giving a written undertaking not to return to apartheid South Africa to compete.[2] The register is regarded as having been an effective instrument.[1][3][4]

The UN General Assembly adopted the International Convention Against Apartheid in Sports on 10 December 1985.[5]

Agreement establishing the Fund for the Development of the Indigenous Peoples of Latin America and the Caribbean

Madrid, 24 July 1992

Entry into force: 4 August 1993, in accordance with article 14(2)

Registration : 4 August 1993, No. 30177

Status : Signatories : 24. Parties : 23

Note : The Agreement, of which the English, Portuguese and Spanish texts are equally authentic, was adopted during the Second Summit Meeting of Ibero-American Heads of State, held at Madrid from 23 to 24 July 1992. In accordance with its article 14 (1), the Agreement was opened for signature at Madrid on 24 July 1992 and shall remain open for signature at the Headquarters of the United Nations.

Constitution of the International Refugee Organization. New York, 15 December 1946.

The International Refugee Organization (IRO) was founded on April 20, 1946 to deal with the massive refugee problem created by World War II. A Preparatory Commission began operations fourteen months previously. It was a

United Nations specialized agency and took over many of the functions of the earlier United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. In 1952, its operations ceased, and it was replaced by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR).

The Constitution of the International Refugee Organization, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 15, 1946, specified the agency's field of operations. Controversially, this defined "persons of German ethnic origin" who had been expelled, or were to be expelled from their countries of birth into the postwar Germany, as individuals who would "not be the concern of the Organization." This excluded from its purview a group that exceeded in number all the other European displaced persons put together. Also, because of disagreements between the Western allies and the Soviet Union, the IRO only worked in areas controlled by Western armies of occupation.

Eighteen countries acceeded to membership of the IRO: Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, France, Guatemala, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Venezuela. The U.S. provided about 40% of the IRO's $155 million annual budget. The total contribution by the members for the five years of operation was around $400 million. It had rehabilitated around 10 million people during this time, out of 15 million people who were stranded in Europe. The organisation's first Director General was William Hallam Tuck, succeeded by J. Donald Kingsley on July 31, 1949.

Agreement concerning the Manufacture of, Internal Trade in and Use of Prepared Opium

The Agreement concerning the Manufacture of, Internal Trade in and Use of Prepared Opium, also known as the Agreement concerning the Suppression of the Manufacture of, Internal Trade in, and Use of, Prepared Opium, was a treaty promulgated in Geneva on 11 February 1925.

The Agreement stated that the signatory nations were "fully determined to bring about the gradual and effective suppression of the manufacture of, internal trade in and use of prepared opium". Article I required that, with the exception of retail sale, the importation, sale and distribution of opium be a monopoly of government, which would have the exclusive right to import, sell, or distribute opium. Leasing, according, or delegating this right was specifically prohibited. Article II prohibited sale of opium to minors, and Article III prohibited minors from entering smoking divans. Article IV required governments to limit the

number of opium retail shops and smoking divans as much as possible. Articles V and VI regulated the export and transport of opium and dross. Article VII required governments to discourage the use of opium through instruction in schools, literature, and other methods.

The Agreement was superseded by the 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs.

1946 Lake Success Protocol

The Protocol Amending the Agreements, Conventions and Protocols on Narcotic Drugs concluded at The Hague on 23 January 1912, at Geneva on 11 February 1925 and 19 February 1925, and 13 July 1931, at Bangkok on 27 November 1931 and at Geneva on 26 June 1936 was a treaty, signed on December 11, 1946 at Lake Success, that shifted the drug control functions previously assigned to the League of Nations to the United Nations. As the Protocol's official title suggests, it modifies the provisions of the:

- 1912 and 1925 International Opium Conventions,
- 1931 Convention for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, and the
- 1936 Convention for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs.

Under this Protocol, the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, appointed by the UN Economic and Social Council, took over drug policymaking from the League of Nations' Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium and Other Dangerous Drugs. In an important precedent, the Supervisory Body that was created to administer the estimate system (which required nations to keep within their predetermined estimates of necessary narcotics production, imports, exports, etc.) was appointed by:

- The World Health Organization (two members)
- The Commission on Narcotic Drugs (one member)
- The Permanent Central Board (one member).

The Supervisory Body's successor, the International Narcotics Control Board, also had 3 of its 13 members nominated by the World Health Organization, with the rest nominated by UN members, with nominations subject to approval by the UN Economic and Social Council. No doubt in both cases, lobbying by the pharmaceutical industries influenced the inclusion of a requirement to place some scientific and medical experts on the board. However, the influence of

Harry J. Anslinger and his Canadian counterpart Charles Henry Ludovic Sharman, both narcotics control officials, could be seen in the decision to allow the Commission to select somemembers (thus allowing law enforcement officials to be appointed to the Supervisory Body).

In accordance with the provisions of the drug control treaties, the revisions instituted by the Protocol did not require ratification to enter into force. For each Party, the treaty entered into force immediately upon their (a) signature without reservation as to approval, (b) signature subject to approval followed by acceptance or (c) acceptance. Since there were far fewer independent nations in the 1940s than there are today, the Protocol's 40 Parties – including populous empires and unions such as the United Kingdom and Soviet Union – encompassed the vast majority of the world's population.

The Protocol was terminated by the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, except as it affected the 1936 Convention for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs. However, the Protocol's influence can be plainly seen in the power structure established by the Single Convention, which remains in force.

Convention for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs

The Convention for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs was a drug control treaty promulgated in Geneva on 13 July 1931 that entered into force on 9 July 1933.

Overview

It established two groups of drugs.

Group I consisted of:

- Sub-group (a), which consisted of:
    - Morphine and its salts, including its ester salts like morphine diacetate (heroin) and preparations made directly from raw or medicinal opium and containing more than 20 percent of morphine;
    - Cocaine and its salts, including preparations made direct from the coca leaf and containing more than 0.1 percent of cocaine, all the esters of ecgonine and their salts;
    - Dihydrohydrooxycodeinone (of which the substance registered under the name of eucodal is a salt), dihydrocodeinone (of which

the substance registered under the name of dicodide is a salt), dihydromorphinone (of which the substance registered under the name of dilaudide is a salt), acetyldihydrocodeinone or acetyldemethylodihydrothebaine (of which the substance registered under the name of acedicone is a salt); dihydromorphine (of which the substance registered under the name of paramorfan is a salt), their esters and the salts of any of these substances and of their esters, morphine-N-oxide (registered trade name genomorphine), also the morphine-N-oxide derivatives, and the other pentavalent nitrogen morphine derivatives.

- Sub-group (b), which consisted of:
  - Ecgonine, thebaine and their salts, benzylmorphine and the other ethers of morphine and their salts, except methylmorphine (codeine), ethylmorphine and their salts.

Group II consisted of:

- Methylmorphine (codeine), ethylmorphine and their salts.

Group I was subject to stricter regulations than Group II. For instance, in estimating the amount of drugs needed for medical and scientific needs, the margin allowed for demand fluctuations was wider for Group II drugs than for Group I drugs. Also, in certain reports, a summary statement would be sufficient for matters related to Group II drugs. The establishment of these rudimentary groups foreshadowed the development of the drug scheduling system that exists today. Both the 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs and the 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances have schedules of controlled substances. The 1988 United Nations Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances has two tables of controlled precursor chemicals.

The 1931 convention's scope was broadened considerably by the 1948 Protocol Bringing under International Control Drugs outside the Scope of the Convention of 13 July 1931 for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs. The Convention was superseded by the 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs.

Convention for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs

The Convention for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs was a drug control treaty signed in 1936.

Harry Anslinger representing the United States attempted to add provisions to criminalize all activities – cultivation, production, manufacture and distribution – related to the use of opium, coca (and its derivatives) and cannabis for non-medical and non-scientific purposes. Other countries objected to this proposal, so the Convention's focus remained on trafficking. The U.S. considered the final treaty to be too weak, and refused to sign it, fearing that it might have to weaken its own controls to comply with the treaty. The Convention therefore had little effect, although it was the first treaty to make certain drug offenses international crimes; all the previous treaties had dealt with regulating licit drug activity.

Protocol for Limiting and Regulating the Cultivation of the Poppy Plant, the Production of, International and Wholesale Trade in, and Use of Opium

The Protocol for Limiting and Regulating the Cultivation of the Poppy Plant, the Production of, International and Wholesale Trade in, and Use of Opium, signed on June 23, 1953 in New York, was a drug control treaty, promoted by Harry Anslinger, with the purpose of imposing stricter controls on opium production. Article 6 of the treaty limited opium production to seven countries. Article 2 stated that Parties were required to "limit the use of opium exclusively to medical and scientific needs". It did not receive sufficient ratifications to enter into force until 1963, by which time it had been superseded by the 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs.

Protocol amending the International Agreement for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, signed at Paris on 18 May 1904, and the International Convention for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, signed at Paris on 4 May 1910

Lake Success, New York, 4 May 1949

Entry into force: 4 May 1949, in accordance with article 5 [1]

Registration : 4 May 1949, No. 446

Status : Signatories : 13. Parties : 33

Note : The Protocol was approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolution 256 (III)[2] of 3 December 1948. The Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons

and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others, concluded at Lake Success, New York of 21 March 1950 consolidates the Protocols, Conventions and Agreements listed in the present chapter under Nos. 1 to 10. Furthermore, the Convention of 21 March 1950 supercedes the provisions of the above-referenced instruments in the relations between the Parties thereto and shall terminate such instruments when all the Parties thereto shall have become Parties to the Convention of 21 March 1950, in accordance with its article 28.

International Convention for the Suppression of the Circulation of and Traffic in Obscene Publications

Geneva, 12 September 1923

Entry into force: 7 August 1924, in accordance with article 11

Registration : 7 August 1924, No. 685 [1]

Protocol concerning the Office international d'hygiène publique

New York, 22 July 1946 [1]

Entry into force: 20 October 1947, in accordance with article 7

Registration : 20 October 1947, No. 125

Status : Signatories : 42. Parties : 55

The Office International d'Hygiène Publique (OIHP) (English: International Office of Public Hygiene) was an international organization founded 9 December 1907 and based in Paris, France. It was created to oversee international rules regarding the quarantining of ships and ports to prevent the spread of plague and cholera, and to administer other public health conventions.[1]

The OIHP was dissolved by protocols signed 22 July 1946 and its epidemiological service was incorporated into the Interim Commission of the World Health Organization on 1 January 1947.

Agreement on the establishment of the International Vaccine Institute

The International Vaccine Institute (IVI) is an international nonprofit organization that was founded on the belief that the health of children in developing countries can be dramatically improved by the use of new and improved vaccines. Working in collaboration with the international scientific community, public health organizations, governments, and industry, IVI is involved in all areas of the vaccine spectrum – from new vaccine design in the laboratory to vaccine development and evaluation in the field to facilitating sustainable introduction of vaccines in countries where they are most needed.

Created initially as an initiative of the UN Development Programme (UNDP), IVI began formal operations as an independent international organization in 1997 in Seoul, Republic of Korea. Currently, IVI has 40 countries and the World Health Organization (WHO) as signatories to its Establishment Agreement. The Institute has a unique mandate to work exclusively on vaccine development and introduction specifically for people in developing countries, with a focus on neglected diseases affecting these regions.

Agreement establishing the African Development Bank

The African Development Bank Group (French: Banque africaine de développement [1] / Portuguese: Banco Africano de Desenvolvimento) is a development bank established in 1964 with the intention of promoting economic and social development in Africa. The Group comprises the African Development Bank (AfDB), the African Development Fund (ADF), and the Nigeria Trust Fund (NTF). AfDB provides loans and grants to African governments and private companies investing in the regional member countries (RMC) in Africa. It is owned and funded by member governments, and has a public-interest mandate to reduce poverty and promote sustainable development. Originally headquartered in Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire, the Bank's headquarters moved to Tunis, Tunisia, during the civil war in Côte d'Ivoire.

History

Following the end of colonial period in Africa, growing desire for more unity within the continent led to the establishment of two draft charters, one for the establishment of the Organisation of African Unity (established in 1963, later replaced by the African Union), and for a regional development bank.

A draft accord was submitted to top African officials, then to African Ministers, before being cosigned by twenty-three African governments on August 4, 1963, in the form of an agreement establishing the African Development Bank. The agreement came into force on 10 September 1964. Although established officially in under the auspices of the Economic Commission for Africa, the AfDB began operation in 1966.

Although originally only African countries were able to join the bank, since 1982 it has allowed the entry of non-African countries as well.

During its forty years of operations, AfDB has financed 2 885 operations, for a total of $47.5 billion. In 2003, it received an AAA rating from the major financial rating agencies and had a capital of $32.043 billion.

Convention on Transit Trade of Land-locked States

Done at: New York

Date enacted: 1965-07-08

In force: 1967-06-09

The States Parties to the present Convention,

Recalling that Article 55 of its Charter requires the United Nations to promote conditions of economic progress and solutions of international economic problems,

Noting General Assembly resolution 1028 (Xl) on the land-locked countries and the expansion of international trade which, "recognizing, the need of land-locked countries for adequate transit facilities in promoting international trade", invited "the Governments of Member States to give full recognition of the needs of land-locked Member States in the matter of transit trade and, therefore, to accord them adequate facilities in terms of international law and practice in this

regard, bearing in mind the future requirements resulting from the economic development of the land-locked countries",

Recalling article 2 of the Convention on the High Seas which states that the high seas being open to all nations, no State may validly purport to subject any part of them to its sovereignty and article 3 of the said Convention which states;

"l. In order to enjoy the freedom of the seas on equal terms with coastal States, States having no sea-coast should have free access to the sea.

To this end States situated between the sea and a State having no sea-coast shall by common agreement with the latter and in conformity with existing international conventions accord:

(a) To the State having no sea-coast, on a basis of reciprocity, free transit through their territory; and

(b) To ships flying the flag of that State treatment equal to that accorded to their own ships, or to the ships of any other States, as regards access to seaports and the use of such ports.

2. States situated between the sea and a State having no sea-coast shall settle, by mutual agreement with the latter, and taking into account the rights of the coastal State or State of transit and the special conditions of the State having no sea-coast, all matter relating to freedom of transit and equal treatment in ports, in case such States are not already parties to existing international conventions."

Reaffirming, the following principles adopted by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development with the understanding that these principles are interrelated and each principle should be construed in the context of the other principles:

Principle I

The recognition of the right of each land-locked State of free access to the sea is an essential principle for the expansion of international trade and economic development.

Principle II

In territorial and on internal waters, vessels flying the flag of land-locked countries should have identical rights and enjoy treatment identical to that enjoyed by vessels flying the flag of coastal States other than the territorial States.

Principle III

In order to enjoy the freedom of the seas on equal terms with coastal States, States having no sea-coast should have free access to the sea. To this end States situated between the sea and a State having no sea-coast shall by common agreement with the latter and in conformity with existing international conventions accord to ships flying the flag of that State treatment equal to that accorded to their own ships or to the ships of any other State as regards access to seaports and the use of such ports.

Principle IV

In order to promote fully the economic development of the land-locked countries, the said countries should be afforded by all States, on the basis of reciprocity, free and unrestricted transit, in such a manner that they have free access to regional and international trade in all circumstances and for every type of goods.

Goods in transit should not be subject to any customs duty.

Means of transport in transit should not be subject to special taxes or charges higher than those levied for the use of means of transport of the transit country.

Principle V

The State of transit, while maintaining full sovereignty over its territory, shall have the right to take all indispensable measures to ensure that the exercise of the right of free and unrestricted transit shall in no way infringe its legitimate interests of any kind.

Principle VI

In order to accelerate the evolution of a universal approach to the solution of the special and particular problems of trade and development of land-locked countries in the different geographical areas, the conclusion of regional and other international agreements in this regard should be encouraged by all States.

Principle VII

The facilities and special rights accorded to land-locked countries in view of their special geographical position are excluded form the operation of the most-favoured-nation clause.

Principle VIII

The principles which govern the right of free access to the sea of the land-locked State shall in no way abrogate existing agreements between two or more contracting parties concerning the problems, nor shall they raise an obstacle as regards the conclusions of such agreements in the future, provided that the latter do not establish a regime which is less favourable than or opposed to the above-mentioned provisions.

Agreement establishing the Asian Development Bank. Manila, 4 December 1965.

The Asian Development Bank (ADB) is a regional development bank established on 22 August 1966 to facilitate economic development of countries in Asia.[2] The bank admits the members of the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP, formerly known as the United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East) and non-regional developed countries.[2] From 31 members at its establishment, ADB now has 67 members - of which 48 are from within Asia and the Pacific and 19 outside. ADB was modeled closely on the World Bank, and has a similar weighted voting system where votes are distributed in proportion with member's capital subscriptions. At present, both the United States and Japan hold 552,210 shares, the largest proportion of shares at 12.756% each.[3] China holds 228,000 shares (6.429 %), India holds 224,010 shares (6.317 %), the 2nd and 3rd largest proportion of shares respectively.

Articles of Association for the establishment of an Economic Community of West Africa

Accra, 4 May 1967

Entry into force: 4 May 1967, in accordance with article 7(2)

Registration : 4 May 1967, No. 8623

Status : Parties : 12

Note : Adopted by the West African Sub-regional Conference on Economic Co-operation, held at Accra from 27 April to

4 May 1967.)

The Articles of Association for the Establishment of an Economic Community of West Africa done at Accra on 4 May 1967 were concluded "pending the formal establishment of the Community" (preamble). Thereafter, two additional agreements were concluded: (1) the Treaty establishing the Community of West Africa, concluded at Abidjan on 17 April 1973 between the Ivory Coast, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal and Upper Volta (came into force on 1 January 1974 and deposited with the Government of Upper Volta); and (2) the Treaty of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), concluded at Lagos on 28 May 1975 between Benin, the Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo and Upper Volta (came into force on 20 June 1975 and deposited with the Government of Nigeria.

1974 - Convention on the Limitation Period in the International Sale of Goods

Date of adoption: 14 June 1974

Date of adoption of amending protocol: 11 April 1980

Purpose

The Limitation Convention establishes uniform rules governing the period of time within which a party under a contract for the international sale of goods must commence legal proceedings against another party to assert a claim arising from the contract or relating to its breach, termination or validity. By doing so, it brings clarity and predictability on an aspect of great importance for the adjudication of the claim.

Why is it relevant?

Most legal systems limit or prescribe a claim from being asserted after the lapse of a specified period of time to prevent the institution of legal proceedings at such a late date that the evidence relating to the claim is likely to be unreliable or lost and to protect against the uncertainty that would result if a party were to remain exposed to unasserted claims for an extensive period of time. However,

numerous disparities exist among legal systems with respect to the conceptual basis for doing so, resulting in significant variations in the length of the limitation period and in the rules governing the claims after that period. Those differences may create difficulties in the enforcement of claims arising from international sales transactions. In response to those difficulties, the Limitation Convention was prepared and adopted in 1974. The Limitation Convention was further amended by a Protocol adopted in 1980 in order to harmonize its text with that of the United Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods (CISG), in particular, with regard to scope of application and admissible declarations. Indeed, the Limitation Convention may be functionally seen as a part of the CISG and, as such, considered as an important step towards a comprehensive standardization of international sales law.

Key provisions

The Limitation Convention applies to contracts for the sale of goods between parties whose places of business are in different States if both of those States are Contracting States or when the rules of private international law lead to the application to the contract of sale of goods of the law of a Contracting State. It may also apply by virtue of the parties' choice.

The limitation period is set at four years (art. 8). Subject to certain conditions, that period may be extended to a maximum of ten years (art. 23). Furthermore, the Limitation Convention also regulates certain questions pertaining to the effect of commencing proceedings in a Contracting State.

The Limitation Convention further provides rules on the cessation and extension of the limitation period. The period ceases when the claimant commences judicial or arbitral proceedings or when it asserts claims in an existing process. If the proceedings end without a binding decision on the merits, it is deemed that the limitation period continued to run during the proceedings. However, if the period has expired during the proceedings or has less than one year to run, the claimant is granted an additional year to commence new proceedings (art. 17).

No claim shall be recognized or enforced in legal proceedings commenced after the expiration of the limitation period (art. 25(1)). Such expiration is not to be taken into consideration unless invoked by parties to the proceedings (art. 24); however, States may lodge a declaration allowing for courts to take into account the expiration of the limitation period on their own initiative (art. 36). Otherwise, the only exception to the rule barring recognition and enforcement occurs when the party raises its claim as a defense to or set-off against a claim asserted by the other party (art. 25(2)).

Relation to private international law and existing domestic law

The Limitation Convention applies only to international transactions and avoids the recourse to rules of private international law for those contracts falling under its scope of application. International contracts falling outside the scope of application of the Limitation Convention, as well as contracts subject to a valid choice of other law, would not be affected by the Limitation Convention. Purely domestic sales contracts are not affected by the Limitation Convention and are regulated by domestic law.

Additional information

Becoming a party to the Convention has no financial implications for Contracting States. Moreover, its administration at the domestic level does not require a dedicated body, and does not involve any reporting obligations.

The Limitation Convention is accompanied by an explanatory note.

1980 - United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods (CISG)

Date of adoption: 11 April 1980

Purpose

The purpose of the CISG is to provide a modern, uniform and fair regime for contracts for the international sale of goods. Thus, the CISG contributes significantly to introducing certainty in commercial exchanges and decreasing transaction costs.

Why is it relevant?

The contract of sale is the backbone of international trade in all countries, irrespective of their legal tradition or level of economic development. The CISG is therefore considered one of the core international trade law conventions whose universal adoption is desirable.

The CISG is the result of a legislative effort that started at the beginning of the twentieth century. The resulting text provides a careful balance between the interests of the buyer and of the seller. It has also inspired contract law reform at the national level.

The adoption of the CISG provides modern, uniform legislation for the international sale of goods that would apply whenever contracts for the sale of goods are concluded between parties with a place of business in Contracting States. In these cases, the CISG would apply directly, avoiding recourse to rules of private international law to determine the law applicable to the contract, adding significantly to the certainty and predictability of international sales contracts.

Moreover, the CISG may apply to a contract for international sale of goods when the rules of private international law point at the law of a Contracting State as the applicable one, or by virtue of the choice of the contractual parties, regardless of whether their places of business are located in a Contracting State. In this latter case, the CISG provides a neutral body of rules that can be easily accepted in light of its transnational nature and of the wide availability of interpretative materials.

Finally, small and medium-sized enterprises as well as traders located in developing countries typically have reduced access to legal advice when negotiating a contract. Thus, they are more vulnerable to problems caused by inadequate treatment in the contract of issues relating to applicable law. The same enterprises and traders may also be the weaker contractual parties and could have difficulties in ensuring that the contractual balance is kept. Those merchants would therefore derive particular benefit from the default application of the fair and uniform regime of the CISG to contracts falling under its scope.

Key provisions

The CISG governs contracts for the international sales of goods between private businesses, excluding sales to consumers and sales of services, as well as sales of certain specified types of goods. It applies to contracts for sale of goods between parties whose places of business are in different Contracting States, or when the rules of private international law lead to the application of the law of a Contracting State. It may also apply by virtue of the parties' choice. Certain matters relating to the international sales of goods, for instance the validity of the contract and the effect of the contract on the property in the goods sold, fall outside the Convention's scope. The second part of the CISG deals with the formation of the contract, which is concluded by the exchange of offer and acceptance. The third part of the CISG deals with the obligations of the parties to the contract. Obligations of the sellers include delivering goods in conformity with the quantity and quality stipulated in the contract, as well as related documents, and transferring the property in the goods. Obligations of the buyer include payment of the price and taking delivery of the goods. In addition, this part provides common rules regarding remedies for breach of the contract. The

aggrieved party may require performance, claim damages or avoid the contract in case of fundamental breach. Additional rules regulate passing of risk, anticipatory breach of contract, damages, and exemption from performance of the contract. Finally, while the CISG allows for freedom of form of the contract, States may lodge a declaration requiring the written form.

Relation to private international law and existing domestic law

The CISG applies only to international transactions and avoids the recourse to rules of private international law for those contracts falling under its scope of application. International contracts falling outside the scope of application of the CISG, as well as contracts subject to a valid choice of other law, would not be affected by the CISG. Purely domestic sale contracts are not affected by the CISG and remain regulated by domestic law.

Additional information

Becoming a party to the CISG has no financial implications for Contracting States. Moreover, its administration at the domestic level does not require a dedicated body and does not involve any reporting obligations.

The CISG is accompanied by an explanatory note.

The CLOUT (Case Law on UNCITRAL Texts) system contains numerous cases relating to the application of the CISG. A Digest of those cases is also available.

2005 - United Nations Convention on the Use of Electronic Communications in International Contracts

Date of adoption: 23 November 2005

Purpose

The Electronic Communications Convention aims at facilitating the use of electronic communications in international trade by assuring that contracts concluded and other communications exchanged electronically are as valid and enforceable as their traditional paper-based equivalents.

Why is it relevant?

Certain formal requirements contained in widely adopted international trade law treaties, such as the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign

Arbitral Awards (the "New York Convention") and the United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods (CISG) may pose obstacles to the wide use of electronic communications. The Electronic Communications Convention is an enabling treaty whose effect is to remove those formal obstacles by establishing equivalence between electronic and written form. Moreover, the Electronic Communications Convention serves additional purposes further facilitating the use of electronic communications in international trade. Thus, the Convention is intended to strengthen the harmonization of the rules regarding electronic commerce and foster uniformity in the domestic enactment of UNCITRAL model laws relating to electronic commerce, as well as to update and complement certain provisions of those model laws in light of recent practice. Finally, the Convention may provide those countries not having yet adopted provisions on electronic commerce with modern, uniform and carefully drafted legislation.

Key provisions

The Electronic Communications Convention builds upon earlier instruments drafted by the Commission, and, in particular, the UNCITRAL Model Law on Electronic Commerce and the UNCITRAL Model Law on Electronic Signatures. These instruments are widely considered standard legislative texts setting forth the three fundamental principles of electronic commerce legislation, which the Convention incorporates, namely non-discrimination, technological neutrality and functional equivalence.

The Convention applies to all electronic communications exchanged between parties whose places of business are in different States when at least one party has its place of business in a Contracting State (Art. 1). It may also apply by virtue of the parties' choice. Contracts concluded for personal, family or household purposes, such as those relating to family law and the law of succession, as well as certain financial transactions, negotiable instruments, and documents of title, are excluded from the Convention's scope of application (Art. 2).

As noted above, the Convention sets out criteria for establishing the functional equivalence between electronic communications and paper documents, as well as between electronic authentication methods and handwritten signatures (Art. 9). Similarly, the Convention defines the time and place of dispatch and receipt of electronic communications, tailoring the traditional rules for these legal concepts to suit the electronic context and innovating with respect to the provisions of the Model Law on Electronic Commerce (Art. 10).

Moreover, the Convention establishes the general principle that communications are not to be denied legal validity solely on the grounds that

they were made in electronic form (Art. 8). Specifically, given the proliferation of automated message systems, the Convention allows for the enforceability of contracts entered into by such systems, including when no natural person reviewed the individual actions carried out by them (Art. 12). The Convention further clarifies that a proposal to conclude a contract made through electronic means and not addressed to specific parties amounts to an invitation to deal, rather than an offer whose acceptance binds the offering party, in line with the corresponding provision of the CISG (Art. 11). Moreover, the Convention establishes remedies in case of input errors by natural persons entering information into automated message systems (Art. 14).

Finally, the Convention allows contractual parties to exclude its application or vary its terms within the limits allowed by otherwise applicable legislative provisions (Art. 3).

Relation to private international law and existing domestic law

Whether the Convention applies to a given international commercial transaction is a matter to be determined by the choice of law rules of the State whose court is asked to decide a dispute (lex fori). Thus, if the rules of private international law of that State require application of the substantive law of a Contracting State to the resolution of the dispute, the Convention will apply as law of that Contracting State, irrespective of the court's location. The Convention is also applicable if the parties to the contract have validly chosen its provisions as the law applicable to the contract.

Moreover, States may also consider adopting the provisions of the Convention at the domestic level. Such decision would promote uniformity, economizing on judicial and legislative resources as well as further increasing certainty in commercial transactions, especially in light of the diffusion of mobile devices for electronic transactions. It is particularly recommended for those jurisdictions that have not yet adopted any legislation on electronic commerce. Otherwise, purely domestic communications are not affected by the Convention and will continue to be governed by domestic law.

Additional information

Becoming party to the Convention has no financial implications and its administration at the domestic level does not require any dedicated body. Furthermore, no mandatory reporting requirement arises from the adoption of this treaty.

The Electronic Communications Convention is accompanied by an explanatory note.

United Nations Convention on International Bills of Exchange and International Promissory Notes

The United Nations Convention on international bills of exchange and international promissory notes, of December 9, 1988 promotes uniformity between various national laws governing international transactions. The Convention provides a form for instruments that could be used in international trade, facilitating financial transactions between States. The Convention does not replace the national laws, rather it is a set of optional rules for governing bills of exchange and promissory notes.

A bill of exchange is a written instrument which contains an unconditional order, given by the drawer to the payee, to pay (on demand or at a given time) a certain sum of money. The document must be dated and signed by the drawer. A promissory note is a written instrument, dated and signed by the maker, which contains an unconditional promise to pay a certain amount to the payee.

To qualify as part of the Convention, the instrument must meet the following criteria. First, a bill of exchange must contain the words "International bill of exchange (UNCITRAL Convention)" in its title and text. A promissory note must contain the words "International promissory note of exchange (UNCITRAL Convention)" in its title and text. In addition, a bill of exchange must specify two places, listed in Article 2(1) of the Convention, which indicate the locations of the drawer and the payee. These two places must be in different countries, one of which is a signatory to the Convention. A promissory note must also specify two places, listed in Article 2(2), which are also different countries, and in which the place of payment is a signatory to the Convention.

Once these conditions are fulfilled, the Convention continues to apply even if the international instrument circulates inside a contracting State. If a State is not a signatory, the Convention effectively applies if its rules comply with those within the domestic law.

With regard to transfer warrantees, except when expressly agreed upon, a person who transfers an instrument, by endorsement and delivery, is liable for the quality of the instrument and lack of knowledge of any other legal claim against it.

Lastly, the Convention introduces several important provisions concerning: floating interest rates; rates of exchange outside the instrument; payments in installments; payments in units of value other than official national currencies; foreign currencies; signatures not hand written; lost instruments; limitation period for legal actions (4 years); etc.

The Convention comes into effect for a signatory State on the first day of the month following the expiration of 12 months after the date of deposit of the 10th instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or ratification.

1. The United Nations Convention on International Bills of Exchange and International

Promissory Notes is the culmination of over fifteen years of work by the United Nations

Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL). It was adopted by the General Assembly

of the United Nations under recommendation of the Sixth (Legal) Committee on 9 December

1988.

2. The Convention presents, for optional use in international transactions, a modern,

comprehensive set of rules for international bills of exchange and international promissory notes

that satisfy its requisites of form. The text of the Convention reflects a deliberate policy to

minimize departures from the content of the two existing principal legal systems, preserving,

where possible, the rules on which those systems concur. Where conflicts exist, requiring

selection of one system's rule or a compromise solution, the Convention introduces a number of

novel provisions. Another group of new rules are the result of special efforts to have the

Convention respond to modern commercial needs and banking and financial market practices.

3. The Convention is divided into nine chapters. Chapter one deals with the sphere of

application of the Convention and the form of the instrument covered by it. Chapter two contains

definitions and other general provisions, including rules on the interpretation of various formal

requirements. Chapter three addresses questions relating to the transfer of an instrument. The

fourth chapter covers the rights and liabilities of parties to, and holders of, an instrument. The

fifth chapter addresses issues relating to presentment of an instrument, dishonour by

non-acceptance or non-payment, and the conditions precedent to parties' rights of recourse. The

sixth chapter deals with the discharge of liability on an instrument. Chapters seven and eight deal

with lost instruments and limitation of actions (prescription). Lastly, the final provisions are

found in chapter nine.

1991 - United Nations Convention on the Liability of Operators of Transport Terminals in International Trade

Adopted by a diplomatic conference on 19 April 1991, the Convention sets forth uniform legal rules governing the liability of a terminal operator for loss of and damage to goods involved in international transport while they are in a transport terminal, and for delay by the terminal operator in delivering the goods.

Conventions

The Convention is an agreement among participating states establishing obligations binding upon those States that ratify or accede to it. A convention is designed to unify law by establishing binding legal obligations To become a party to a convention, States are required formally to deposit a binding instrument of ratification or accession with the depositary. The entry into force of a convention is usually dependent upon the deposit of a minimum number of instruments of ratification.

UNCITRAL conventions:

- the Convention on the Limitation Period in the International Sale of Goods (1974) (text)
- the United Nations Convention on the Carriage of Goods by Sea (1978)
- the United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods (1980)
- the United Nations Convention on International Bills of Exchange and International Promissory Notes (1988)
- the United Nations Convention on the Liability of Operators of Transport Terminals in International Trade (1991)
- the United Nations Convention on Independent Guarantees and Stand-by Letters of Credit (1995)
- the United Nations Convention on the Assignment of Receivables in International Trade (2001)
- the United Nations Convention on the Use of Electronic Communications in International Contracts (2005)
- the United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Carriage of Goods Wholly or Partly by Sea (2008)

Model laws

A model law is a legislative text that is recommended to States for enactment as part of their national law. Model laws are generally finalized and adapted by

UNCITRAL, at its annual session, while conventions require the convening of a diplomatic conference.

- UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration (1985) (text)
- Model Law on International Credit Transfers (1992)
- UNCITRAL Model Law on Procurement of Goods, Construction and Services (1994)
- UNCITRAL Model Law on Electronic Commerce (1996)
- Model Law on Cross-border Insolvency (1997)
- UNCITRAL Model Law on Electronic Signatures (2001)
- UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Conciliation (2002)
- Model Legislative Provisions on Privately Financed Infrastructure Projects (2003)

UNCITRAL also drafted the:

- UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (1976) (text)—revised rules will be effective August 15, 2010; pre-released, July 12, 2010
- UNCITRAL Conciliation Rules (1980)
- UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (1982)
- UNCITRAL Notes on Organizing Arbitral Proceedings (1996)

1995 - United Nations Convention on Independent Guarantees and Stand-by Letters of Credit

Adopted by the General Assembly on 11 December 1995, the Convention is designed to facilitate the use of independent guarantees and stand-by letters of credit, in particular where only one or the other of those instruments may be traditionally in use. The Convention also solidifies recognition of common basic principles and characteristics shared by the independent guarantee and the stand-by letter of credit. The Convention entered into force on 1 January 2000.

Agreement Establishing the Bank for Economic Cooperation and Development in the Middle East and North Africa

Cairo, 28 August 1996

Not yet in force: see article 53 which reads as follows : "(a) This Agreement shall be open for signature at the United Nations Headquarters in New York by, for or on behalf of all prospective members whose names are set forth in Schedule A of this Agreement [Non-regional members: Austria, Canada, Cyprus, Greece, Italy, Japan, Korea (Republic of), Malta, Netherlands, Russia, Turkey, United States; Regional members: Algeria, Egypt (Arab Republic of), Israel, Jordan, Morocco, Palestinian Authority, Tunisia], and shall be subject to ratification,

acceptance or approval by the signatories, in accordance with their own procedures. (b) Instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval of this Agreement and amendments thereto shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations who shall act as the depositary of this Agreement (hereinafter referred to as the "Depositary"). The Depositary shall transmit certifed copies of this Agreement to each signatory, and shall notify the signatories of deposits of instruments of ratification, acceptance and approval, the date thereof, and the date on which this Agreement enters into force. (c) This Agreement shall enter into force on the date on which instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval shall have been deposited by signatoires whose initial subscriptions represent not less than sixty-five percent of the total subscriptions set forth in Schedule A of this Agreement. (d) For each prospective member which deposits its instrument of ratification, acceptance or approval after this Agreement shall have entered into force, this Agreement shall enter into force on the date of such deposit. (e) If this Agreement shall not have entered into force within two years after its opening for signature, the Depositary shall convene a conference of interested parties to determine the future course of action."

Note :

The Agreement is the result of negotiations begun pursuant to a mandate from the Middle East/North Africa Economic Summit held in Casablanca from 30 October to 1 November 1994. Following a meeting of the prospective signatories in Cairo, from 13 to 14 February 1996, the text of the Agreement was forwarded to the Secretary-General of the United Nations for deposit on 28 August 1996. In accordance with its article 53, the Agreement is open for signature at the United Nations Headquarters in New York by, for or on behalf of all prospective members whose names are set forth in Schedule A of the Agreement.

International Convention to Facilitate the Importation of Commercial Samples and Advertising Material

Geneva, 7 November 1952

Entry into force: 20 November 1955, in accordance with article XI

Registration : 20 November 1955, No. 3010

Status : Signatories : 6. Parties :. 66 [1]

Note : The Convention was drawn up by the Contracting Parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade at its seventh session, held at Geneva in November 1952. The proposal for the conclusion of such a convention had been referred to the Contracting Parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations in resolution 347 (XII)[2] of 7 March 1951.

Convention on the Political Rights of Women

ump to: navigation, search

The Convention on the Political Rights of Women was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 1952, and it is the first international legislation protecting the equal status of women to exercise political rights.

Overview

The preamble of the Convention reiterates the principles set out in article 21 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which declares that everyone has the right to participate in the government of his country, and to access public services. The Convention on the Political Rights of Women specifically protects this right for women. Women are given the right to vote or hold office, as established by national law, on equal terms with men and without discrimination on the basis of sex.[1]

The Convention entered into force in 1954.

Convention on the Nationality of Married Women

The Convention on the Nationality of Married Women is an international convention passed by the United Nations General Assembly in 1957.

Background

Before the Convention on the Nationality of Married Women, no legislation existed to protect married women's right to retain or renounce national citizenship in the way that men could. Women's rights groups recognized a need to legally protect the citizenship rights of women who married someone from outside of their country or nationality. The League of Nations, the international organization later succeeded by the United Nations, was lobbied by women's rights groups during the early 20th century to address the lack of international laws recognizing married womens' rights of national citizenship. The Conference for the Codification of International Law, held at The Hague in 1930, drew protests from international women's rights groups, yet the League declined to include legislation enforcing married women's nationality rights. The League took the position that it was not their role, but the role of member states, to deal with equality between men and women.[1]

The International Women's Suffrage Alliance (IWSA, later renamed the International Alliance of Women) launched a telegram campaign in 1931 to pressure the League of Nations to address the lack of legislation. Women from around the world sent telegrams to the League of Nations as a protest. The League made the concession of creating an unfunded Consultative Committee on Nationality of Women.[2]

The Pan-American Conference in Montevideo passed a Convention on the Nationality of Married Women in 1933. It was passed by the Pan American Conference at the same time as the Treaty on the Equality of Rights Between Men and Women. These were the first pieces of international law to "explicitly set sexual equality as a principle to be incorporated into national legislation"[3] which was required of countries ratifying the convention and treaty. Lobbying by the American National Women's Party has been credited with this legislation.[4] However, neither the International Labour Organization (ILO) nor the League of Nations passed any legislation on the issue during the interwar years.

Entry into Force

The issue of the nationality of married women was a leading women's rights issue facing the United Nations after its establishment. The United Nations Commission on the Status of Women was created, and made it a priority of their agenda, launching a study in 1948. The Commission recommended to the United Nations Economic and Social Council that legislation be drafted to give women equal rights as set out in Article 15 of the Universal Declaration of

Human Rights.[5] The Convention on the Nationality of Married Women was entered into force on August 11, 1958

Purpose

The Convention was concluded in the light of the conflicts of law on nationality derived from provisions concerning the loss or acquisition of nationality by women as a result of marriage, divorce, or of the change of nationality by the husband during marriage. It allows women to adopt the nationality of their husband based upon the woman's own decision, but does not require it.[6]

The Convention seeks to fulfill aspirations articulated in Article 15 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights that 'everyone has a right to a nationality' and 'no one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality nor denied the right to change his nationality'.

Key Substantive Content (summarised)

Article 1
Woman's nationality not to be automatically affected by marriage to an alien.
Article 2
Acquisition or renunciation of a nationality by a husband not to prevent the wife's retention of her nationality. Article 3
Specially privileged nationality procedures to be available for wives to take the nationality of their husbands.

Convention on Consent to Marriage, Minimum Age for Marriage, and Registration of Marriages

The Convention on Consent to Marriage, Minimum Age for Marriage, and Registration of Marriages was a treaty agreed upon in the United Nations on the standards of marriage. The treaty was opened for signature and ratification by General Assembly resolution 1763 A (XVII) on 7 November 1962 and entered into force 9 December 1964 by exchange of letters, in accordance with article 6. The Convention has been signed by 16 countries and there are 55 parties to the Convention.[1]

The Convention reaffirms the consensual nature of marriages and requires the parties to establish a minimum marriage age by law and to ensure the registration of marriages.[2]

Convention on the High Seas

The Convention on the High Seas is an international treaty created to codify the rules of international law relating to the high seas, otherwise known as international waters.[1] The treaty was one of four agreed upon at the first United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS I). The treaty was signed 29 April 1958 and entered into force 30 September 1962.[2]

The treaty is divided into 37 articles:

Article 1: Definition of "high seas".

Article 2: Statement of principles

Article 3: Access to the sea for landlocked states

Articles 4–7: the concept of a Flag State

Article 8: Warships

Article 9: Other ships in government service

Articles 10–12: Safety, rescue

Article 13: Outlawing transport of slaves at sea

Articles 14–21: Piracy

Article 22: Boarding of merchant ships by warships

Article 23: Hot pursuit, that is, pursuit of a vessel across borders for the purposes of law enforcement

Articles 24–25: Pollution

Articles 26–29: Submarine cables and pipelines

Articles 30–37: legal framework, ratification, accession

Convention on Fishing and Conservation of Living Resources of the High Seas

The Convention on Fishing and Conservation of Living Resources of the High Seas is an agreement that was designed to solve through international

cooperation the problems involved in the conservation of living resources of the high seas, considering that because of the development of modern technology some of these resources are in danger of being overexploited.

Convention on the Continental Shelf

The Convention on the Continental Shelf was an international treaty created to codify the rules of international law relating to continental shelves. The treaty, after entering into force 10 June 1964, established the rights of a sovereign state over the continental shelf surrounding it, if there be any. The treaty was one of three agreed upon at the first United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS I).[1] It has since been superseded by a new agreement reached in 1982 at UNCLOS III.

The treaty dealt with seven topics: the regime governing the superjacent waters and airspace; laying or maintenance of submarine cables or pipelines; the regime governing navigation, fishing, scientific research and the coastal state's competence in these areas; delimitation; tunneling.[2]

Historical background

The Convention on the Continental Shelf replaced the earlier practice of nations having sovereignty over only a very narrow strip of the sea surrounding them, with anything beyond that strip considered International Waters.[3] This policy was used until President of the United States Harry S Truman proclaimed that the resources on the continental shelf contiguous to the United States belonged to the United States through an Executive Order on September 28, 1945.[4] Many other nations quickly adapted similar policies, most stating that their portion of the sea extended either 12 or 200 nautical miles from its coast.

Rights of states

Article 1 of the convention defined the term shelf in terms of exploitability rather than relying upon the geological definition. It defined a shelf "to the seabed and subsoil of the submarine areas adjacent to the coast but outside the area of the territorial sea, to a depth of 200 metres or, beyond that limit, to where the depth of the superjacent waters admits of the exploitation of the natural resources of the said areas" or "to the seabed and subsoil of similar submarine areas adjacent to the coasts of islands".[5]

Besides outlining what is legal in continental shelf areas, it also dictated what could not be done in Article 5.[6]

Optional Protocol of Signature concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes. Geneva, 29 April 1958.

Protocol on the Privileges and Immunities of the International Seabed Authority

Title of Treaty

Protocol on the Privileges and Immunities of the International Seabed Authority.

Subject Matter

The purpose of the Protocol, which was opened for signature on 17 August 1998 and signed by the United Kingdom on 19 August 1999, is to confer upon the International Seabed Authority ('the Authority') such legal capacity, privileges and immunities as are necessary for the exercise of its functions.

The Authority has been established in Kingston Jamaica pursuant to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (Cmnd.8941). The Convention provides a limited amount of privileges and immunities for the Authority and persons connected with it. The International Sea-Bed Authority (Immunities and Privileges) Order 1996 (S.I. 1996/270) makes provision for these privileges and immunities in UK law.

The Protocol provides for the additional privileges and immunities, which are comparable to those accorded in respect of similar international organisations.

Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards

The Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, also known as the New York Convention, was adopted by a United Nations diplomatic conference on 10 June 1958 and entered into force on 7 June 1959. The Convention requires courts of contracting states to give effect to private agreements to arbitrate and to recognize and enforce arbitration awards made in other contracting states. Widely considered the foundational instrument for international arbitration, it applies to arbitrations which are not considered as domestic awards in the state where recognition and enforcement is sought.

Though other international conventions apply to the cross-border enforcement of arbitration awards, the New York Convention is by far the most important.

Background

In 1953, the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) produced the first draft Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of International Arbitral Awards to the United Nations Economic and Social Council. With slight modifications, the Council submitted the convention to the International Conference in the Spring of 1958. The Conference was chaired by Willem Schurmann, the Dutch Permanent Representative to the United Nations and Oscar Schachter, a leading figure in international law who later taught at Columbia Law School and the Columbia School of International and Public Affairs, and served as the President of the American Society of International Law.

International arbitration is an increasingly popular means of alternative dispute resolution for cross-border commercial transactions. The primary advantage of international arbitration over court litigation is enforceability: an international arbitration award is enforceable in most countries in the world. Other advantages of international arbitration include the ability to select a neutral forum to resolve disputes, that arbitration awards are final and not ordinarily subject to appeal, the ability to choose flexible procedures for the arbitration, and confidentiality.

Once a dispute between parties is settled, the winning party needs to collect the award or judgment. Unless the assets of the losing party are located in the country where the court judgment was rendered, the winning party needs to obtain a court judgment in the jurisdiction where the other party resides or where its assets are located. Unless there is a treaty on recognition of court judgments between the country where the judgment is rendered and the country where the winning party seeks to collect, the winning party will be unable to use the court judgment to collect.

Countries which have adopted the New York Convention have agreed to recognize and enforce international arbitration awards. As of July 23, 2011, there are 146 signatories which have adopted the New York Convention: 144 of the 193 United Nations Member States, the Cook Islands (a New Zealand dependent territory), and the Holy See have adopted the New York Convention.[1] 49 U.N. Member States have not yet adopted the New York Convention. A number of British dependent territories have not yet had the Convention extended to them by Order in Council.

Summary of provisions

Under the Convention, an arbitration award issued in any other state can generally be freely enforced in any other contracting state (save that some contracting states may elect to enforce only awards from other contracting states - the "reciprocity" reservation), only subject to certain, limited defenses. These defenses are:

1. a party to the arbitration agreement was, under the law applicable to him, under some incapacity;
2. the arbitration agreement was not valid under its governing law;
3. a party was not given proper notice of the appointment of the arbitrator or of the arbitration proceedings, or was otherwise unable to present its case;
4. the award deals with an issue not contemplated by or not falling within the terms of the submission to arbitration, or contains matters beyond the scope of the arbitration (subject to the proviso that an award which contains decisions on such matters may be enforced to the extent that it contains decisions on matters submitted to arbitration which can be separated from those matters not so submitted);
5. the composition of the arbitral tribunal was not in accordance with the agreement of the parties or, failing such agreement, with the law of the place where the hearing took place (the "lex loci arbitri");
6. the award has not yet become binding upon the parties, or has been set aside or suspended by a competent authority, either in the country where the arbitration took place, or pursuant to the law of the arbitration agreement;
7. the subject matter of the award was not capable of resolution by arbitration; or
8. enforcement would be contrary to "public policy".

Environmental Modification Convention

The Environmental Modification Convention (ENMOD), formally the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques is an international treaty prohibiting the military or other hostile use of environmental modification techniques. It opened for signature on 18 May 1977 in Geneva and entered into force on 5 October 1978. The Convention bans weather warfare, which is the use of weather modification techniques for the purposes of inducing damage or destruction. The Convention on Biological Diversity of 2010 would also ban some forms of weather modification or geoengineering.[2]

Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer

The Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer is a Multilateral Environmental Agreement. It was agreed upon at the Vienna Conference of 1985 and entered into force in 1988. It has been ratified by 196 states (all United Nations members as well as the Holy See, Niue and the Cook Islands) as well as the European Union.[1]

It acts as a framework for the international efforts to protect the ozone layer. However, it does not include legally binding reduction goals for the use of CFCs, the main chemical agents causing ozone depletion. These are laid out in the accompanying Montreal Protocol.

Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context

The Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context is a United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) convention signed in Espoo, Finland, in 1991 that entered into force in 1997. The Convention sets out the obligations of Parties -- that is States that have agreed to be bound by the Convention -- to carry out an environmental impact assessment of certain activities at an early stage of planning. It also lays down the general obligation of States to notify and consult each other on all major projects under consideration that are likely to have a significant adverse environmental impact across boundaries.

The Convention involves a Party (or Parties) of origin (States where an activity is planned) and an affected Party (or Parties) (States whose territory may be significantly adversely affected by the activity). The Convention's main procedural steps are:

- application of the Convention by the Party of origin (Art. 2.2, 2.5/App. I+III)
- notification of the affected Party by the Party of origin (Art. 3.1)
- confirmation of participation by the affected Party (Art. 3.3)
- transmittal of information from the affected Party to the Party of origin (Art. 3.6)
- public participation in tha affected Party (Art. 3.8)
- preparation of EIA documentation (Art. 4/App. II)
- distribution of the EIA documentation for the purpose of participation of authorities and public of the affected Party (Art. 4.2)

- consultation between the concerned Parties (Art. 5)
- final decision by the Party of origin(Art. 6.1)
- transmittal of final decision documentation to the affected Party(Art. 6.2)
- post-project analysis (Art. 7.1/App. V)

The Convention has been amended twice, though neither amendment is expected to enter into force for some time. The first amendment was adopted in Sofia in 2001; once in force it will open the Convention to accession upon approval by United Nations Member States that are not members of the UNECE. The second amendment was adopted in Cavtat, Croatia, in 2004; once in force it will: allow, as appropriate, affected Parties to participate in scoping; require reviews of compliance; revise the Convention's Appendix I (list of activities); and make other minor changes. [1]

The Convention was also instrumental in the creation of Strategic Environmental Assessment and has been supplemented by a Protocol on Strategic Environmental Assessment. [2]

Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes

The Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary and International Lakes, also known as the Water Convention, is an international environmental agreement and one of five UNECE's negotiated environmental treaties. The purpose of this Convention is to improve national attempts and measures for protection and management of transboundary surface waters and groundwaters. On the international level, Parties are obliged to cooperate and create joint bodies. The Convention includes provisions on: monitoring, research, development, consultations, warning and alarm systems, mutual assistance and access as well as exchange of information.[1] It was open for signature in Helsinki on 17 March 1992.

About the Convention

Some of the UNECE's water related problems are of water quantity and water quality, high water stress and overexploitation of water resources, increasing droughts and floods, contaminated water resulting in water-related diseases, etc. These issues are even harder to solve due to transboundary nature of watersources UNECE region. More than 150 major rivers and 50 large lakes are either shared or are situated along the borders of two or more countries.[2]

The Water Convention approaches its issues in a holistic way, equally emphasizing the importance of ecosystems, human societies and economies,[3] and stressing the integrated water management instead the previously used focus on specific localized problems.

In 2003, the Water Convention was amended, allowing countries outside the UNECE region to join the Convention, and thus benefit from its legal framework and experience. This is especially beneficial for countries bordering UNECE region.[4]

History of international agreements concerning transboundary waters

UNECE's records on transboundary water agreements previous to the Water Convention:

- in 1858 Austria and Bavaria signed the agreement concerning the regulation and management of the river Inn
- in 1863 Belgium and the Netherlands signed the treaty concerning the regulation of water supply from the Meuse
- in 1890 Germany and Switzerland signed the agreement concerning the hydropower station at Rheinfelden
- from 1909 dates the first and still existing agreement covering both water-quality and water-quantity issues, and setting up a joint body, between Great Britain and the United States of America relating to boundary waters between Canada and the United States[5]

Protocol on Water and Health to the 1992 Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes. London, 17 June 1999

Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents

The Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents is a United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) convention signed in Helsinki, Finland, on 17 March 1992, that entered into force on 19 April 2000. The Convention is designed to protect people and the environment against industrial accidents. The Convention aims to prevent accidents from occurring, or reducing their frequency and severity and mitigating their effects if required. The Convention promotes active international cooperation between countries, before, during and after an industrial accident.

The Convention helps its Parties -- that is States or certain regional organizations that have agreed to be bound by the Convention -- to prevent

industrial accidents that can have transboundary effects and to prepare for, and respond to, accidents if they occur. The Convention also encourages its Parties to help each other in the event of an accident, to cooperate on research and development, and to share information and technology.

The Conference of the Parties was constituted as the Convention's governing body at its first meeting in Brussels on 22-24 November 2000.

As of the beginning of 2012, the Convention had 40 Parties, including the European Union, the Russian Federation and most other countries in all parts of Europe, as well as Armenia, Azerbaijan and Kazakhstan.

At its third meeting, in 2004, the Conference of the Parties adopted an Assistance Programme to support the countries from Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia and South Eastern Europe in implementing the Convention.

The Protocol on Civil Liability for Damage and Compensation for Damage Caused by Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents on Transboundary Waters, was adopted in Kyiv, Ukraine on 21 May 2003. The Protocol is a joint instrument to the Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents and to the Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes. The Protocol is not in force. [1]

ASCOBANS

ASCOBANS is a regional agreement on the protection of small cetaceans that was concluded as the “Agreement on the Conservation of Small Cetaceans of the Baltic and North Seas” under the auspices of the UNEP Convention on Migratory Species, or Bonn Convention, in September 1991 and came into force in March 1994. In February 2008, an extension of the agreement area came into force which changed the name to “Agreement on the Conservation of Small Cetaceans of the Baltic, North East Atlantic, Irish and North Seas”. ASCOBANS covers all species of toothed whales (Odontoceti) in the Agreement Area, with the exception of the sperm whale (Physeter macrocephalus).

Background

Numerous species of small cetaceans live in the Baltic, Irish and North Seas and the North East Atlantic, including dolphins, whales and harbour porpoises. The harbour porpoise is the most common small cetacean species in the North Sea and the only cetacean species native to the Baltic Sea and therefore is the

flagship species of the Agreement. As migratory species, cetaceans face of a number of threats caused by human activities. These include habitat loss, marine pollution, acoustic disturbances from various sources and, most importantly, incidental catch by entanglement in fishing gear, so-called bycatch. Every year, thousands of whales, dolphins and porpoises fall victim to bycatch, drowning because they can no longer swim up to the surface for a breath of air.

Aarhus Convention

The UNECE Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters, usually known as the Aarhus Convention, was signed on June 25, 1998 in the Danish city of Aarhus. It entered into force on 30 October 2001. As of July 2009, it had been signed by 40 (primarily European and Central Asian) countries and the European Union and ratified by 41 countries. It had also been ratified by the European Community, which has begun applying Aarhus-type principles in its legislation, notably the Water Framework Directive (Directive 2000/60/EC).

The Aarhus Convention grants the public rights regarding access to information, public participation and access to justice, in governmental decision-making processes on matters concerning the local, national and transboundary environment. It focuses on interactions between the public and public authorities.

Content

The Aarhus Convention is a multilateral environmental agreement through which the opportunities for citizens to access environmental information are increased and transparent and reliable regulation procedure is secured.[1][2] It is a way of enhancing the environmental governance network, introducing a reactive and trustworthy relationship between civil society and governments and adding the novelty of a mechanism created to empower the value of public participation in the decision making process and guarantee access to justice: a "governance-by-disclosure" that leads a shift toward an environmentally responsible society.[3] The Aarhus Convention was drafted by governments, with the highly required participation of NGOs, and is legally binding for all the States who ratified it becoming Parties. Among the latter is included the EC, who therefore has the task to ensure compliance not only within the member States but also for its institutions, all those bodies who carry out public administrative duties.[4] Each Party has the commitment to promote the principles contained in the

convention and to fill out a national report, always embracing a consultative and transparent process[5]

International Coffee Agreement

The International Coffee Agreement (ICA) is an international commodity agreement aimed to achieve a reasonable balance between the supply and demand of coffee at a higher price than would otherwise be the case.[1] Export quotas are the principal instruments used.[2]

The original agreement was signed in 1962 for a five-year period, and since then there have been five subsequent agreements, ratified in 1968, 1976, 1983, 1994, and 2001.[3] The ICA 2007 entered into force definitively on 2 February 2011, once it was approved by two-thirds of the exporting and importing signatory governments.[4] As of 1 October 2009, the International Coffee Agreement of 2001 has 77 members, of which 45 are exporting members, and 32 importing.[5]

History

The precursor to the ICA was the Inter-American Coffee Agreement (IACA) established during the Second World War. The war had created the conditions for a Latin American coffee agreement: European markets were closed off, the price of coffee was in decline and the United States feared that the declining price could drive Latin American countries—especially Brazil—towards Nazi or Communist sympathies.[6][7]

In 1940, the United States agreed to restrict its imports to a quota of 15.9 million bags, and other Latin American countries agreed to restrict their production.[8] The agreement had an immediate effect, the price almost doubled by the end of 1941.[6] After the end of the war in 1945 the price of coffee rose continuously[7][9] until 1955-57 when a degree of equilibrium was reached.

Producers sought ways to maintain the price,[10] this led to the first International Coffee Agreement.[9] A target price was set, and export quotas allocated to each producer.[11] When the indicator price set by the International Coffee Organization (ICO) fell below the target price, quotas were decreased; if it rose above it, quotas were increased.[11] Although the system had its problems, it was successful in raising and stabilizing the price.[11]

The International Coffee Organization was established in 1963 to administer the clauses of the agreement and supervise the mechanisms in place. Until 1986 the Coffee Council, the decision-making body of ICO, approved export quotas.[1]

In 1989, ICO failed to reach an agreement on new export quotas, causing the 1983 ICA to break down.[12] Without an extended agreement producing countries lost most of their influence on the international market.[13] ICO's average indicator price for the last five years previous the end of the regime fell from US$1.34 per pound, to US$0.77 per pound for the first five years after.[13]

International Grains Agreement

The International Grains Agreement (IGA), which replaced the International Wheat Agreement in 1995, comprises a Grains Trade Convention (GTC) and a Food Aid Convention (FAC). The IGA is administered by the International Grains Council (IGC), an intergovernmental forum for cooperation on wheat and coarse grain matters.

The Grains Trade Convention provides for information-sharing, analysis and consultations on grain market and policy developments. Under the Food Aid Convention, donor countries pledge to provide annually specified amounts of food aid to developing countries in the form of grain suitable for human consumption, or cash to buy suitable grains in recipient countries. The International Grains Agreement does not contain any mechanisms for stabilizing supplies, prices, or trade.

International Rubber Regulation Agreement

The International Rubber Regulation Agreement was a 1934 accord between the United Kingdom, India, the Netherlands, France and Thailand that formed a cartel of major rubber producing nations to restrict global rubber production and maintain a stable, high price for natural rubber.

Background

Demand for rubber declined sharply after World War I resulting in the British enacting the Stevenson Plan in 1921 to restrict the supply of rubber to support rubber prices and ensure the profitability of British rubber plantations in the Far East. However, the plan had many flaws and was abandoned in 1928. By 1928 the plan both irritated the United States and lacked apparent purpose. Demand for rubber was robust due to expanded use of the automobile in the United States.

After the stock market crash of 1929 the Great Depression hit the United States and rubber demanded once again softened. It was in this context that the International Rubber Regulation Agreement was implemented.

The Agreement

The Agreement was enacted in 1934 between the United Kingdom, India, the Netherlands, France and Thailand to restrict the rubber supply in accordance with the decline of rubber prices to maintain rubber prices and profitability of rubber producing firms. The agreement both prevented establishment of new rubber plantations and placed production restrictions on existing plantations. The agreement in effect formed a cartel of rubber producing nations that neglected the needs of rubber consuming nations, most notably the United States and Japan.

Outcome

The United States responded by: establishing rubber plantations in territories under its control; conducting research into rubber-producing plants that thrive in the United States' climate; and reinvigorated efforts to replace natural rubber in tires with a synthetic. In the Fordlandia venture, Henry Ford failed in an attempt to produce rubber in Brazil. The Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company developed plantations in the Philippines and Costa Rica and Harvey Firestone developed plantations in Liberia.

Research into synthetic rubber was limited by lack of knowledge of the chemical structure of rubber compounds until after 1945. DuPont had developed neoprene in the 1920s in response to the Stevenson Plan, but neoprene was too costly for making tires. During this period the International Rubber Research & Development Board and the Research Association of British Rubber Manufacturers were founded.

Convention on the Rights of the Child

The United Nations **Convention on the Rights of the Child** (commonly abbreviated as the **CRC**, **CROC**, or **UNCRC**) is a human rights treaty setting out the civil, political, economic, social, health and cultural rights of children. The Convention defines a child as any human being under the age of eighteen, unless under states own domestic legislation majority is attained earlier.[4]

Nations that ratify this convention are bound to it by international law. Compliance is monitored by the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child,

which is composed of members from countries around the world. Once a year, the Committee submits a report to the Third Committee of the United Nations General Assembly, which also hears a statement from the CRC Chair, and the Assembly adopts a Resolution on the Rights of the Child.[5]

Governments of countries that have ratified the Convention are required to report to, and appear before, the United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child periodically to be examined on their progress with regards to the advancement of the implementation of the Convention and the status of child rights in their country. Their reports and the committee's written views and concerns are available on the committee's website.

The UN General Assembly adopted the Convention and opened it for signature on 20 November 1989 (the 30th anniversary of its Declaration of the Rights of the Child).[6] It came into force on 2 September 1990, after it was ratified by the required number of nations. Currently, 193 countries are party to it,[1] including every member of the United Nations except Somalia, South Sudan and the United States.[5][7] Somalia's cabinet ministers had announced plans in late 2009 to ratify the treaty.[8]

Two optional protocols were adopted on 25 May 2000. The First Optional Protocol restricts the involvement of children in military conflicts, and the Second Optional Protocol prohibits the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography. Both protocols have been ratified by more than 140 states.[9][10]

Contents

The Convention deals with the child-specific needs and rights. It requires that states act in the best interests of the child. This approach is different from the common law approach found in many countries that had previously treated children as possessions or chattels, ownership of which was sometimes argued over in family disputes.

In many jurisdictions, properly implementing the Convention requires an overhaul of child custody and guardianship laws, or, at the very least, a creative approach within the existing laws. The Convention acknowledges that every child has certain basic rights, including the right to life, his or her own name and identity, to be raised by his or her parents within a family or cultural grouping, and to have a relationship with both parents, even if they are separated.

The Convention obliges states to allow parents to exercise their parental responsibilities. The Convention also acknowledges that children have the right

to express their opinions and to have those opinions heard and acted upon when appropriate, to be protected from abuse or exploitation, and to have their privacy protected, and it requires that their lives not be subject to excessive interference.

The Convention also obliges signatory states to provide separate legal representation for a child in any judicial dispute concerning their care and asks that the child's viewpoint be heard in such cases. The Convention forbids capital punishment for children.

In its General Comment 8 (2006) the Committee on the Rights of the Child stated that there was an "obligation of all States parties to move quickly to prohibit and eliminate all corporal punishment and all other cruel or degrading forms of punishment of children".[11] Article 19 of the Convention states that State Parties must "take all appropriate legislative, administrative, social and educational measures to protect the child from all forms of physical or mental violence",[12] but it makes no reference to corporal punishment, and the Committee's interpretation on this point has been explicitly rejected by several States Party to the Convention, including Australia,[13] Canada and the United Kingdom.

The European Court of Human Rights has made reference to the Convention when interpreting the European Convention on Human Rights.[14]

Convention on Biological Diversity

The **Convention on Biological Diversity** (**CBD**), known informally as the **Biodiversity Convention**, is an international legally binding treaty. The Convention has three main goals:

1. conservation of biological diversity (or biodiversity);
2. sustainable use of its components; and
3. fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from genetic resources

In other words, its objective is to develop national strategies for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity. It is often seen as the key document regarding sustainable development.

The Convention was opened for signature at the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro on 5 June 1992 and entered into force on 29 December 1993.

2010 was the International Year of Biodiversity. The Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity is the focal point for the International Year of Biodiversity. At the 2010 10th Conference of Parties (COP) to the Convention on Biological Diversity in October in Nagoya, Japan, the Nagoya Protocol was adopted.[1] On 22 December 2010, the UN declared the period from 2011 to 2020 as the UN-Decade on Biodiversity. They, hence, followed a recommendation of the CBD signatories during COP10 at Nagoya in October 2010.

About the convention

The convention recognized for the first time in international law that the conservation of biological diversity is "a common concern of humankind" and is an integral part of the development process. The agreement covers all ecosystems, species, and genetic resources. It links traditional conservation efforts to the economic goal of using biological resources sustainably. It sets principles for the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the use of genetic resources, notably those destined for commercial use. It also covers the rapidly expanding field of biotechnology through its Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, addressing technology development and transfer, benefit-sharing and biosafety issues. Importantly, the Convention is legally binding; countries that join it ('Parties') are obliged to implement its provisions.

The convention reminds decision-makers that natural resources are not infinite and sets out a philosophy of sustainable use. While past conservation efforts were aimed at protecting particular species and habitats, the Convention recognizes that ecosystems, species and genes must be used for the benefit of humans. However, this should be done in a way and at a rate that does not lead to the long-term decline of biological diversity.

The convention also offers decision-makers guidance based on the precautionary principle that where there is a threat of significant reduction or loss of biological diversity, lack of full scientific certainty should not be used as a reason for postponing measures to avoid or minimize such a threat. The Convention acknowledges that substantial investments are required to conserve biological diversity. It argues, however, that conservation will bring us significant environmental, economic and social benefits in return.

The Convention on Biological Diversity of 2010 would ban some forms of geoengineering.[2]

Issues under the convention

Some of the many issues dealt with under the convention include:

- Measures and incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity.
- Regulated access to genetic resources and traditional knowledge, including Prior Informed Consent of the party providing resources.
- Sharing, in a fair and equitable way, the results of research and development and the benefits arising from the commercial and other utilization of genetic resources with the Contracting Party providing such resources (governments and/or local communities that provided the traditional knowledge or biodiversity resources utilized).
- Access to and transfer of technology, including biotechnology, to the governments and/or local communities that provided traditional knowledge and/or biodiversity resources.
- Technical and scientific cooperation.
- Impact assessment.
- Education and public awareness.
- Provision of financial resources.
- National reporting on efforts to implement treaty commitments.

International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism

The 1999 United Nations **International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism** (Terrorist Financing Convention) is a multilateral treaty open to the ratification of all states designed to criminalize acts thos who finance terrorist activities and to promote police and judicial cooperation to prevent, investigate and punish financing those acts.

Article 2.1 defines the crime of terrorist financing as the offence committed by "any person" who "by any means, directly or indirectly, unlawfully and wilfully, provides or collects funds with the intention that they should be used or in the knowledge that they are to be used, in full or in part, in order to carry out" an act "intended to cause death or serious bodily injury to a civilian, or to any other person not taking an active part in the hostilities in a situation of armed conflict, when the purpose of such act, by its nature or context, is to intimidate a population, or to compel a government or an international organization to do or to abstain from doing any act."[1]

State parties to this treaty commit themselves also to freezing and seize of funds intended to be used for terrorist activities, to share the forfeited funds. Moreover, States commit themselves not to used Bank secrecy as a justification for refusing to cooperate.

Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants

Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants is an international environmental treaty, signed in 2001 and effective from May 2004, that aims to eliminate or restrict the production and use of persistent organic pollutants (POPs).

History

In 1995, the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) called for global action to be taken on POPs, which it defined as "chemical substances that persist in the environment, bio-accumulate through the food web, and pose a risk of causing adverse effects to human health and the environment".

Following this, the Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety (IFCS) and the International Programme on Chemical Safety (IPCS) prepared an assessment of the 12 worst offenders, known as the dirty dozen.

The INC met five times between June 1998 and December 2000 to elaborate the convention, and delegates adopted the Stockholm Convention on POPs at the Conference of the Plenipotentiaries convened from 22-23 May 2001 in Stockholm, Sweden.

The negotiations for the Convention were completed on 23 May 2001 in Stockholm. The convention entered into force on 17 May 2004 with ratification by an initial 128 parties and 151 signatories. Co-signatories agree to outlaw nine of the dirty dozen chemicals, limit the use of DDT to malaria control, and curtail inadvertent production of dioxins and furans.

Parties to the convention have agreed to a process by which persistent toxic compounds can be reviewed and added to the convention, if they meet certain criteria for persistence and transboundary threat. The first set of new chemicals to be added to the Convention were agreed at a conference in Geneva on 8 May 2009.

As of April, 2011, there are 173 parties to the Convention.[1]

By October 2011 there were 176 Parties to the Convention.

Summary of Provisions

Key elements of the Convention include the requirement that developed countries provide new and additional financial resources and measures to eliminate production and use of intentionally produced POPs, eliminate unintentionally produced POPs where feasible, and manage and dispose of POPs wastes in an environmentally sound manner. Precaution is exercised throughout the Stockholm Convention, with specific references in the preamble, the objective and the provision on identifying new POPs.

Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination

The **International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination** (ICERD) is a United Nations convention. A second-generation human rights instrument, the Convention commits its members to the elimination of racial discrimination and the promotion of understanding among all races.[5] Controversially, the Convention also requires its parties to outlaw hate speech and criminalize membership in racist organizations.[6]

The Convention also includes an individual complaints mechanism, effectively making it enforceable against its parties. This has led to the development of a limited jurisprudence on the interpretation and implementation of the Convention.

The convention was adopted and opened for signature by the United Nations General Assembly on December 21, 1965,[7] and entered into force on January 4, 1969. As of October 2011, it has 86 signatories and 175 parties.[1]

The Convention is monitored by the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD).

Genesis

In December 1960, following incidents of antisemitism in several parts of the world,[8] the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution condemning "all manifestations and practices of racial, religious and national hatred" as violations of the United Nations Charter and Universal Declaration of Human Rights and calling on the governments of all states to "take all necessary

measures to prevent all manifestations of racial, religious and national hatred".[9] The Economic and Social Council followed this up by drafting a resolution on "manifestations of racial prejudice and national and religious intolerance", calling on governments to educate the public against intolerance and rescind discriminatory laws.[10] Lack of time prevented this from being considered by the General Assembly in 1961,[11] but it was passed the next year.[10]

During the early debate on this resolution, African nations led by the Central African Republic, Chad, Dahomey, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Mali, Mauritania, and Upper Volta pushed for more concrete action on the issue, in the form of an international convention against racial discrimination.[12] Some nations preferred a declaration rather than a binding convention, while others wanted to deal with racial and religious intolerance in a single instrument.[13] The eventual compromise, forced by Arab nations' reluctance to discuss antisemitism[14] was for two resolutions, one calling for a declaration and draft convention aimed at eliminating racial discrimination,[15] the other doing the same for religious intolerance.[16]

The draft Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination was adopted by the General Assembly on November 20, 1963.[17] The same day the General Assembly called for the Economic and Social Council and the Commission on Human Rights to make the drafting of a Convention on the subject an absolute priority.[18] The draft was completed by mid-1964,[19] but delays in the General Assembly meant that it could not be adopted that year.[14] It was finally adopted on December 21, 1965.[7]

Summary

The Convention follows the structure of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, with a preamble and twenty-five articles, divided into three parts.[20]

Part 1 (Articles 1 – 7) commits parties to the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination and to promoting understanding among all races (Article 2). Parties are obliged to not discriminate on the basis of race, not to sponsor or defend racism, and to prohibit racial discrimination within their jurisdictions. They must also review their laws and policies to ensure that they do not discriminate on the basis of race, and commit to amending or repealing those that do. Specific areas in which discrimination must be eliminated are listed in Article 5.

The Convention imposes a specific commitment on parties to eradicate racial segregation and the crime of apartheid within their jurisdictions (Article 3). Parties are also required to criminalize the incitement of racial hatred (Article 4), to ensure judicial remedies for acts of racial discrimination (Article 6), and to engage in public education to promote understanding and tolerance (Article 7).

Part 2 (Articles 8 – 16) governs reporting and monitoring of the Convention and the steps taken by the parties to implement it. It establishes the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, and empowers it to make general recommendations to the UN General Assembly.[21] It also establishes a dispute-resolution mechanism between parties (Articles 11 – 13), and allows parties to recognise the competence of the Committee to hear complaints from individuals about violations of the rights protected by the Convention (Article 14).

Part 3 (Articles 17 – 25) governs ratification, entry into force, and amendment of the Convention.

Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents.

The Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents (also referred to as the "Protection of Diplomats Convention") was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 14 December 1973. It is one of a series of "sectoral" anti-terrorism conventions negotiated within the United Nations and its specialised agencies. It built on the great codification conventions in the field of privileges and immunities, including the Vienna Conventions on Diplomatic and Consular Relations. Already in February 1971, the Organization of American States had adopted a convention on the subject. The Convention was negotiated in response to a spate of kidnappings and killings of diplomatic agents beginning in the late 1960s, such as the killing of von Spreti, Federal Republic of Germany's Ambassador to Guatemala. The adoption of the sectoral conventions typically occurred in response to such events: aircraft hijacking, aircraft sabotage, attacks on shipping, etc.

Entry into force: 20 February 1977, in accordance with article 17(1)

Registration : 20 February 1977, No. 15410

Status : Signatories : 25. Parties : 173

Note : The Convention was opened for signature at New York on 14 December 1973 until 31 December 1974.

The Convention's central provision requires that a person alleged to have committed certain serious attacks against diplomats and other "internationally protected persons" should either be extradited or have his or her case submitted to the authorities for the purposes of prosecution (art. 7). States must establish jurisdiction over the crimes set forth in article 2 of the Convention (which will in any event be crimes under the ordinary criminal law) in certain circumstances (art. 3). It provides for cooperation between States in the prevention of the crimes, and for the communication of information (arts. 4 and 5). States must ensure that alleged offenders in their territory are available for prosecution or extradition (art. 6). The Convention makes provision to facilitate extradition, but does not remove the political offence exception where this exists under domestic law (art. 8). (That was the subject of the later 1977 European Convention on the Suppression of Terrorism.) And it makes provision for mutual assistance (art. 10). It contains a carefully circumscribed provision on asylum (art. 11).

The term "internationally protected persons" is new and has no particular meaning outside the context of the Convention. The aim was to cover all persons entitled pursuant to international law to special protection from any attack on his or her person, freedom and dignity. This mirrors the language of article 29 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations and the corresponding articles in other conventions on privileges and immunities. The definition in article 1 expressly covers Heads of State, Heads of Government and Ministers for Foreign Affairs, thus reaffirming the special position of these three office holders (cf. art. 7 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, art. 21 of the Convention on Special Missions)

The final clauses of the Convention contain some interesting points. The dispute settlement provision in article 13 allows States to opt out, but a number of reservations to this effect have been withdrawn following the end of the Cold War. Article 14 provides that the Convention is open to participation by "all States". This was the first such departure from the "Vienna formula" (which spelt out which States were entitled to become party to the convention in question), and was accompanied by an understanding in the Assembly (applicable to all such treaties) "that the Secretary-General, in discharging his functions as depositary of a convention with an 'all States' clause, will follow the practice of the General Assembly and, whenever advisable, will request the opinion of the Assembly before receiving a signature or an instrument of ratification or accession".

As of 25 May 2008, the Internationally Protected Persons Convention had attracted 168 States parties, and so (in terms of participation) has been very successful. A considerable number of States became party in the last few years, presumably as part of the move, encouraged by the General Assembly, to accept anti-terrorism conventions following the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Centre in New York on 9/11. The Convention forms part of the international community's "law enforcement" response to terrorism. Terrorism was a great scourge in the 1960s and 1970s, but the reaction to it had not yet reached the scale of later decades, with Chapter VII action by the Security Council and on occasion an "armed conflict" approach to the fight against terrorism (the "Global War on Terror"). Like most of the anti-terrorism conventions, it has been of more symbolic than practical importance. It has occasionally been referred to in argument in cases before the International Court of Justice, and been applied by domestic courts. In 1980, the General Assembly instituted reporting procedures, under which States report on the measures they have taken to enhance the protection, security and safety of diplomats and consular missions and representatives, as well as missions and representatives to international organizations and officials of such organizations (General Assembly resolution 35/168 of 15 December 1980). These procedures remain in place. Attacks on internationally protected persons continue to be a scourge, and have even extended to United Nations staff members (most tragically, the bombing of the United Nations Mission in Baghdad on 19 August 2003). Potentially, therefore, the Convention remains important.

The Convention entered into force on 20 February 1977. For the current participation status of the Convention, as well as information and relevant texts of related treaty actions, such as reservations, declarations, objections, denunciations and notifications, see:

Convention against Transnational Organized Crime

The **Convention against Transnational Organized Crime** is a United Nations-sponsored multilateral treaty against transnational organized crime, adopted in 2000. By June 2012, the Convention has been signed by 147 countries and 168 parties.[1] It is also called the **Palermo Convention**, and its three protocols (the **Palermo Protocols**) are:[2]

- Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children; and

- Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air.
- Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing and Trafficking in Firearms

All four of these instruments contain elements of the current international law on human trafficking, arms trafficking and money laundering. The convention and the protocols fall under the jurisdiction of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC).

The United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, adopted by General Assembly resolution 55/25 of 15 November 2000, is the main international instrument in the fight against transnational organized crime. It opened for signature by Member States at a High-level Political Conference convened for that purpose in Palermo, Italy, on 12-15 December 2000 and entered into force on 29 September 2003. The Convention is further supplemented by three Protocols, which target specific areas and manifestations of organized crime: the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children; the Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air; and the Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, their Parts and Components and Ammunition. Countries must become parties to the Convention itself before they can become parties to any of the Protocols.

The Convention represents a major step forward in the fight against transnational organized crime and signifies the recognition by Member States of the seriousness of the problems posed by it, as well as the need to foster and enhance close international cooperation in order to tackle those problems. States that ratify this instrument commit themselves to taking a series of measures against transnational organized crime, including the creation of domestic criminal offences (participation in an organized criminal group, money laundering, corruption and obstruction of justice); the adoption of new and sweeping frameworks for extradition, mutual legal assistance and law enforcement cooperation; and the promotion of training and technical assistance for building or upgrading the necessary capacity of national authorities.

The Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children, was adopted by General Assembly resolution 55/25. It entered into force on 25 December 2003. It is the first global legally binding instrument with an agreed definition on trafficking in persons. The intention behind this definition is to facilitate convergence in national approaches with regard to the establishment of domestic criminal offences that would support efficient international cooperation in investigating and prosecuting trafficking in

persons cases. An additional objective of the Protocol is to protect and assist the victims of trafficking in persons with full respect for their human rights.

The Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air, adopted by General Assembly resolution 55/25, entered into force on 28 January 2004. It deals with the growing problem of organized criminal groups who smuggle migrants, often at high risk to the migrants and at great profit for the offenders. A major achievement of the Protocol was that, for the first time in a global international instrument, a definition of smuggling of migrants was developed and agreed upon. The Protocol aims at preventing and combating the smuggling of migrants, as well as promoting cooperation among States parties, while protecting the rights of smuggled migrants and preventing the worst forms of their exploitation which often characterize the smuggling process.

The Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, their Parts and Components and Ammunition was adopted by General Assembly resolution 55/255 of 31 May 2001. It entered into force on 3 July 2005. The objective of the Protocol, which is the first legally binding instrument on small arms that has been adopted at the global level, is to promote, facilitate and strengthen cooperation among States Parties in order to prevent, combat and eradicate the illicit manufacturing of and trafficking in firearms, their parts and components and ammunition. By ratifying the Protocol, States make a commitment to adopt a series of crime-control measures and implement in their domestic legal order three sets of normative provisions: the first one relates to the establishment of criminal offences related to illegal manufacturing of, and trafficking in, firearms on the basis of the Protocol requirements and definitions; the second to a system of government authorizations or licensing intending to ensure legitimate manufacturing of, and trafficking in, firearms; and the third one to the marking and tracing of firearms.

Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air

The **Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air**, supplementing the Convention against Transnational Organised Crime, was adopted by the United Nations in Palermo, Italy in 2000. It is also referred to as the **Smuggling protocol**. It is one of the two Palermo protocols, the other one being the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children

The Smuggling Protocol entered into force on 28 January 2004. By 2012 the protocol had been signed by 112 states, and ratified by 130.[1]

The Protocol is aimed at the protection of rights of migrants and the reduction of the power and influence of organized criminal groups that abuse migrants. It

emphasizes the need to provide migrants with humane treatment, and the need for comprehensive international approaches to combating people smuggling, including socio-economic measures that address the root causes of migration.

Palermo protocols

There are three protocols that are referred to jointly as the **Palermo Protocols**, or are sometimes incorrectly referred to individually as **the Palermo Protocol**.

The Palermo Protocols are three protocols adopted by the United Nations in 2000 in Palermo, Italy, together with the Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (the Palermo Convention). They are:

- the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children; and
- the Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air.
- the Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing and Trafficking in Firearms, Their Parts and Components and Ammunition, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime

International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings

The 1997 United Nations **International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings** (Terrorist Bombings Convention) is a multilateral treaty open to the ratification of all states designed to criminalize the unlawful and intentional use of explosives in public places with intention to kill, to injure, or to cause extensive destruction to compel a government or an international organization to do or to abstain from doing some act. It also seeks to promote police and judicial cooperation to prevent, investigate and punish those acts.

Article 2.1 of this convention defines the offence of terrorist bombing as follows:

"Any person commits an offence within the meaning of this Convention if that person unlawfully and intentionally delivers, places, discharges or detonates an explosive or other lethal device in, into or against a place or public use, a State or government facility, a public transportation system or an infrastructure facility:

a) With the intent to cause death or serious bodily injury; or

b)With the intent to cause extensive destruction of such a place, facility or system, where such a destruction results in or is likely to result in major economic loss.[1]

Article 19 expressly excluded from the scope of the convention certain activities of state armed forces and of self-determination movements as follows:

"1. Nothing in this Convention shall affect other rights, obligations and responsibilities of States, and individuals under international law, in particular the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and international humanitarian law. 2. The activities of armed forces during an armed conflict, as those terms are understood under international humanitarian law, which are governed by that law, are not governed by this Convention, and the activities undertaken by the military forces of a State in the exercise of their official duties, inasmuch as they are governed by other rules of international law, are not governed by this Convention.[2]

Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

The **Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety** is an international agreement on biosafety, as a supplement to the Convention on Biological Diversity. The Biosafety Protocol seeks to protect biological diversity from the potential risks posed by living modified organisms resulting from modern biotechnology.

The Biosafety Protocol makes clear that products from new technologies must be based on the precautionary principle and allow developing nations to balance public health against economic benefits. It will for example let countries ban imports of a living modified organism if they feel there is not enough scientific evidence that the product is safe and requires exporters to label shipments containing genetically altered commodities such as corn or cotton.

The required number of 50 instruments of ratification/accession/approval/acceptance by countries was reached in May 2003. In accordance with the provisions of its Article 37, the Protocol entered into force on 11 September 2003.

Objective

In accordance with the precautionary approach, contained in Principle 15 of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, the objective of the Protocol is to contribute to ensuring an adequate level of protection in the field of the safe transfer, handling and use of 'living modified organisms resulting from modern biotechnology' that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health, and specifically focusing on transboundary movements (Article 1 of the Protocol, SCBD 2000).

International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

The **International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights** (ICESCR) is a multilateral treaty adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 16 December 1966, and in force from 3 January 1976. It commits its parties to work toward the granting of economic, social, and cultural rights (ESCR) to individuals, including labour rights and the right to health, the right to education, and the right to an adequate standard of living. As of July 2011, the Covenant had 160 parties.[1] A further seven countries had signed, but not yet ratified the Covenant.

The ICESCR is part of the International Bill of Human Rights, along with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), including the latter's first and second Optional Protocols.[2]

The Covenant is monitored by the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

Genesis

The ICESCR has its roots in the same process that led to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. A "Declaration on the Essential Rights of Man" had been proposed at the 1945 San Francisco Conference which led to the founding of the United Nations, and the Economic and Social Council was given the task of drafting it.[2] Early on in the process, the document was split into a declaration setting forth general principles of human rights, and a convention or covenant containing binding commitments. The former evolved into the UDHR and was adopted on 10 December 1948.[2]

Drafting continued on the convention, but there remained significant differences between UN members on the relative importance of negative civil and political versus positive economic, social and cultural rights.[3] These eventually caused the convention to be split into two separate covenants, "one to contain civil and political rights and the other to contain economic, social and cultural rights."[4] The two covenants were to contain as many similar provisions as possible, and be opened for signature simultaneously.[4] Each would also contain an article on the right of all peoples to self-determination.[5]

The first document became the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the second the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. The drafts were presented to the UN General Assembly for discussion in 1954, and adopted in 1966.[6]

United Nations Convention against Corruption

The **United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC)** is the first legally binding international anti-corruption instrument.[1] In its 8 Chapters and 71 Articles, the UNCAC obliges its States Parties to implement a wide and detailed range of anti-corruption measures affecting their laws, institutions and practices. These measures aim to promote the prevention, criminalization and law enforcement, international cooperation, asset recovery, technical assistance and information exchange, and mechanisms for implementation.

Background

The UNCAC is the most recent of a long series of developments in which experts and politicians have recognized the far-reaching impact of corruption and economic crimes, including money laundering that undermine the value of democracy, sustainable development, and rule of law[3] also the need to develop effective measures against it at both the domestic and international levels. International action against corruption has progressed from general consideration and declarative statements to legally binding agreements. While at the beginning of the discussion, measures were focused relatively narrowly on specific crimes, above all bribery, the definitions and understanding of corruption have become broader and so have the measures against it. The Conventions' (not only the UNCAC, but the Inter-American Convention against Corruption, the OECD Anti-Bribery Convention, the African Union Convention

on Preventing and Combating Corruption) comprehensive approach and the mandatory character of many of its provisions give proof of this development. The UNCAC deals with forms of corruption that had not been covered by many of the earlier international instruments, such as trading in official influence, general abuses of power, and various acts of corruption in the private sector. A further significant development was the inclusion of a specific chapter of the Convention dealing with the recovery of assets, a major concern for countries that pursue the assets of former leaders and other officials accused or found to have engaged in corruption.

Measures and Provisions

The UNCAC covers five main areas: prevention, criminalization and law enforcement measures, international cooperation, asset recovery, and technical assistance and information exchange. It includes both mandatory and non-mandatory provisions.

In its resolution 55/61 of 4 December 2000, the General Assembly recognized that an effective international legal instrument against corruption, independent of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (resolution 55/25, annex I) was desirable and decided to establish an ad hoc committee for the negotiation of such an instrument in Vienna at the headquarters of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime.

The text of the United Nations Convention against Corruption was negotiated during seven sessions of the Ad Hoc Committee for the Negotiation of the Convention against Corruption, held between 21 January 2002 and 1 October 2003.

The Convention approved by the Ad Hoc Committee was adopted by the General Assembly by resolution 58/4 of 31 October 2003. The General Assembly, in its resolution 57/169 of 18 December 2002, accepted the offer of the Government of Mexico to host a high-level political signing conference in Merida for the purpose of signing the United Nations Convention against Corruption.

In accordance with article 68 (1) of resolution 58/4, the United Nations Convention against Corruption entered into force on 14 December 2005. A Conference of the States Parties is established to review implementation and facilitate activities required by the Convention.

Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

The **Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities** is an international human rights instrument of the United Nations intended to protect the rights and dignity of persons with disabilities. Parties to the Convention are required to promote, protect, and ensure the full enjoyment of human rights by persons with disabilities and ensure that they enjoy full equality under the law.

The text was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 13 December 2006, and opened for signature on 30 March 2007. Following ratification by the 20th party, it came into force on 3 May 2008.[1] As of July 2012, it has 153 signatories and 117 parties, including the European Union which 'concluded' the treaty (in effect, ratified it to the extent responsibilities of the member states were transferred to the European Union) on 23 December 2010.[2] The Convention is monitored by the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

Genesis

1981-1992 was the UN "Decade of Disabled Persons". In 1987, a global meeting of experts to review progress recommended that the UN General Assembly should draft an international convention on the elimination of discrimination against persons with disabilities. Draft convention outlines were proposed by Italy and subsequently Sweden, but no consensus was reached. Many government representatives argued that existing human rights documents were sufficient. Instead, non-compulsory "Standard Rules on the Equalisation of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities" were adopted by the General Assembly in 1993. In 2000, leaders of five international disability NGOs issued a declaration, calling on all governments to support a Convention. In 2001, the General Assembly, following a proposal by Mexico, established an Ad Hoc Committee to consider proposals for a comprehensive and integral convention to promote and protect the rights and dignity of persons with disabilities, based on a holistic approach.[3] Disability rights organisations, including the International Disability Alliance as coordinator of an ad hoc International Disability Caucus, participated actively in the drafting process, in particular seeking a role for disabled people and their organisations in the implementation and monitoring of what became the Convention.[4]

International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance

The **International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance** (ICCPED) is an international human rights instrument of the United Nations and intended to prevent forced disappearance defined in international law, crimes against humanity.[3] The text was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 20 December 2006 and opened for signature on 6 February 2007. It entered into force on 23 December 2010.[4] 91 states have signed the convention, and as of June 2012, 32 have ratified or acceded.[2]

Genesis

Following a General Assembly resolution in 1992 containing a 21 article declaration about enforced disappearance,[5] and its resolution of 1978 requesting that recommendations be made,[6] the Commission on Human Rights established an "inter-sessional open-ended working group to elaborate a draft legally binding normative instrument for the protection of all persons from enforced disappearance" in 2001.[1]

The Group concluded its work in 2006 and its draft international convention was adopted by the Human Rights Council on 29 June 2006, and welcomed the offer by France to host the signing ceremony.[1]

On 20 December 2006, the General Assembly adopted without a vote the text of the Convention and opened it for signature at the signing ceremony in Paris.[7]

Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees

The **United Nations Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees (CRSR)** is an international convention that defines who is a refugee, and sets out the rights of individuals who are granted asylum and the responsibilities of nations that grant asylum. The Convention also sets out which people do not qualify as refugees, such as war criminals. The Convention also provides for some visa-free travel for holders of travel documents issued under the convention.

History

The Convention was approved at a special United Nations conference on 28 July 1951. It entered into force on 22 April 1954. It was initially limited to protecting European refugees after World War II but a 1967 Protocol removed the geographical and time limits, expanding the Convention's scope. Because the convention was approved in Geneva, it is often referred to as "the Geneva Convention," though it is not one of the Geneva Conventions specifically dealing with allowable behavior in time of war.[2]

Denmark was the first state to ratify the treaty (on 4 December 1952). As of April 1, 2011 there were 147 signatories to either the Convention or the Protocol or to both.[3] Subsequently, the President of Nauru, Marcus Stephen, signed both the Convention and the Protocol on June 17, 2011.[4] [5]

Convention Relating to the Status of Stateless Persons

Surrounding events

The United Nations Charter and Universal Declaration of Human Rights were approved on 10 December 1948. Of significance, the Declaration at Article 15 affirms that:

1. Everyone has the right to a nationality.
2. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality nor denied the right to change his nationality.

The Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees was promulgated on 28 July 1951. Despite an original intention, it did not include any content about the status of stateless persons and there was no protocol regarding measures to effect the reduction of statelessness.

On 26 April 1954, ECOSOC adopted a Resolution to convene a Conference of Plenipotentiaries to "regulate and improve the status of stateless persons by an international agreement".

The ensuing Conference adopted the Convention on 28 September 1954.

The Convention entered into force on 6 June 1960.

Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees

The **Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees** (also known as the **New York Protocol**) entered into force on October 4, 1967. Where the United Nations 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees had restricted refugee status to those whose circumstances had come about "as a result of events occurring before 1 January 1951", as well as giving States party to the Convention the option of interpreting this as "events occurring in Europe" or "events occurring in Europe or elsewhere", the 1967 Protocol removed both the temporal and geographic restrictions. However, it also gave those States which had previously ratified the 1951 Convention and chosen to use the geographically restricted definition the option to retain that restriction.

Rotterdam Rules

The "**Rotterdam Rules**", formally the **United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Carriage of Goods Wholly or Partly by Sea** is a treaty comprising international rules that revises the legal and political framework for maritime carriage of goods. The convention establishes a modern, comprehensive, uniform legal regime governing the rights and obligations of shippers, carriers and consignees under a contract for door-to-door shipments that involve international sea transport.[1] The aim of the convention is to extend and modernize international rules already in existence and achieve uniformity of admiralty law in the field of maritime carriage, updating and/or replacing many provisions in the Hague Rules, Hague-Visby Rules and Hamburg Rules.[1][2]

The final draft of the Rotterdam Rules, which was assembled by the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law, was adopted by the United Nations on December 11, 2008 and a signing ceremony commenced in Rotterdam, Netherlands (the convention's informal namesake) on September 23, 2009.[2][3] Signers included United States, France, Greece, Denmark, Switzerland and the Netherlands; in all, signatures were obtained from countries which are said to make up 25 percent of world trade by volume.[4] Signatures were allowed after the ceremony at the UN Headquarters in New York City, New York, United States.[3]

The World Shipping Council is a prominent supporter of the Rotterdam Rules. In 2010, the American Bar Association House of Delegates approved a resolution supporting U.S. ratification of the Rotterdam Rules.[5][6]

Main provisions

The following are critical provisions and law changes found in the Rotterdam Rules.

- It extends the period of time that carriers are responsible for goods to cover the time between the point where the goods are received to the point where the goods are delivered.[4] (Note: This applies only if there is a sea leg involved in the transport. Thus, the Rotterdam Rules are not completely multimodal since all multimodal carriage excluding a sea leg is outside of the scope of application.)
- It allows for more e-commerce and approves more forms of electronic documentation.[4]
- It obligates carriers to have ships that are seaworthy and properly crewed throughout the voyage.[4] The level of care is set to due diligence, which is the same as in the Hague Rules.
- It increases the limit liability of carriers to 875 units of account per shipping unit or three units of account per kilogram of gross weight.[4]
- It eliminates the "nautical fault defence" which had prevented carriers and crewmen from being held liable for negligent ship management and navigation.[4]
- It extends the time that legal claims can be filed to two years following the day the goods were delivered or should have been delivered.[4]
- It allows parties to certain "volume" contracts to opt-out of some liability rules set in the convention.[4]

International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism

The 2005 United Nations **International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism** (Nuclear Terrorism Convention) is a multilateral treaty open to the ratification of all states designed to criminalize acts of nuclear terrorism and to promote police and judicial cooperation to prevent, investigate and punish those acts.

It covers a broad range of acts and possible targets, including nuclear power plants and nuclear reactors; covers threats and attempts to commit such crimes or to participate in them, as an accomplice; stipulates that offenders shall be either extradited or prosecuted; encourages States to cooperate in preventing terrorist attacks by sharing information and assisting each other in connection with criminal investigations and extradition proceedings; and, deals with both crisis situations, assisting States to solve the situations and post-crisis situations

by rendering nuclear material safe through the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

Historical Context

The United Nations Ad Hoc Committee established by General Assembly resolution 51/210 of 17 December 1996 (Measures to eliminate international terrorism) was mandated by the General Assembly to elaborate, as a matter of priority, an International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings (hereinafter referred to as the Convention on Terrorist Bombings) and thereafter an International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism (hereinafter referred to as the Convention on Nuclear Terrorism).

The alarming scenario that would emerge, if nuclear weapons or material should fall into terrorist hands, had preoccupied the international community in the post-cold war era. Such concerns were heightened with reports of a great deal of enriched fissionable material unaccounted for, mainly from the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), giving rise to apprehension that such material were being freely smuggled across international borders in Central Asia. It should also be recalled that the scope of the only existing international convention on this subject matter at this time, the 1980 Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, was limited to nuclear material used for peaceful purposes and did not cover nuclear material of a military nature.

This was the backdrop against which the Ad Hoc Committee commenced its work on the draft International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism in 1998, based on a text presented by the Russian Federation, which culminated with the adoption of the Convention by the General Assembly, on 13 April 2005, and its opening for signature on 14 September 2005.

Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons

The United Nations **Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons** (**CCW** or **CCWC**), concluded at Geneva on October 10, 1980 and entered into force in December 1983, seeks to prohibit or restrict the use of certain conventional weapons which are considered excessively injurious or whose effects are indiscriminate.

The full title is **Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively**

Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects and it is an annex to the Geneva Conventions of August 12, 1949.

Convention adoption and entry into force

The CCWC consist of a set of additional protocols first formulated on October 10, 1980, in Geneva and entered into force on December 2, 1983. As of March 2009, there were 109 state parties to the convention. Some of those countries have only adopted two of the five protocols, the minimum required to be considered a signatory.

The convention has five protocols:

- Protocol I restricts weapons with non-detectable fragments
- Protocol II restricts landmines, booby traps
- Protocol III restricts incendiary weapons
- Protocol IV restricts blinding laser weapons (adopted on October 13, 1995, in Vienna)
- Protocol V sets out obligations and best practice for the clearance of explosive remnants of war, adopted on November 28, 2003 in Geneva[1]

Protocol II was amended in 1996 (extending its scope of application), and entered in force on December 3, 1998. As at June 15, 2000, there were 50 contracting parties to the amended protocol. The amendment extended the restrictions on landmine use to internal conflicts; established reliability standards for remotely delivered mines; and prohibited the use of non-detectable fragments in anti-personnel landmines (APL). The failure to agree to a total ban on landmines led to the Ottawa Treaty.

Protocol IV entered into force on July 30, 1998, and as of June 15, 2000, there were 49 contracting parties.

Objectives

The aim of the Convention and its Protocols is to provide new rules for the protection of military personnel and, particularly, civilians and civilian objects from injury or attack under various conditions by means of fragments that cannot readily be detected in the human body by X-rays, landmines and booby traps, and incendiary weapons and blinding laser weapons.

CCWC along with the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) serves as an umbrella for protocols dealing with specific weapons. The Convention and its annexed Protocols apply in the situations common to the Geneva Conventions

of August 12, 1949 for the Protection of War Victims, including any situation described in Additional Protocol I and Protocol II to these Conventions.

CCWC lacks verification and enforcement mechanisms and spells out no formal process for resolving compliance concerns. A state-party can refute its commitment to the convention or any of the protocols, but it will remain legally bound until one year after notifying the treaty depositary, the UN Secretary-General, of its intent to be free of its obligations.

Protocol I: Non-Detectable Fragments

Protocol I on Non-Detectable Fragments prohibits the use of any weapon the primary effect of which is to injure by fragments which are not detectable in human body by X-rays.

Protocol II: Mines, Booby Traps and Other Devices

Protocol II on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices was amended on May 3, 1996 to strengthen its provisions. It extends the scope of application to cover both international and internal armed conflicts; prohibits the use of non-detectable anti-personnel mines and their transfer; prohibits the use of non-self-destructing and non-self-deactivating mines outside fenced, monitored and marked areas; broadens obligations of protection in favour of peacekeeping and other missions of the United Nations and its agencies; requires States to enforce compliance with its provisions within their jurisdiction; and calls for penal sanctions in case of violation.

Protocol III: Incendiary Weapons

Protocol III on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Incendiary Weapons prohibits, in all circumstances, making the civilian population as such, individual civilians or civilian objects, the object of attack by any weapon or munition which is primarily designed to set fire to objects or to cause burn injury to persons through the action of flame, heat or a combination thereof, produced by a chemical reaction of a substance delivered on the target. The protocol also prohibits the use of incendiary weapons against military targets near concentration of civilians, which may otherwise be allowed by the principle of proportionality. Protocol III lists certain munition types like smoke shells which, even if they contain White Phosphorus, only have a secondary incendiary effect; these munition types are not considered to be incendiary weapons.

Protocol IV: Blinding Laser Weapons

Main article: Protocol on Blinding Laser Weapons

Protocol IV on Blinding Laser Weapons prohibits the use of laser weapons specifically designed to cause permanent blindness. The High Contracting Parties shall not transfer such weapons to any State or non-State entity.

Protocol V: Explosive Remnants of War

Protocol V on Explosive Remnants of War requires the clearance of UXO (unexploded ordnance), such as unexploded bomblets of cluster bombs, land mines and abandoned explosive weapons.

At the cessation of active hostilities, Protocol V establishes a responsibility on parties that have used explosive weapons to assist with the clearance of unexploded ordnance that this use has created. Parties are also required, subject to certain qualifications, to provide information on their use of explosive weapons.

Rotterdam Convention

The **Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade**, more commonly known simply as the **Rotterdam Convention**, is a multilateral treaty to promote shared responsibilities in relation to importation of hazardous chemicals. The convention promotes open exchange of information and calls on exporters of hazardous chemicals to use proper labeling, include directions on safe handling, and inform purchasers of any known restrictions or bans. Signatory nations can decide whether to allow or ban the importation of chemicals listed in the treaty, and exporting countries are obliged make sure that producers within their jurisdiction comply.

Multilateral Agreement for the Establishment of an International Think Tank for Landlocked Developing Countries

New York, 24 September 2010

Not yet in force: in accordance with article 12(1) which reads as follows: "The present Agreement shall enter into force on the sixtieth day after the date of deposit of the tenth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession."

Status : Signatories : 7. Parties : 1

Note : Following the resolution 58/201 of the General Assembly of 23 December 2003 adopting the outcome of the International Ministerial Conference and the Almaty Programme of Action, and the resolution A/RES/64/214 of the General Assembly of 22 December 2009 welcoming the establishment of the think tank for the landlocked developing countries in Ulaanbaata, the 9th Annual Ministerial Meeting of Landlocked Developping Countries, held at the United Nations Headquarters in New York on 24 September 2010, endorsed the final text of the Multilateral Agreement for the Establishment of an International Think Tank for Landlocked Developing Countries which was deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 24 September 2010. In accordance with its article X, the Agreement was opened for signature at the United Nations Headquarters in New York on 1 November 2010 and will remain open for signature at United Nations Headquarters in New York until 31 October 2011.

United Nations Convention on Jurisdictional Immunities of States and Their Property

The United Nations Convention on Jurisdictional Immunities of States and Their Property was adopted by the General Assembly on 2 December 2004. The Convention was open for signature by all States until 17 January 2007 and would have entered into force on the thirtieth day following the date of deposit of the thirtieth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession. As of 14 June 2010, there are 28 signatories to the Convention and 10 instruments of ratification have been deposited. (According to its Article 30, the Convention requires 30 state parties in order to come into force.)

New York, 2 December 2004

Not yet in force: in accordance with article 30 which reads as follows: "1. The present Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day following the date of deposit of the thirtieth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. 2. For each State ratifying, accepting, approving or acceding to the present Convention after the deposit of the thirtieth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, the Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day after the deposit by such State of its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession."

Status : Signatories : 28. Parties : 13

Note : The above Convention was adopted during the 65th plenary meeting of the General Assembly by resolution A/59/38 of 2 December 2004. In accordance with its articles 28 and 33, the Convention shall be open for signature by all States from 17 January 2005 until 17 January 2007, at United Nations Headquarters in New York.

European Convention on State Immunity

The European Convention on State Immunity was signed in Basle on May 16, 1972 and is currently in force in 8 countries.

North Pacific Fur Seal Convention of 1911

The **North Pacific Fur Seal Convention of 1911**, formally known as the **Convention between the United States and Other Powers Providing for the Preservation and Protection of Fur Seals**, was an international treaty signed on July 7, 1911 designed to manage the commercial harvest of fur bearing mammals (such as Northern fur seals and sea otters) in the Pribilof Islands of the Bering Sea. The treaty, signed by the United States, Great Britain, Japan, and Russia, outlawed open-water seal hunting and acknowledged the United States' jurisdiction in managing the on-shore hunting of seals for commercial

purposes. It was the first international treaty to address wildlife preservation issues.[1]

Terms of the treaty

The two most significant terms of the treaty were the banning of pelagic seal hunting and the granting of jurisdiction to the United States in managing on-shore hunts. In exchange for granting jurisdiction to the United States, the other signatories to the treaties were guaranteed payments and/or minimum takes of seal furs while the treaty remained in effect, subject to certain conditions.[2]

The treaty also provided an exemption to aboriginal tribes which hunted seals using traditional methods and for non-commercial purposes including food and shelter. Aboriginal tribes specifically mentioned in the treaty include the Aleut and Aino (Ainu) peoples.[2]

Authorship and ratification

The treaty was co-authored by environmentalist Henry Wood Elliott and United States Secretary of State John Hay in 1905, although the treaty was not ratified for another six years. [1] The treaty was signed at Washington, D.C. on July 7, 1911, with ratifications by each signatory on the following dates:

- United States: Ratification advised by the Senate on July 24, 1911, and ratified by President William Howard Taft on November 24, 1911
- Great Britain: August 25, 1911
- Russia: October 22 / November 4, 1911
- Japan: November 6, 1911

Ratifications were then exchanged at Washington on December 12, 1911, and the treaty was proclaimed two days later on December 14. [2]

Enactment and legacy

Following ratification, the United States Congress enacted an immediate 5-year moratorium on hunting, to allow for recovery of the decimated herds. The treaty remained in effect until hostilities erupted among the signatories in World War II. However, the treaty set precedent for future national and international laws and treaties, including the Fur Seal Act of 1966 and the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972.[1]

Armistice of Mudros

The **Armistice of Moudros** (Turkish: Mondros Ateşkes Anlaşması), concluded on 30 October 1918, ended the hostilities in the Middle Eastern theatre between the Ottoman Empire and the Allies of World War I. It was signed by the Ottoman Minister of Marine Affairs Rauf Bey and the British Admiral Somerset Arthur Gough-Calthorpe, on board HMS Agamemnon in Moudros harbor on the Greek island of Lemnos.[1]

As part of several conditions to the armistice, the Ottomans surrendered their remaining garrisons outside Anatolia, as well as granted the Allies the right to occupy forts controlling the Straits of the Dardanelles and the Bosporus; and the right to occupy "in case of disorder" any Ottoman territory in case of a threat to security. The Ottoman army was demobilized, and all ports, railways, and other strategic points were made available for use by the Allies. In the Caucasus, the Ottomans had to retreat to within the pre-war borders between the Ottoman and the Russian Empires.

The armistice was followed with occupation of Constantinople and subsequent partitioning of the Ottoman Empire. The Treaty of Sèvres (10 August 1920) followed the armistice, but this treaty was not enacted due to the outbreak of the Turkish War of Independence.

Treaty of Versailles

The **Treaty of Versailles** (French: le **Traité de Versailles**) was one of the peace treaties at the end of World War I. It ended the state of war between Germany and the Allied Powers. It was signed on 28 June 1919, exactly five years after the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand. The other Central Powers on the German side of World War I were dealt with in separate treaties.[1] Although the armistice signed on 11 November 1918, ended the actual fighting, it took six months of negotiations at the Paris Peace Conference to conclude the peace treaty. The treaty was registered by the Secretariat of the League of Nations on 21 October 1919, and was printed in The League of Nations Treaty Series.

Of the many provisions in the treaty, one of the most important and controversial required Germany to accept responsibility for causing the war (along with Austria and Hungary, according to the Treaty of Saint-Germain-en-Laye and the Treaty of Trianon, respectively) and, under the terms of articles 231–248 (later known as the War Guilt clauses), to disarm, make substantial territorial concessions and pay heavy reparations to certain countries that had formed the Entente powers. In 1921 the total cost of these reparations was assessed at 132 billion Marks (then $31.4 billion or £6.6 billion, roughly

equivalent to US $442 billion or UK £284 billion in 2012), a sum that many economists at the time, notably John Maynard Keynes, deemed to be excessive and counterproductive and would have taken Germany until 1988 to pay.[2][3] The final payments ended up being made on 4 October 2010,[4] the 20th anniversary of German reunification, and some 92 years after the end of the war for which they were exacted.[5] The Treaty was undermined by subsequent events starting as early as 1932 and was widely flouted by the mid-1930s.[6]

The result of these competing and sometimes conflicting goals among the victors was compromise that left none contented: Germany was not pacified or conciliated, nor permanently weakened. This would prove to be a factor leading to later conflicts, notably and directly World War II.[7]

Content

Impositions on Germany

Legal restrictions

- Article 227 charges the former German Emperor, Wilhelm II, with supreme offense against international morality. He is to be tried as a war criminal.
- Articles 228–230 tries many other Germans as war criminals.
- Article 231 (the "War Guilt Clause") lays sole responsibility for the war on Germany and her allies, which is to be accountable for all damage to civilian populations of the Allies.

Occupation of the Rhineland

As a guarantee of compliance by Germany, Part XIV of the Treaty provided that the Rhineland would be occupied by Allied troops for a period of 15 years.[13]

Military restrictions

Part V of the treaty begins with the preamble, "In order to render possible the initiation of a general limitation of the armaments of all nations, Germany undertakes strictly to observe the military, naval and air clauses which follow."[14]

- German armed forces will number no more than 100,000 troops, and conscription will be abolished.
- Enlisted men will be retained for at least 12 years; officers to be retained for at least 25 years.

- German naval forces will be limited to 15,000 men, six battleships (no more than 10,000 tons displacement each), six cruisers (no more than 6,000 tons displacement each), 12 destroyers (no more than 800 tons displacement each) and 12 torpedo boats (no more than 200 tons displacement each). No submarines are to be included.[clarification needed]
- The import and export of weapons is prohibited.
- Poison gas, armed aircraft, tanks and armoured cars are prohibited.
- Blockades on ships are prohibited.
- Restrictions on the manufacture of machine guns (e.g. the Maxim machine gun) and rifles (e.g. Gewehr 98 rifles).

Territorial changes

Germany′s borders in 1919 had been established nearly 50 years earlier, at the country′s official establishment in 1871. Territory and cities in the region had changed hands repeatedly for centuries, including at various times being owned by the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Kingdom of Sweden, Kingdom of Poland, and Kingdom of Lithuania. However, Germany laid claim to lands and cities that it viewed as historically "Germanic" centuries before Germany′s establishment as a country in 1871. Other countries disputed Germany′s claim to this territory. In the peace treaty, Germany agreed to return disputed lands and cities to various countries.

Germany was compelled to yield control of its colonies, and would also lose a number of European territories. The province of West Prussia would be ceded to the restored Poland, thereby granting it access to the Baltic Sea via the "Polish Corridor" which Prussia had annexed in the Partitions of Poland. This turned East Prussia into an exclave, separated from mainland Germany.

- Alsace and much of Lorraine—both originally German-speaking territories—were part of France, having been annexed by France′s King Louis XIV who desired the Rhine as a "natural border". After approximately 200 years of French rule, Alsace and the German-speaking part of Lorraine were ceded to Germany in 1871 under the Treaty of Frankfurt. In 1919, both regions were returned to France.
- Northern Schleswig was returned to Denmark following a plebiscite on February 14, 1920 (area 3,984 km², 163,600 inhabitants (1920)). Central Schleswig, including the city of Flensburg, opted to remain German in a separate referendum on 14 March 1920.
- Most of the Prussian provinces of Province of Posen (now Poznan) and of West Prussia which Prussia had annexed in the Partitions of Poland (1772–1795) were ceded to Poland (area 53,800 km², 4,224,000 inhabitants (1931)) without a plebiscite. Most of the Province of Posen

had already come under Polish control during the Greater Poland Uprising of 1918–1919.

- The Hultschin area of Upper Silesia was transferred to Czechoslovakia (area 316 or 333 km², 49,000 inhabitants) without a plebiscite.
- The eastern part of Upper Silesia was assigned to Poland, as in the Upper Silesia plebiscite inhabitants of about 45% of communities voted for this (with general results of 717,122 votes being cast for Germany and 483,514 for Poland).
- The area of Eupen-Malmedy was given to Belgium. An opportunity was given to the population to "protest" against the transfer by signing a register, which gathered few signatures. The Vennbahn railway was also transferred to Belgium.
- The area of Soldau in East Prussia, an important railway junction on the Warsaw–Danzig route, was transferred to Poland without a plebiscite (area 492 km²).[15]
- The northern part of East Prussia known as the "Memelland" or Memel Territory was placed under the control of France and was later annexed by Lithuania.
- From the eastern part of West Prussia and the southern part of East Prussia, after the East Prussian plebiscite a small area was ceded to Poland.
- The Territory of the Saar Basin was to be under the control of the League of Nations for 15 years, after which a plebiscite between France and Germany, was to decide to which country it would belong. During this time, coal would be sent to France. The region was then called the Saargebiet (German: "Saar Area") and was formed from southern parts of the German Rhine Province and western parts of the Bavarian Palatinate under the "Saar statute" of the Versailles Treaty of 28. 6. 1919 (Article 45–50).
- The strategically important port of Danzig with the delta of the Vistula River on the Baltic Sea was separated from Germany as the Freie Stadt Danzig (Free City of Danzig).
- Austria (see the Republic of German Austria) was forbidden from integrating with/into Germany.
- In article 22, German colonies were divided between Belgium, Great Britain, and certain British Dominions, France, and Japan with the determination not to see any of them returned to Germany — a guarantee secured by Article 119.[16]
- In Africa, Britain and France divided German Kamerun (Cameroons) and Togoland. Belgium gained Ruanda-Urundi in northwestern German East Africa, the United Kingdom obtained by far the greater landmass of this colony, thus gaining the "missing link" in the chain of British possessions stretching from South Africa to Egypt (Cape to Cairo), Portugal received

the Kionga Triangle, a sliver of German East Africa. German South West Africa was mandated to the Union of South Africa.[17]

- In the Pacific, Japan gained Germany's islands north of the equator (the Marshall Islands, the Carolines, the Marianas, the Palau Islands) and Kiautschou in China. German Samoa was assigned to New Zealand; German New Guinea, the Bismarck Archipelago and Nauru[18] to Australia as mandatory.[19]

Shandong problem

Article 156 of the treaty transferred German concessions in Shandong, China, to Japan rather than returning sovereign authority to China. Chinese outrage over this provision led to demonstrations and a cultural movement known as the May Fourth Movement and influenced China not to sign the treaty. China declared the end of its war against Germany in September 1919 and signed a separate treaty with Germany in 1921.

Reparations

Main article: World War I reparations

Article 231 of the Treaty of Versailles assigned blame for the war to Germany; much of the rest of the Treaty set out the reparations that Germany would pay to the Allies.

The total sum of war reparations demanded from Germany—around 226 billion Marks (ℳ)—was decided by an Inter-Allied Reparations Commission. In 1921, it was reduced to ℳ 132 billion, at that time, $31.4 billion (US $442 billion in 2012), or £6.6 billion (UK £284 billion in 2012).[3]

It could be seen that the Versailles reparation impositions were partly a reply to the reparations placed upon France by Germany through the 1871 Treaty of Frankfurt signed after the Franco-Prussian War; critics[who?] of the Treaty argued that France had been able to pay the reparations (5 billion francs) within three years while the Young Plan of 1929 estimated that German reparations would be paid for a further 59 years, until 1988.[20] Indemnities of the Treaty of Frankfurt were in turn calculated, on the basis of population, as the precise equivalent of the indemnities imposed by Napoleon I on Prussia in 1807.[21]

The Versailles Reparations came in a variety of forms, including coal, steel, intellectual property (e.g. the trademark for Aspirin) and agricultural products, in no small part because currency reparations of that order of magnitude would lead to hyperinflation, as actually occurred in post-war Germany (see 1920s German inflation), thus decreasing the benefits to France and Britain.

Reparations due in the form of coal played a big part in punishing Germany. The Treaty of Versailles declared that Germany was responsible for the destruction of coal mines in Northern France, parts of Belgium, and parts of Italy. Therefore, France was awarded full possession of Germany's coal-bearing Saar basin for a period. Also, Germany was forced to provide France, Belgium, and Italy with millions of tons of coal for 10 years. However, under the control of Adolf Hitler, Germany stopped outstanding deliveries of coal within a few years, thus violating the terms of the Treaty of Versailles.[citation needed]

Germany finally finished paying its reparations in 2010.[22]

The creation of international organizations

Part I of the treaty was the Covenant of the League of Nations which provided for the creation of the League of Nations, an organization intended to arbitrate international disputes and thereby avoid future wars.[23] Part XIII organized the establishment of the International Labour Organization, to promote "the regulation of the hours of work, including the establishment of a maximum working day and week; the regulation of the labour supply; the prevention of unemployment; the provision of an adequate living wage; the protection of the worker against sickness, disease and injury arising out of his employment; the protection of children, young persons and women; provision for old age and injury; protection of the interests of workers when employed in countries other than their own; recognition of the principle of freedom of association; the organization of vocational and technical education and other measures"[24] Further international commissions were to be set up, according to Part XII, to administer control over the Elbe, the Oder, the Niemen (Russstrom-Memel-Niemen) and the Danube rivers.[25]

Treaty of Berlin (1921)

The **Treaty of Peace with Germany** or the **Treaty of Berlin** in 1921, are terms used to describe the separate post-World War I peace treaty between the United States and Germany, signed on August 25, 1921.[1] It followed the U.S. Senate's rejection of parts of the 1919 Treaty of Versailles, based on the Lodge Reservations, and Republican Warren G. Harding's defeat of the League of Nations advocate and Democratic candidate, James M. Cox, in the 1920 presidential election. Within days, the United States also signed separate treaties with Austria[2] and Hungary.[3]

Russo-Persian Treaty of Friendship (1921)

The **Russo-Persian Treaty of Friendship** was signed on February 26, 1921 between representatives of Iran and the Soviet Russia. Based on the terms of the treaty, all previous agreements made between the signatories including the Treaty of Turkmenchay were canceled. Moreover, both the Soviet Russia and Iran were given full and equal shipping rights in the Caspian Sea along with the right to fly their respective national flags on their commercial vessels.[1][2] Ratifications were exchanged in Teheran on February 26, 1922. It was registered in League of Nations Treaty Series on June 7, 1922.[3] The original purpose of the treaty was to prevent White Russian counter-revolutionary forces who fled to Iran after the Bolshevik Revolution, from attacking the Soviets from Iranian territory. The Soviets however would use it to menace the Iranians for years to come.

Excerpts

Signed at Moscow, February 26, 1921

ARTICLE 5

The two High Contracting Parties undertake:

(1) To prohibit the formation or presence within their respective territories, of any organization or groups of persons, irrespective of the name by which they are known, whose object is to engage in acts of hostility against Persia or Russia, or against the Allies of Russia. They will likewise prohibit the formation of troops or armies within their respective territories with the aforementioned object.

(2) Not to allow a third party or organization, whatever it be called, which is hostile to the other Contracting Party, to import or to convey in transit across their countries material which can be used against the other party.

(3) To prevent by all means in their power the presence within their territories or within the territories of their Allies of all armies or forces of a third party in cases in which the presence of such forces would be regarded as a menace to the frontiers, interests or safety of the other Contracting Party.

ARTICLE 6

If a third party should attempt to carry out a policy of usurpation by means of armed intervention in Persia, or if such Power should desire to use Persian territory as a base of operations against Russia, or if a Foreign Power should threaten the frontiers of Federal Russia or those of its Allies, and if the Persian Government should not be able to put a stop to such menace after having been

once called upon to do so by Russia, Russia shall have the right to advance her troops into the Persian interior for the purpose of carrying out the military operations necessary for its defence. Russia undertakes, however, to withdraw her troops from Persian territory as soon as the danger has been removed.

1931 Annex

(The Shah of Persia demanded Soviet clarification of Articles 5 & 6 of the Treaty of Friendship)

Tehran, 12 December, 1931 Your Excellency,

In reply to your letter dated 20th day of Ghows, I have the honour to inform you that Articles 5 and 6 are intended to apply only to cases in which preparations have been made for a considerable armed attack upon Russia or the Soviet Republics allied to her, by the partisans of the regime which has been overthrown or by its supporters among those foreign Powers which are in a position to assist the enemies of the Workers' and Peasants' Republics and at the same time to possess themselves, by force or by underhand methods, of part of the Persian territory, thereby establishing a base of operations for any attacks—made either directly or through the counter-revolutionary forces—which they might meditate against Russia or the Soviet Republics allied to her. The Articles referred to are therefore in no sense intended to apply to verbal or written attacks directed against the Soviet Government by the various Persian groups, or even by any Russian emigres in Persia, in so far as such attacks are generally tolerated as between neighbouring Powers animated by sentiments of mutual friendship.

With regard to Article 13 and the small error to which you draw attention in Article 3 with reference to the Convention of 1881, I am in a position to state categorically, as I have always stated, that my Government, whose attitude towards the Persian nation is entirely friendly, has never sought to place any restrictions upon the progress and prosperity of Persia. I myself fully share this attitude, and would be prepared, should friendly relations be maintained between the two countries to promote negotiations with a view to a total or partial revision of these Articles on the lines desired by the Persian Government, as far as the interests of Russia permit.

In view of the preceding statements, I trust that, as you promised me in your letter, your Government and the Mejlis will ratify the Treaty in question as soon as possible.

I have the honour to be, Your Excellency, etc.

(Signed) ROTHSTEIN

Diplomatic Representative of the

Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic

Washington Naval Treaty

The **Washington Naval Treaty**, also known as the **Five-Power Treaty**, was a treaty to limit naval construction and prevent an arms race among the victorious powers in the wake of World War I. The treaty was negotiated at the Washington Naval Conference, which was held in Washington, D.C. from November 1921 to February 1922, and signed by Britain, the US, Japan, France and Italy. It limited the construction of battleships, battlecruisers and aircraft carriers by the signatories. The numbers of other categories of warships, including cruisers, destroyers and submarines, were not limited by the treaty but were limited to 10,000 tons displacement.

The treaty was followed by a number of other naval arms limitation conferences, which sought to extend or tighten limitations on warship building. The terms of the treaty were modified by the London Naval Treaty of 1930 and the Second London Naval Treaty of 1936. However, by the mid-1930s, Japan and Italy had indicated their withdrawal from the Treaties, and naval arms limitation increasingly became a dead letter.

Terms

The Treaty put strict limits on both the tonnage and construction of capital ships and aircraft carriers, and also contained limits on the size of individual ships.

The tonnage limits defined in Articles IV and VII (tabulated) gave a strength ratio of approximately 5:5:3:1.75:1.75 between Britain, the USA, Japan, Italy and France.

The qualitative limits on each type of ship were as follows;

- Capital ships (battleships and battlecruisers) were limited to 35,000 tons standard displacement and guns of no larger than 16-inch calibre. (Articles V and VI)
- Aircraft carriers were limited to 27,000 tons and could carry no more than 10 heavy guns, of a maximum calibre of 8 inches. However, each signatory was allowed to use two existing capital ship hulls for aircraft carriers, with a displacement limit of 33,000 tons each. (Articles IX and X)

- All other warships were limited to a maximum displacement of 10,000 tons and a maximum gun calibre of 8 inches. (Articles XI and XII)

The Treaty also detailed in Chapter II which individual ships were to be retained by each Navy, including the allowance for the USA to complete two further ships of the West Virginia class and for Britain to complete two new ships in line with the Treaty limits. Chapter II, part 2, detailed what steps were to be taken to adequately put a ship beyond military use; in addition to sinking or scrapping, a limited number of ships could be converted as target ships or training vessels, so long as their armament, armour and other combat-essential parts were completely removed; some could also be converted into aircraft carriers.

Part 3, Section II of the Treaty laid out which ships were to be scrapped to comply with the Treaty, and when the remaining ships could be replaced. In all the USA had to scrap 28 existing or planned capital ships; Britain, 23; and Japan, 16.

Effects

The Washington Treaty marked the end of a long period of growth in battleship construction. Many ships currently under construction were scrapped or converted into aircraft carriers. The Treaty limits were respected, and then extended in the 1930 London Naval Treaty. It was not until the mid-1930s that navies began to build battleships once again, and the power and size of new battleships began to take off once again. The 1936 London Naval Treaty sought to extend the Washington Treaty limits until 1942, but in the absence of Japan or Italy was largely ineffective.

The effects on cruiser building were less fortunate. While the Treaty specified 10,000 tons and 8-inch guns as the maximum size of a cruiser, in effect this was also treated as the minimum size cruiser that any navy was willing to build. The Treaty sparked a building competition of 8-inch, 10,000 ton "treaty cruisers"[17] which gave rise to further cause for concern. Subsequent Naval Treaties sought to address this, by limiting cruiser, destroyer and submarine tonnage.

Japanese denunciation

The naval treaty had a profound effect on the Japanese. With superior American and even British industrial power, a long war would very likely end in a Japanese defeat. Thus, gaining parity on the strategic level was not economically possible.

Many Japanese saw the 5:5:3 ratio of ships as another way of being snubbed by the West (though it can be argued that the Japanese, having a one-ocean navy, had a far greater concentration of force than the two-ocean United States Navy or the three-ocean Royal Navy). It also contributed to a schism in high ranks of the Imperial Japanese Navy between the Treaty Faction officers on the one hand and on the other those opposed to it, who were also allied to the ultranationalists in the Japanese army and other parts of the Japanese government. For Treaty Faction opponents, the Treaty was one of the factors which contributed to the deterioration of the relationship between the United States and the Japanese Empire. The unfairness, at least in the eyes of the Japanese, led to Japan's renunciation of the Naval Limitation Treaties in 1936. Isoroku Yamamoto, who later masterminded the Pearl Harbor attack, held that Japan should remain in the treaty and was therefore regarded by many as a member of the Treaty Faction. His view was more complex, however, in that he felt the United States could out-produce Japan by a greater factor than the 5:3 ratio because of the huge US production advantage, on which he was expert, having served in the Japanese Embassy in Washington. He felt that other methods would be needed to even the odds, which may have contributed to his advocacy of the plan to attack Pearl Harbor. However, he did not have sufficient influence at Navy headquarters or in the government.

On 29 December 1934, the Japanese government gave formal notice that it intended to terminate the treaty. Its provisions remained in force until the end of 1936, and it was not renewed, Japan effectively leaving the treaty in 1936.

Cryptanalytic influences on the treaty

What was unknown to the participants in the Conference was that the American "Black Chamber" (the Cypher Bureau, a US intelligence service), under Herbert Yardley, was spying on the delegations' communications with their home capitals. In particular, Japanese communications were thoroughly penetrated, and American negotiators were able to get the minimum possible deal the Japanese had indicated they would accept, below which they would leave the Conference. As this ratio value was unpopular with much of the Imperial Japanese Navy and with the increasingly active and important ultranationalist groups, the value the Japanese Government accepted was the cause of much suspicion and accusation among Japanese between politicians and Naval officers.

Locarno Treaties

The **Locarno Treaties** were seven agreements negotiated at Locarno, Switzerland, on 5 October – 16 October 1925 and formally signed in London on 3 December, in which the First World War Western European Allied powers and the new states of central and Eastern Europe sought to secure the post-war territorial settlement, and return normalizing relations with defeated Germany (which was, by this time, the Weimar Republic). Ratifications for the Locarno treaties were exchanged in Geneva on 14 September 1926, and on the same day they became effective. The treaties were also registered in the League of Nations Treaty Series on the same day.[1]

Locarno divided borders in Europe into two categories: western, which were guaranteed by Locarno treaties, and eastern borders of Germany with Poland, which were open for revision, thus leading to German renewed claims to the Free City of Danzig and Polish territories approved by the League of Nations including the Polish Corridor, and Upper Silesia.[2][3][4][5][6]

Parties and agreement

The principal treaty concluded at Locarno was the "Rhineland Pact" between Germany, France, Belgium, the United Kingdom, and Italy. The first three signatories undertook not to attack each other, with the latter two acting as guarantors. In the event of aggression by any of the first three states against another, all other parties were to assist the country under attack.

Germany also agreed to sign arbitration conventions with France and Belgium and arbitration treaties with Poland and Czechoslovakia, undertaking to refer disputes to an arbitration tribunal or to the Permanent Court of International Justice.

France signed further treaties with Poland and Czechoslovakia, pledging mutual assistance in the event of conflict with Germany. These essentially reaffirmed existing treaties of alliance concluded by France with Poland on 19 February 1921 and with Czechoslovakia on 25 January 1924.

Effect

The Locarno Treaties were regarded as the keystone of the improved western European diplomatic climate of 1924–1930, introducing a hope for international peace, typically called the "spirit of Locarno". This spirit was seen in Germany's admission to the League of Nations, the international organization established under the Versailles treaty to promote world peace and co-operation, and in the subsequent withdrawal (completed in June 1930) of Allied troops from Germany's western Rhineland.

In contrast, in Poland, the public humiliation received by Polish diplomats was one of contributing factors to the fall of the Grabski cabinet. Locarno contributed to the worsening of atmosphere between Poland and France (despite the French-Polish alliance), and introduced distrust between Poland and Western countries.[10] Locarno divided borders in Europe in two categories: those guaranteed by Locarno, and others, which were free for revision.

In the words of Józef Beck, "Germany was officially asked to attack the east, in return for peace in the west."[11] The failure at Locarno may be also one of the contributory factors in the decision of Józef Piłsudski to overthrow parliamentary democracy in Poland.[12] With regard to Locarno, Piłsudski would say that "every honest Pole spits when he hears this word [Locarno]". Later, when a French ambassador assured him that France would always back Poland and stand up to Germany, Piłsudski, foreseeing the appeasement, would say: "No, no, believe me, you will back down, really, you will."

One notable exception from the Locarno arrangements was, however, the Soviet Union, which foresaw western détente as potentially deepening its own political isolation in Europe, in particular by detaching Germany from its own understanding with Moscow under the April 1922 Treaty of Rapallo. Political tensions also continued throughout the period in eastern Europe.

In both 1925 and 1926, the Nobel Peace Prize was given to the lead negotiators of the treaty, going to Sir Austen Chamberlain in 1925 and jointly to Aristide Briand and Gustav Stresemann in 1926. In 1930, after the death of Stresemann the year before, German politics became less cooperative again. In 1933, Hitler came to power; he believed in bilateral, not multilateral negotiations. Proposals in 1934 for an "eastern Locarno" pact securing Germany's eastern frontiers foundered on German opposition and on Poland's insistence that its eastern borders should be covered by any western guarantee of her borders. Germany formally repudiated its Locarno undertakings by sending troops into the demilitarized Rhineland on 7 March 1936.

Third Geneva Convention

The **Third Geneva Convention**, relative to the treatment of prisoners of war, is one of the four treaties of the Geneva Conventions. It was first adopted in 1929, but was significantly updated in 1949. It defines humanitarian protections for prisoners of war.

Part I: General provisions

This part sets out the overall parameters for GCIII:

- Articles 1 and 2 cover which parties are bound by GCIII
- Article 2 specifies when the parties are bound by GCIII
    - That any armed conflict between two or more "High Contracting Parties" is covered by GCIII;
    - That it applies to occupations of a "High Contracting Party";
    - That the relationship between the "High Contracting Parties" and a non-signatory, the party will remain bound until the non-signatory no longer acts under the strictures of the convention. "...Although one of the Powers in conflict may not be a party to the present Convention, the Powers who are parties thereto shall remain bound by it in their mutual relations. They shall furthermore be bound by the Convention in relation to the said Power, if the latter accepts and applies the provisions thereof."
- Article 3 has been called a "Convention in miniature." It is the only article of the Geneva Conventions that applies in non-international conflicts.[1] It describes minimal protections which must be adhered to by all individuals within a signatory's territory during an armed conflict not of an international character (regardless of citizenship or lack thereof): Noncombatants, combatants who have laid down their arms, and combatants who are hors de combat (out of the fight) due to wounds, detention, or any other cause shall in all circumstances be treated humanely, including prohibition of outrages upon personal dignity, in particular humiliating and degrading treatment. The passing of sentences must also be pronounced by a regularly constituted court, affording all the judicial guarantees which are recognized as indispensable by civilized peoples. Article 3's protections exist even if one is not classified as a prisoner of war. Article 3 also states that parties to the internal conflict should endeavour to bring into force, by means of special agreements, all or part of the other provisions of GCIII.
- Article 4 defines **prisoners of war** to include:
    - 4.1.1 Members of the armed forces of a Party to the conflict and members of militias of such armed forces
    - 4.1.2 Members of other militias and members of other volunteer corps, including those of organized resistance movements, provided that they fulfill all of the following conditions:
        - that of being commanded by a person responsible for his subordinates;
        - that of having a fixed distinctive sign recognizable at a distance (there are limited exceptions to this among countries who observe the 1977 Protocol I);
        - that of carrying arms openly;
        - that of conducting their operations in accordance with the laws and customs of war.

    - 4.1.3 Members of regular armed forces who profess allegiance to a government or an authority not recognized by the Detaining Power.
    - 4.1.4 Civilians who have non-combat support roles with the military and who carry a valid identity card issued by the military they support.
    - 4.1.5 Merchant marine and the crews of civil aircraft of the Parties to the conflict, who do not benefit by more favourable treatment under any other provisions of international law.
    - 4.1.6 Inhabitants of a non-occupied territory, who on the approach of the enemy spontaneously take up arms to resist the invading forces, without having had time to form themselves into regular armed units, provided they carry arms openly and respect the laws and customs of war.
    - 4.3 makes explicit that Article 33 takes precedence for the treatment of medical personnel of the enemy and chaplains of the enemy.
- Article 5 specifies that prisoners of war (as defined in article 4) are protected from the time of their capture until their final repatriation. It also specifies that when there is any doubt whether a combatant belongs to the categories in article 4, they should be treated as such until their status has been determined by a competent tribunal.

Part II: General Protection of Prisoners of War

This part of the convention covers the status of prisoners of war.

Article 12 states that prisoners of war are the responsibility of the state, not the persons who capture them, and that they may not be transferred to a state that is not party to the Convention.

Articles 13 to 16 state that prisoners of war must be treated humanely without any adverse discrimination and that their medical needs must be met.

Part III: Captivity

This part is divided into several sections:

Section 1 covers the beginning of captivity (Articles 17–20). It dictates what information a prisoner must give and interrogation methods that the detaining power may use "No physical or mental torture, nor any other form of coercion". It dictates what private property a prisoner of war may keep and that the prisoner of war must be evacuated from the combat zone as soon as possible.

Section 2 covers the internment of prisoners of war and is broken down into 8 chapters which cover:

1. General observations (Articles 21–24)
2. Quarters, food and clothing (Articles 25–28)
3. Hygiene and medical attention (Articles 29–32)
4. The treatment of enemy medical personnel and chaplains retained to assist prisoners of war (Article 33)
5. Religious, intellectual and physical activities (Articles 34–38)
6. Discipline (Articles 39–42)
7. Military rank (Articles 43–45)
8. Transfer of prisoners of war after their arrival in a camp (Articles 46–48)

Section 3 (Articles 49–57) covers the type of labour that a prisoner of war may be compelled to do, taking such factors as rank, age, and sex into consideration, and that which because it is unhealthy or dangerous can only be done by prisoners of war who volunteer for such work. It goes into details about such things as the accommodation, medical facilities, and that even if the prisoner of war works for a private person the military authority remains responsible for them. Rates of pay for work done are covered by Article 62 in the next section.

Section 4 (Articles 58–68) covers the financial resources of prisoners of war.

Section 5 (Articles 69–74) covers the relations of prisoners of war with the exterior. This covers the frequency of which a prisoner of war can send and receive post, including parcels. The Detaining power has the right to censor all mail, but must do so as quickly as possible.

Section 6 covers the relations between prisoners of war and the detaining authorities: it is broken down into three chapters.

1. Complaints of prisoners of war respecting the conditions of captivity(Article 78)
2. Prisoner of war representatives (Articles 79–81). Where there is no senior officer available in a camp the section stipulates that "prisoners shall freely elect by secret ballot, [a representative] every six months". The representative, whether the senior officer or an elected person, acts as a conduit between the authorities of the detaining power and the prisoners.
3. The sub-section on "Penal and disciplinary sanctions" is subdivided into three parts:
    1. General provisions (Articles 82–88)
    2. Disciplinary sanctions (Articles 89–98)
    3. Juridicial proceedings (Articles 99–108)

Part IV: Termination of Captivity

This part is divided into several sections:

Section 1 (Articles 109–117) covers the direct repatriation and accommodation in neutral countries.

Section 2 (Articles 118–119) covers the release and repatriation of prisoners of war at the close of hostilities.

Section 3 (Articles 120–121) covers the death of a prisoner of war.

Part V: Information Bureau and Relief Societies for Prisoners of War

The Information Bureau is an organization that must be set up by the Detaining Power to facilitate the sharing of information by the parties to conflict and neutral powers as required by the various provisions of the Third Geneva Convention. It will correspond freely with "A Central Prisoners of War Information Agency ... created in a neutral country" to act as a conduit with the Power to which the prisoners of war owe their allegiance. The provisions of this part are contained in Articles 122 to 125.

The central prisoners of war information agency was created within the Red Cross.

Part VI: Execution of the Convention

Consists of two sections.

Section 1 (Articles 126–132) General provision.

Section 2 (Articles 133–143) Final provisions.

East African Community Treaty

The **East African Community Treaty** was signed on November 30, 1999 in Arusha, Tanzania between President Daniel Toroitich arap Moi of Kenya, President Yoweri Kaguat Museveni of Uganda and President Benjamin William Mkapa of Tanzania.[1] The accord established the East African Community whereby all three nations agreed to establish more cooperative commercial and political relations. The treaty went into effect on July 7, 2000.[2]

Adapted Conventional Armed Forces in Europe Treaty

The **Adapted Conventional Armed Forces in Europe Treaty** is a post–Cold War adaptation of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE), signed on November 19, 1999 during the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe's (OSCE) 1999 Istanbul summit. The main difference with the earlier treaty is that the troop ceilings on a bloc-to-bloc basis (NATO vs. the Warsaw Pact) would be replaced with a system of national and territorial ceilings.[1] Furthermore, the adapted treaty would provide for more inspections and new mechanisms designed to reinforce States Parties' ability to grant or withhold consent for the stationing of foreign forces on their territory.

The Adapted Treaty will enter into force when all 30 states-parties have ratified the agreement. As of August 2006, only Belarus, Kazakhstan, Russia, and Ukraine have done so. NATO member-states link their ratification of the Adapted CFE Treaty with the fulfillment by Russia of the political commitments it undertook at the 1999 OSCE Istanbul Summit (so called "Istanbul commitments") to withdraw its forces from Georgia and Moldova.

Russia has strongly criticized this linkage, which it considers artificial, and has on several occasions questioned the relevance of the Adapted CFE Treaty, given its continued non-ratification by NATO states.

Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court

The **Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court** (often referred to as the **International Criminal Court Statute** or the **Rome Statute**) is the treaty that established the International Criminal Court (ICC). It was adopted at a diplomatic conference in Rome on 17 July 1998[5][6] and it entered into force on 1 July 2002.[2] As of 1 February 2012, 120 states are party to the statute.[2] Among other things, the statute establishes the court's functions, jurisdiction and structure.

Under the Rome Statute, the ICC can only investigate and prosecute the core international crimes (genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes and the crime of aggression) in situations where states are unable or unwilling to do so themselves. Thus, the majority of international crimes continue to go unpunished unless and until domestic systems can properly deal with them. Therefore, permanent solutions to impunity must be found at the domestic level.[7]

POP Air Pollution Protocol

The **Protocol to the 1979 Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution on Persistent Organic Pollutants** is an agreement to provide for the control and reduction of emissions of persistent organic pollutants (POPs) in order to reduce their transboundary fluxes so as to protect human health and the environment from adverse effects.

It opened for signature on 1998-06-24 and entered into force on 2003-10-23.

Twenty-seven countries and the European Union have ratified the treaty and a further nine have signed but not yet ratified.

Good Friday Agreement

The **Good Friday Agreement** or **Belfast Agreement** (Irish: Comhaontú Bhéal Feirste or Comhaontú Aoine an Chéasta, Ulster-Scots: Bilfawst Greeance or Guid Friday Greeance),[1] sometimes called the **Stormont Agreement**, was a major political development in the Northern Ireland peace process. The Agreement was made up of two inter-related documents, both signed in Belfast on 10 April 1998 (Good Friday): a multi-party agreement by most of Northern Ireland's political parties, and an international agreement between the British and Irish governments. The Democratic Unionist Party (DUP) was the only major political group in Northern Ireland to oppose the Agreement.

The Belfast Agreement set out a complex series of provisions relating to a number of areas, including: the future status and system of government within Northern Ireland; the relationship between Northern Ireland and institutions in both the Republic of Ireland and the United Kingdom; human rights; the principle of respect for each of Northern Ireland's communities and their traditions; the decommissioning of arms held by the various paramilitary groups, the release of members of paramilitary groups from prison; and the normalisation of British security arrangements within Northern Ireland.

The Agreement was approved by voters in Northern Ireland at a referendum held on 23 May 1998, while on the same day the Agreement was tacitly approved by voters in the Republic of Ireland at a referendum to amend the Constitution in conformity with the Agreement.

The Agreement came into force on 2 December 1999.[2][3] The present constitutional status of Northern Ireland as part of the United Kingdom, and Northern Ireland's devolved system of government (made up of the Northern Ireland Assembly and a joint executive based on cross-community power-sharing) are based on the Belfast Agreement, as well as on the 2006 St Andrews Agreement.

Kyoto Protocol

The **Kyoto Protocol** is a protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC or FCCC), aimed at fighting global warming. The UNFCCC is an international environmental treaty with the goal of achieving the "stabilisation of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system."[5]

The Protocol was initially adopted on 11 December 1997 in Kyoto, Japan, and entered into force on 16 February 2005. As of September 2011, 191 states have signed and ratified the protocol.[6] The only remaining signatory not to have ratified the protocol is the United States. Other United Nations member states which did not ratify the protocol are Afghanistan, Andorra and South Sudan. In December 2011, Canada renounced the Protocol.[2]

Under the Protocol, 37 countries ("Annex I countries") commit themselves to a reduction of four greenhouse gases (GHG) (carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, sulphur hexafluoride) and two groups of gases (hydrofluorocarbons and perfluorocarbons) produced by them, and all member countries give general commitments. At negotiations, Annex I countries (including the US) collectively agreed to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions by 5.2% on average for the period 2008-2012. This reduction is relative to their annual emissions in a base year, usually 1990. Since the US has not ratified the treaty, the collective emissions reduction of Annex I Kyoto countries falls from 5.2% to 4.2% below base year.[7]:26

Emission limits do not include emissions by international aviation and shipping, but are in addition to the industrial gases, chlorofluorocarbons, or CFCs, which are dealt with under the 1987 Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer.[clarification needed]

The benchmark 1990 emission levels accepted by the Conference of the Parties of UNFCCC (decision 2/CP.3) were the values of "global warming potential" calculated for the IPCC Second Assessment Report.[8] These figures are used for

converting the various greenhouse gas emissions into comparable CO_2 equivalents (CO_2-eq) when computing overall sources and sinks.

The Protocol allows for several "flexible mechanisms", such as emissions trading, the clean development mechanism (CDM) and joint implementation to allow Annex I countries to meet their GHG emission limitations by purchasing GHG emission reductions credits from elsewhere, through financial exchanges, projects that reduce emissions in non-Annex I countries, from other Annex I countries, or from annex I countries with excess allowances.

Each Annex I country is required to submit an annual report of inventories of all anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions from sources and removals from sinks under UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol. These countries nominate a person (called a "designated national authority") to create and manage its greenhouse gas inventory. Virtually all of the non-Annex I countries have also established a designated national authority to manage its Kyoto obligations, specifically the "CDM process" that determines which GHG projects they wish to propose for accreditation by the CDM Executive Board.

Chemical Weapons Convention

The **Chemical Weapons Convention** (**CWC**) is an arms control agreement which outlaws the production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons. Its full name is the **Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on their Destruction**. The agreement is administered by the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW), which is an independent organization based in The Hague, Netherlands.

The main obligation under the convention is the prohibition of use and production of chemical weapons, as well as the destruction of all chemical weapons. The destruction activities are verified by the OPCW. As of November 2011, around 71% of the (declared) stockpile of chemical weapons has thus been destroyed.[5][6] The convention also has provisions for systematic evaluation of chemical and military plants, as well as for investigations of allegations of use and production of chemical weapons based on intelligence of other state parties.

As of August 2010, 188 states are party to the CWC, and another two countries have signed but not yet ratified the convention.[1]

Key points of the Convention

- Prohibition of production and use of chemical weapons
- Destruction (or monitored conversion to other functions) of chemical weapons production facilities
- Destruction of all chemical weapons (including chemical weapons abandoned outside the state parties territory)
- Assistance between State Parties and the OPCW in the case of use of chemical weapons
- An OPCW inspection regime for the production of chemicals which might be converted to chemical weapons
- International cooperation in the peaceful use of chemistry in relevant areas

Ottawa Treaty

The **Ottawa Treaty** or the **Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention**, officially known as the **Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on their Destruction**, aims at eliminating anti-personnel landmines (AP-mines) around the world. To date, there are 160 States Parties to the treaty. Two states have signed but not ratified while 34 UN states are non-signatories, making a total of 36 United Nations states not party.[1]

Implementation

Besides ceasing the production and development of anti-personnel mines, a party to the treaty must destroy its stockpile of anti-personnel mines within four years, although it may retain a small number for training purposes (mine-clearance, detection, etc.). Within ten years after ratifying the treaty, the country should have cleared all of its mined areas. This is a difficult task for many countries, but at the annual meetings (see below) they may request an extension and assistance. The treaty also calls on States Parties to provide assistance to mine-affected persons in their own country and to provide assistance to other countries in meeting their Mine Ban Treaty obligations.[2][3]

The treaty covers only anti-personnel mines. It does not address mixed mines, anti-tank mines, remote controlled claymore mines, anti-handling devices (booby-traps) and other "static" explosive devices.

Amsterdam Treaty

The **Amsterdam Treaty**, officially the Treaty of Amsterdam amending the Treaty of the European Union, the Treaties establishing the European Communities and certain related acts, was signed on 2 October 1997, and entered into force on 1 May 1999; it made substantial changes to the Maastricht Treaty, which had been signed in 1992.

The Amsterdam Treaty meant a greater emphasis on citizenship and the rights of individuals, an attempt to achieve more democracy in the shape of increased powers for the European Parliament, a new title on employment, a Community area of freedom, security and justice, the beginnings of a common foreign and security policy (CFSP) and the reform of the institutions in the run-up to enlargement.

Contents

Amsterdam comprises 13 Protocols, 51 Declarations adopted by the Conference and 8 Declarations by Member States plus amendments to the existing Treaties set out in 15 Articles. Article 1 (containing 16 paragraphs) amends the general provisions of the Treaty on European Union and covers the CFSP and cooperation in criminal and police matters. The next four Articles (70 paragraphs) amend the EC Treaty, the European Coal and Steel Community Treaty (which expired in 2002), the Euratom Treaty and the Act concerning the election of the European Parliament. The final provisions contain four Articles. The new Treaty also set out to simplify the Community Treaties, deleting more than 56 obsolete articles and renumbering the rest in order to make the whole more legible. By way of example, Article 189b on the codecision procedure became Article 251.

The most pressing concerns of ordinary Europeans, such as their legal and personal security, immigration and fraud prevention, were all dealt with in other chapters of the Treaty. In particular, the EU will now be able to legislate on immigration, civil law or civil procedure, in so far as this is necessary for the free movement of persons within the EU. At the same time, intergovernmental cooperation was intensified in the police and criminal justice field so that Member States will be able to coordinate their activities more effectively. The Union aims to establish an area of freedom, security and justice for its citizens. The Schengen Agreements have now been incorporated into the legal system of the EU. (Ireland and the UK remained outside the Schengen agreement, see Common Travel Area for details)

The Treaty lays down new principles and responsibilities in the field of the common foreign and security policy, with the emphasis on projecting the EU's values to the outside world, protecting its interests and reforming its modes of action. The European Council will lay down common strategies, which will then be put into effect by the Council acting by a qualified majority, subject to certain conditions. In other cases, some States may choose to abstain "constructively", i.e. without actually preventing decisions being taken.

The treaty introduced a High Representative for EU Foreign Policy who, together with the Presidents of the Council and the European Commission, puts a "name and a face" on EU policy in the outside world. Although the Amsterdam Treaty did not provide for a common defence, it did increase the EU's responsibilities for peacekeeping and humanitarian work, in particular by forging closer links with Western European Union.

As for the institutions, there were two major reforms concerning the codecision procedure (the legislative procedure involving the European Parliament and the Council), affecting its scope - most legislation was adopted by the codecision procedure - and its detailed procedures, with Parliament playing a much stronger role. The President of the Commission will also have to earn the personal trust of Parliament, which will give him the authority to lay down the Commission's policy guidelines and play an active part in choosing the Members of the Commission by deciding on their appointment by common accord with the national governments. These provisions make the Commission more politically accountable, particularly vis-à-vis the European Parliament. Finally, the new Treaty opens the door, under very strict conditions, to closer cooperation between Member States which so wish. Closer cooperation may be established, on a proposal from the Commission, in cases where it is not possible to take joint action, provided that such steps do not undermine the coherence of the EU or the rights and equality of its citizens.

WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty

The **WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty** (or **WPPT**) is an international treaty signed by the member states of the World Intellectual Property Organization was adopted in Geneva on December 20, 1996. The Digital Millennium Copyright Act is the United States's implementation of the treaty (see WIPO Copyright and Performances and Phonograms Treaties Implementation Act).

WPPT was adopted with an objective to develop and maintain the protection of the rights of performers and producers of phonograms in a manner as effective and uniform as possible. This treaty would not disturb the existing obligations that Contracting Parties have to each other under the International Convention for the Protection of Performers, Producers of Phonograms and Broadcasting Organizations done in Rome, October 26, 1961 (Rome Convention). Articles 183 and 194 of the WPPT provide similar obligations for performers and producers of phonograms to contracting states as provided under Articles 11 and 12 of the WCT.

World Intellectual Property Organization Copyright Treaty

The **World Intellectual Property Organization Copyright Treaty**, abbreviated as the **WIPO Copyright Treaty** or **WCT**, is an international treaty on copyright law adopted by the member states of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) in 1996. It provides additional protections for copyright deemed necessary due to advances in information technology since the formation of previous copyright treaties before it. It ensures that computer programs are protected as literary works (Article 4), and that the arrangement and selection of material in databases is protected (Article 5). It provides authors of works with control over their rental and distribution in Articles 6 to 8 which they may not have under the Berne Convention alone. It also prohibits circumvention of technological measures for the protection of works (Article 11) and unauthorized modification of rights management information contained in works (Article 12).

There have been a variety of criticisms of this treaty, including that it is too broad (for example in its prohibition of circumvention of technical protection measures, even where such circumvention is used in the pursuit of legal and fair use rights) and that it applies a 'one size fits all' standard to all signatory countries despite widely differing stages of economic development and knowledge industry.

Implementation

The WIPO Copyright Treaty is implemented in United States law by the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA). By Decision 2000/278/EC of 16 March 2000, the Council of the European Union approved the treaty on behalf of the European Community. European Union Directives which largely cover the subject matter of the treaty are: Directive 91/250/EC creating copyright protection for software, Directive 96/9/EC on copyright protection for databases

and Directive 2001/29/EC prohibiting devices for circumventing "technical protection measures" such as digital rights management.

The WIPO Copyright Treaty made no reference to copyright term extension beyond the existing terms of the Berne Convention, but there was a degree of association.[vague] This was because the United States Congress passed both the Digital Millennium Copyright Act and Sonny Bono Copyright Term Extension Act, which enacts copyright term extension during the same week[chronology citation needed] and used the same method using voice vote to make it less likely that the news media would report on the bills.[citation needed] In addition, the European Union adopted its own copyright term extension around the same time.

Khasavyurt Accord

Khasavyurt Accord (Russian: Хасавюртовские соглашения) was an agreement that marked the end of the First Chechen War, signed in Khasavyurt in Dagestan on August 30, 1996 between Alexander Lebed and Aslan Maskhadov.

Khasavyurt Accord took place following a formal ceasefire agreement which was signed by General Lebed and General Maskhadov in Novye Atagi on August 22, 1996. It included technical aspects of demilitarisation of the Chechen capital Grozny, the creation of joint headquarters to preclude looting in the city, the withdrawal of all federal forces from Chechnya by December 31, 1996 and a stipulation that any agreement on the relations between the Chechen Republic of Ichkeria and the Russian federal government need not be signed until late 2001.

On May 12, 1997, the presidents of Russia and Chechnya, Boris Yeltsin and Aslan Maskhadov, met at the Moscow Kremlin to sign final version of the treaty.

Negotiations for the CTBT

Given the political situation prevailing in the subsequent decades, little progress was made in nuclear disarmament until the end of the Cold War in 1991. Parties to the PTBT held an amendment conference that year to discuss a proposal to convert the Treaty into an instrument banning all nuclear-weapon tests; with

strong support from the UN General Assembly, negotiations for a comprehensive test-ban treaty began in 1993.

Adoption of the CTBT, 1996

Intensive efforts were made over the next three years to draft the Treaty text and its two annexes. However, the Conference on Disarmament, in which negotiations were being held, did not succeed in reaching consensus on the adoption of the text. Under the direction of Prime Minister John Howard and Foreign Minister Alexander Downer, Australia then sent the text to the United Nations General Assembly in New York, where it was submitted as a draft resolution.[11] On 10 September 1996, the Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) was adopted by a large majority, exceeding two-thirds of the General Assembly's Membership.[1]

Nuclear testing after CTBT adoption

Three countries have tested nuclear weapons since the CTBT opened for signature in 1996. India and Pakistan both carried out two sets of tests in 1998. North Korea carried out two announced tests in 2006 and 2009. Both North Korean tests were picked up by the International Monitoring System set up by the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization Preparatory Commission.[12][13]

US ratification of the CTBT

The US has signed the CTBT, but not ratified it. There is ongoing debate whether or not the US should ratify the CTBT.

The United States has stated that its ratification of the CTBT is conditional upon:

> “ A: The conduct of a Science Based Stockpile Stewardship Program to ensure a high level of confidence in the safety and reliability of nuclear weapons in the active stockpile, including the conduct of a broad range of effective and continuing experimental programs.
> B: The maintenance of modern nuclear laboratory facilities and programs in theoretical and exploratory nuclear technology which will attract, retain, and ensure the continued application of our human scientific resources to those programs on which continued ”

progress in nuclear technology depends.

C:The maintenance of the basic capability to resume nuclear test activities prohibited by the CTBT should the United States cease to be bound to adhere to this treaty.

D: Continuation of a comprehensive research and development program to improve our treaty monitoring capabilities and operations.

E: The continuing development of a broad range of intelligence gathering and analytical capabilities and operations to ensure accurate and comprehensive information on worldwide nuclear arsenals, nuclear weapons development programs, and related nuclear programs.

F: The understanding that if the President of the United States is informed by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy (DOE) – advised by the Nuclear Weapons Council, the Directors of DOE's nuclear weapons laboratories and the Commander of the U.S. Strategic Command – that a high level of confidence in the safety or reliability of a nuclear weapon type which the two Secretaries consider to be critical to the U.S. nuclear deterrent could no longer be certified, the President, in consultation with Congress, would be prepared to withdraw from the CTBT under the standard "supreme national interests" clause in order to conduct whatever testing might be required.[14]

Proponents of ratification claim that it would:

1. Establish an international norm that would push other nuclear-capable countries like North Korea, Pakistan, and India to sign.
2. Constrain worldwide nuclear proliferation by vastly limiting a country's ability to make nuclear advancements that only testing can ensure.
3. Not compromise US national security because the Science Based Stockpile Stewardship Program serves as a means for maintaining current US nuclear capabilities without physical detonation.[15]

Opponents of ratification claim that:

1. The treaty is unverifiable and that others nations could easily cheat.
2. The ability to enforce the treaty was dubious
3. The U.S. nuclear stockpile would not be as safe or reliable in the absence of testing.
4. The benefit to nuclear nonproliferation was minimal.[16]

On 13 October 1999, the United States Senate rejected ratification of the CTBT. President Barack Obama stated during his 2008 election campaign that "As president, I will reach out to the Senate to secure the ratification of the CTBT at the earliest practical date."[17] In his speech in Prague on 5 April 2009, he announced that "[To] achieve a global ban on nuclear testing, my administration will immediately and aggressively pursue U.S. ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. After more than five decades of talks, it is time for the testing of nuclear weapons to finally be banned."[18]

An article in Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists describes how a North Korean underground nuclear test on May 25, 2009 was detected and the source located by GPS satellites. The authors suggest that the effectiveness of GPS satellites for detecting nuclear explosions enhances the ability to verify compliance to the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, giving the United States more reason to ratify it.[19]

Monitoring of the CTBT

Geophysical and other technologies are used to monitor for compliance with the Treaty: forensic seismology, hydroacoustics, infrasound, and radionuclide monitoring. The technologies are used to monitor the underground, the waters and the atmosphere for any sign of a nuclear explosion. Statistical theories and methods are integral to CTBT monitoring providing confidence in verification analysis. Once the Treaty enters into force, on site inspection will be provided for where concerns about compliance arise.

The Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO), an international organization headquartered in Vienna, Austria, was created to build the verification regime, including establishment and provisional operation of the network of monitoring stations, the creation of an international data centre, and development of the On Site Inspection capability.

The monitoring network consists of 337 facilities located all over the globe. As of May 2012, more than 260 facilities have been certified. The monitoring stations register data that is transmitted to the international data centre in Vienna

for processing and analysis. The data are sent to states that have signed the Treaty.[20]

Obligations

(Article I):[7]

1. Each State Party undertakes not to carry out any nuclear weapon test explosion or any other nuclear explosion, and to prohibit and prevent any such nuclear explosion at any place under its jurisdiction or control.
2. Each State Party undertakes, furthermore, to refrain from causing, encouraging, or in any way participating in the carrying out of any nuclear weapon test explosion or any other nuclear explosion.

Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty, 1968

A major step towards non-proliferation of nuclear weapons came with the signing of the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT) in 1968. Under the NPT, non-nuclear weapon states were prohibited from, inter alia, possessing, manufacturing or acquiring nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. All signatories, including nuclear weapon states, were committed to the goal of total nuclear disarmament. However, India, Pakistan and Israel have declined to ratify the NPT on grounds that such a treaty is fundamentally discriminatory as it places limitations on states that do not have nuclear weapons while making no efforts to curb weapons development by declared nuclear weapons states.

Partial Test Ban Treaty, 1963

Limited success was achieved with the signing of the Partial Test Ban Treaty in 1963, which banned nuclear tests in the atmosphere, underwater and in space, but not underground. Neither France nor China signed the PTBT. However, the treaty was still ratified by the United States after a 80 to 19 vote in the United States Senate.[9] While the PTBT reduced atmospheric fallout, underground nuclear testing can also vent radioactivity into the atmosphere, and radioactivity released underground may seep into the ground water. Moreover, the PTBT had no restraining effects on the further development of nuclear warheads.[10]

Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty

The **Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT)** bans all nuclear explosions in all environments, for military or civilian purposes. It was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 10 September 1996[1] but it has not entered into force as of May 2012.

History

To date, over 2000 nuclear tests have been carried out at different locations all over the world.[8] Arms control advocates had campaigned for the adoption of a treaty banning all nuclear explosions since the early 1950s, when public concern was aroused as a result of radioactive fall-out from atmospheric nuclear tests and the escalating arms race. Over 50 nuclear explosions were registered between 16 July 1945, when the first nuclear explosive test was conducted by the United States at White Sands Missile Range near Alamogordo, New Mexico, and 31 December 1953. Prime Minister Nehru of India voiced the heightened international concern in 1954, when he proposed the elimination of all nuclear test explosions worldwide. However, within the context of the Cold War, skepticism about the capability to verify compliance with a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty posed a major obstacle to any agreement.

General Agreement on Trade in Services

The **General Agreement on Trade in Services** (**GATS**) is a treaty of the World Trade Organization (WTO) that entered into force in January 1995 as a result of the Uruguay Round negotiations. The treaty was created to extend the multilateral trading system to service sector, in the same way the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) provides such a system for merchandise trade.

All members of the WTO are signatories to the GATS. The basic WTO principle of most favoured nation (MFN) applies to GATS as well. However, upon accession, Members may introduce temporary exemptions to this rule.

Dayton Agreement

The **General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina**, also known as the **Dayton Agreement**, **Dayton Accords**, **Paris Protocol** or **Dayton-Paris Agreement**, is the peace agreement reached at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base near Dayton, Ohio in November 1995, and formally signed in

Paris on 14 December 1995. These accords put an end to the three and a half year long war in Bosnia, one of the armed conflicts in the former Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia.

Content of the agreement

The agreement's main purpose is to promote peace and stability in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and to endorse regional balance in and around the former Republic of Yugoslavia (art. V, annex 1-B), thus in a regional perspective.

The present political divisions of Bosnia and Herzegovina and its structure of government were agreed upon as part the constitution that makes up Annex 4 of the General Framework Agreement concluded at Dayton. A key component of this was the delineation of the Inter-Entity Boundary Line, to which many of the tasks listed in the Annexes referred.

The State of Bosnia Herzegovina was set as of the Federation of Bosnia-Herzegovina and of the Republika Srpska. Bosnia and Herzegovina is a complete state, as opposed to a confederation; no entity or entities could ever be separated from Bosnia and Herzegovina unless through due legal process. Although highly decentralised in its Entities, it would still retain a central government, with a rotating State Presidency, a central bank and a constitutional court.

The agreement mandated a wide range of international organizations to monitor, oversee, and implement components of the agreement. The NATO-led IFOR (Implementation Force) was responsible for implementing military aspects of the agreement and deployed on 20 December 1995, taking over the forces of the UNPROFOR. The Office of the High Representative was charged with the task of civil implementation. The Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe was charged with organising the first free elections in 1996.

Decision of the Constitutional Court of Bosnia and Herzegovina

On 13 October 1997, the Croatian 1861 Law Party and the Bosnia-Herzegovina 1861 Law Party requested the Constitutional Court of Bosnia and Herzegovina to annul several decisions and to confirm one decision of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina and, more importantly, to review the constitutionality of the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina, since they alleged that the agreement violated the Constitution of Bosnia and Herzegovina in a way that it undermined the integrity of the state and that it may cause the dissolution of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Court reached the conclusion that it is not competent to decide the disputes in regards

to the mentioned decisions, since the applicants were not subjects that were identified in Article VI.3 (a) of the Constitution, in regard to those who can refer disputes to the Court. The Court also rejected the other request stating:

(...) the Constitutional Court is not competent to evaluate the constitutionality of the General Framework Agreement as the Constitutional Court has in fact been established under the Constitution of Bosnia and Herzegovina in order to uphold this Constitution (...) The Constitution of Bosnia and Herzegovina was adopted as Annex IV to the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and consequently there cannot be a conflict or a possibility for controversy between this Agreement and the Constitution of Bosnia and Herzegovina.[3]

This was one of the early cases in which the Court had to deal with the question of the legal nature of the Constitution. By making the remark in the manner of obiter dictum concerning the Annex IV (the Constitution) and the rest of the peace agreement, the Court actually "established the ground for legal unity"[4] of the entire peace agreement, which further implied that all the annexes are in the hierarchical equality. In later decisions the Court confirmed this by using other annexes of the peace agreement as a direct base for the analysis and not only in the context of systematic interpretation of the Annex IV. However, since the Court rejected the presented request of the appellants, it did not go into details concerning the controversial questions of the legality of the process in which the new Constitution (Annex IV) came to power, and replaced the former Constitution of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Court used the same reasoning to dismiss the similar claim in a later case.[5]

United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification

The **United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa** is a Convention to combat desertification and mitigate the effects of drought through national action programs that incorporate long-term strategies supported by international cooperation and partnership arrangements.

The Convention, the only convention stemming from a direct recommendation of the Rio Conference's Agenda 21, was adopted in Paris on 17 June 1994 and entered into force in December 1996. It is the first and only internationally legally binding framework set up to address the problem of desertification. The Convention is based on the principles of participation, partnership and decentralization - the backbone of Good Governance and Sustainable

Development. It now has 194 country Parties to the Convention, making it truly global in reach.

To help publicise the Convention, 2006 was declared "International Year of Deserts and Desertification" but debates have ensued regarding how effective the International Year was in practice.[1]

- opened for signature - October 14, 1994
- entered into force - December 26, 1996

United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea

The **United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea** (**UNCLOS**), also called the **Law of the Sea Convention** or the **Law of the Sea treaty**, is the international agreement that resulted from the third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS III), which took place from 1973 through 1982. The Law of the Sea Convention defines the rights and responsibilities of nations in their use of the world's oceans, establishing guidelines for businesses, the environment, and the management of marine natural resources. The Convention, concluded in 1982, replaced four 1958 treaties. UNCLOS came into force in 1994, a year after Guyana became the 60th state to sign the treaty.[1] To date, 162 countries and the European Community have joined in the Convention. However, it is uncertain as to what extent the Convention codifies customary international law.

While the Secretary General of the United Nations receives instruments of ratification and accession and the UN provides support for meetings of states party to the Convention, the UN has no direct operational role in the implementation of the Convention. There is, however, a role played by organizations such as the International Maritime Organization, the International Whaling Commission, and the International Seabed Authority (the latter being established by the UN Convention).

North American Free Trade Agreement

The **North American Free Trade Agreement** (**NAFTA**) is an agreement signed by the governments of Canada, Mexico, and the United States, creating a trilateral trade bloc in North America. The agreement came into force on January 1, 1994. It superseded the Canada – United States Free Trade Agreement between the U.S. and Canada. In terms of combined GDP of its members, as of 2010 the trade bloc is the largest in the world.

NAFTA has two supplements: the North American Agreement on Environmental Cooperation (NAAEC) and the North American Agreement on Labor Cooperation (NAALC).

Israel–Jordan Treaty of Peace

The **Israel–Jordan Treaty of Peace** (full name: **Treaty of Peace Between the State of Israel and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan**) and sometimes referred to as the (Wadi Araba Treaty) was signed in 1994. The treaty normalized relations between the two countries and resolved territorial disputes. The conflict had cost roughly US$18.3 billion. The treaty was closely linked with the efforts to create peace between Israel and the Palestinian Authority. The signing ceremony occurred at the southern border crossing of Arabah on October 26, and made Jordan only the second Arab country, after Egypt, to normalize relations with Israel.

Chemical Weapons Convention

The **Chemical Weapons Convention** (**CWC**) is an arms control agreement which outlaws the production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons. Its full name is the **Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on their Destruction**. The agreement is administered by the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW), which is an independent organization based in The Hague, Netherlands.

The main obligation under the convention is the prohibition of use and production of chemical weapons, as well as the destruction of all chemical weapons. The destruction activities are verified by the OPCW. As of November 2011, around 71% of the (declared) stockpile of chemical weapons has thus been destroyed.[5][6] The convention also has provisions for systematic evaluation of chemical and military plants, as well as for investigations of allegations of use and production of chemical weapons based on intelligence of other state parties.

As of August 2010, 188 states are party to the CWC, and another two countries have signed but not yet ratified the convention.[1]

Key points of the Convention

- Prohibition of production and use of chemical weapons
- Destruction (or monitored conversion to other functions) of chemical weapons production facilities
- Destruction of all chemical weapons (including chemical weapons abandoned outside the state parties territory)
- Assistance between State Parties and the OPCW in the case of use of chemical weapons
- An OPCW inspection regime for the production of chemicals which might be converted to chemical weapons
- International cooperation in the peaceful use of chemistry in relevant areas

Oslo Accords

The **Oslo Accords**, officially called the **Declaration of Principles on Interim Self-Government Arrangements**[1] or **Declaration of Principles** (**DOP**), was an attempt to resolve the ongoing Palestinian-Israeli conflict. One of the major continuing issues within the wider Arab-Israeli conflict, it was the first direct, face-to-face agreement between the government of Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). It was intended to be the one framework for future negotiations and relations between the Israeli government and Palestinians, within which all outstanding "final status issues" between the two sides would be addressed and resolved.

Negotiations concerning the agreements, an outgrowth of the Madrid Conference of 1991, were conducted secretly in Oslo, Norway, hosted by the Fafo institute, and completed on 20 August 1993; the Accords were subsequently officially signed at a public ceremony in Washington, DC on 13 September 1993[2], in the presence of PLO chairman Yasser Arafat, Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin and US President Bill Clinton. The documents themselves were signed by Mahmoud Abbas for the PLO, foreign Minister Shimon Peres for Israel, Secretary of State Warren Christopher for the United States and foreign minister Andrei Kozyrev for Russia.

The Oslo Accords were a framework for the future relations between the two parties. The Accords provided for the creation of a Palestinian National Authority (PNA). The Palestinian Authority would have responsibility for the administration of the territory under its control. The Accords also called for the

withdrawal of the Israel Defense Forces (IDF) from parts of the Gaza Strip and West Bank.

It was anticipated that this arrangement would last for a five-year interim period during which a permanent agreement would be negotiated (beginning no later than May 1996). Permanent issues such as positions on Jerusalem, Palestinian refugees, Israeli settlements, security and borders were deliberately left to be decided at a later stage. Interim Palestinian self-government was to be granted by Israel in phases.

Sochi agreement

The **Sochi agreement** (also known as the Dagomys Agreements (Russian: Дагомысские соглашения), official name in Russian: «Соглашение о принципах мирного урегулирования грузино-осетинского конфликта») was a ceasefire agreement ostensibly marking the end of the both the Georgian–Ossetian and Georgian–Abkhazian conflicts, signed in Sochi on June 24, 1992 between Georgia and South Ossetia, the ceasefire with Abkhazia on July 27, 1993.

Collective Security Treaty Organisation

The **Collective Security Treaty Organization** (**CSTO**; Russian: Организация Договора о Коллективной Безопасности) is an intergovernmental military alliance which was signed on 15 May 1992. On 7 October 2002, the Presidents of Armenia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia and Tajikistan signed a charter in Tashkent founding the CSTO.

Nikolai Bordyuzha was appointed secretary general of the new organization. On 23 June 2006, Uzbekistan became a full participant in the CSTO; and its membership was formally ratified by the Uzbek parliament on 28 March 2008.[1] The CSTO is currently an observer organisation at the United Nations General Assembly.

The CSTO charter reaffirmed the desire of all participating states to abstain from the use or threat of force. Signatories would not be able to join other military alliances or other groups of states,[citation needed] while aggression against one signatory would be perceived as an aggression against all. To this end, the CSTO holds yearly military command exercises for the CSTO nations to have an opportunity to improve inter-organisation cooperation. The largest-scale

CSTO military exercise held to date were the "Rubezh 2008" exercises hosted in Armenia where a combined total of 4,000 troops from all 7 constituent CSTO member countries conducted operative, strategic, and tactical training with an emphasis towards furthering efficiency of the collective security element of the CSTO partnership.[2] A 2011 series of training exercises has recently been held in central Asia consisting of "more than 10,000 troops and 70 combat aircraft".[3] Also, Russia has won the right to veto the establishment of new foreign military bases in the member states of the Collective Security Treaty Organisation (CSTO). In order to deploy military bases of a third country in the territory of the CSTO member-states, it is necessary to obtain the official consent of all its members. But, the tightening of rules for opening extra-regional military bases apparently does not apply to existing facilities, such as the U.S. transit centre in Kyrgyzstan, a German air transit facility in Uzbekistan and French military aircraft based in Tajikistan. However, the decision gains importance in the light of reported plans by the Pentagon to redeploy to Central Asia some of the forces that will be pulled out of Afghanistan in 2014.[4]

The CSTO employs a "rotating presidency" system in which the country leading the CSTO alternates every year. Kazakhstan currently has the CSTO presidency.[5]

Treaty on Open Skies

The **Treaty on Open Skies** entered into force on January 1, 2002, and currently has 34 States Parties. It establishes a program of unarmed aerial surveillance flights over the entire territory of its participants. The treaty is designed to enhance mutual understanding and confidence by giving all participants, regardless of size, a direct role in gathering information about military forces and activities of concern to them. Open Skies is one of the most wide-ranging international efforts to date promoting openness and transparency of military forces and activities. The concept of "mutual aerial observation" was initially proposed to Soviet Premier Nikolai Bulganin at the Geneva Conference of 1955 by President Dwight D. Eisenhower; however, the Soviets promptly rejected the concept and it lay dormant for several years.[citation needed] The treaty was eventually signed as an initiative of US president (and former Director of Central Intelligence) George H. W. Bush in 1989. Negotiated by the then-members of NATO and the Warsaw Pact, the agreement was signed in Helsinki, Finland, on March 24, 1992.

This treaty is not related to civil-aviation open skies agreements.

Basic elements of the treaty

Territory

The Open Skies regime covers the territory over which the State Party exercises sovereignty, including land, islands, and internal and territorial waters. The treaty specifies that the entire territory of a State Party is open to observation. Observation flights may only be restricted for reasons of flight safety; not for reasons of national security.

Aircraft

A USAF OC-135B Open Skies.

Observation aircraft may be provided by either the observing Party or (the "taxi option") by the observed Party, at the latter's choice. All Open Skies aircraft and sensors must pass specific certification and pre-flight inspection procedures to ensure that they are compliant with treaty standards. The official certified U.S. Open Skies aircraft is the OC-135B Open Skies (a military version of the Boeing 707). The United Kingdom's aircraft is a modified Hawker Siddeley Andover C Mk 1, XS596.[citation needed]

Canada uses a C-130 Hercules aircraft equipped with a "SAMSON" sensor pod to conduct flights over other treaty nations. The pod is a converted CC-130 fuel tank modified to carry the permitted sensors, along with associated on-board mission systems. A consortium of nations consisting of Belgium, Netherlands, Luxemburg, Canada, France, Greece, Italy, Norway, Portugal, and Spain own and operate this system. The costs of maintaining the SAMSON Pod are shared, based on each nation's flight quota and actual use.[citation needed]

Bulgaria, Romania, Russia and Ukraine use the Antonov An-30 for their flights. The Czech Republic also used to use the An-30 for this purpose but they apparently retired all of theirs from service in 2003.[citation needed]

Russia also uses the Tu-154M-ON Monitoring Aircraft. Germany formerly used this type as well until the aircraft was lost in a 1997 accident.[citation needed]

Sensors

Open Skies aircraft may have video, optical panoramic and framing cameras for daylight photography, infra-red line scanners for a day/night capability, and synthetic aperture radar for a day/night all weather capability. Photographic image quality will permit recognition of major military equipment (e.g., permit

a State Party to distinguish between a tank and a truck), thus allowing significant transparency of military forces and activities. Sensor categories may be added and capabilities improved by agreement among States Parties. All sensors used in Open Skies must be commercially available to all signatories. Imagery resolution is limited to 30 centimetres.

Quotas

Each State Party is obligated to receive observation flights per its passive quota allocation. Each State Party may conduct as many observation flights - its active quota - as its passive quota. During the first three years after EIF, each State will be obligated to accept no more than seventy-five percent of its passive quota. Since the overall annual passive quota for the United States is 42, this means that it will be obligated to accept no more than 31 observation flights a year during this three-year period. Only two flights were requested over the United States during 2005, by the Russian Federation and Republic of Belarus Group of States Parties (which functions as a single entity for quota allocation purposes). The United States is entitled to 8 of the 31 annual flights available over Russia/Belarus. Additionally, the United States is entitled to one flight over Ukraine, which is shared with Canada.

Data sharing and availability

Imagery collected from Open Skies missions is available to any State Party upon request for the cost of reproduction. As a result, the data available to each State Party is much greater than that which it can collect itself under the treaty quota system.

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

The **United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change** (**UNFCCC** or **FCCC**) is an international environmental treaty produced at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), informally known as the Earth Summit, held in Rio de Janeiro from June 3 to 14, 1992. The objective of the treaty is to stabilize greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system.[1]

The treaty itself set no mandatory limits on greenhouse gas emissions for individual countries and contains no enforcement mechanisms. In that sense, the treaty is considered legally non-binding. Instead, the treaty provides for updates (called "protocols") that would set mandatory emission limits. The principal

update is the Kyoto Protocol, which has become much better known than the UNFCCC itself.

The UNFCCC was opened for signature on May 9, 1992, after an Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee produced the text of the Framework Convention as a report following its meeting in New York from April 30 to May 9, 1992. It entered into force on March 21, 1994. As of May 2011, UNFCCC has 194 parties.

One of its first tasks was to establish national greenhouse gas inventories of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and removals, which were used to create the 1990 benchmark levels for accession of Annex I countries to the Kyoto Protocol and for the commitment of those countries to GHG reductions. Updated inventories must be regularly submitted by Annex I countries.

The UNFCCC is also the name of the United Nations Secretariat charged with supporting the operation of the Convention, with offices in Haus Carstanjen, Bonn, Germany. From 2006 to 2010 the head of the secretariat was Yvo de Boer; on May 17, 2010 his successor, Christiana Figueres from Costa Rica has been named. The Secretariat, augmented through the parallel efforts of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), aims to gain consensus through meetings and the discussion of various strategies.

The parties to the convention have met annually from 1995 in Conferences of the Parties (COP) to assess progress in dealing with climate change. In 1997, the Kyoto Protocol was concluded and established legally binding obligations for developed countries to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions.[2]

Conferences of the Parties

- 3.1 1995: COP 1, The Berlin Mandate
- 3.2 1996: COP 2, Geneva, Switzerland
- 3.3 1997: COP 3, The Kyoto Protocol on Climate Change
- 3.4 1998: COP 4, Buenos Aires, Argentina
- 3.5 1999: COP 5, Bonn, Germany
- 3.6 2000: COP 6, The Hague, Netherlands
- 3.7 2001: COP 6, Bonn, Germany
- 3.8 2001: COP 7, Marrakech, Morocco
- 3.9 2002: COP 8, New Delhi, India
- 3.10 2003: COP 9, Milan, Italy
- 3.11 2004: COP 10, Buenos Aires, Argentina
- 3.12 2005: COP 11/MOP 1, Montreal, Canada
- 3.13 2006: COP 12/MOP 2, Nairobi, Kenya
- 3.14 2007: COP 13/MOP 3, Bali, Indonesia

- 3.15 2008: COP 14/MOP 4, Poznań, Poland
- 3.16 2009: COP 15/MOP 5, Copenhagen, Denmark
- 3.17 2010: COP 16/MOP 6, Cancún, Mexico
- 3.18 2011: COP 17/MOP 7, Durban, South Africa

Treaty on the functioning of the European Union

The Treaty on the functioning of the European Union goes into deeper detail on the role, policies and operation of the EU. It is split into seven parts;[1]

Part 1, Principles

In principles, article 1 establishes the basis of the treaty and its legal value. Articles 2 to 6 outline the competencies of the EU according to the level of powers accorded in each area. Articles 7 to 14 set out social principles, articles 15 and 16 set out public access to documents and meetings and article 17 states that the EU shall respect the status of churches under national law.[1]

Part 2, Non-discrimination and citizenship of the Union

The second part begins with article 18 which outlaws, within the limitations of the treaties, discrimination on the basis of nationality. Article 19 states the EU will "combat discrimination based on sex, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation". Articles 20 to 24 establishes EU citizenship and accords rights to it; to free movement, consular protection from other states, vote and stand in local and European elections, right to petition Parliament and the European Ombudsman and to contact and receive a reply from EU institutions in their own language. Article 25 requires the Commission to report on the implementation of these rights every three years.[1]

Part 3, Union policies and internal actions

Part 3 on policies and actions is divided by area into the following titles: the internal market; the free movement of goods, including the customs union; agriculture and fisheries; free movement of people, services and capital; the area of freedom, justice and security, including police and justice co-operation; transport policy; competition, taxation and harmonisation of regulations (note Article 101 and Article 102); economic and monetary policy, including articles on the euro; employment policy; the European Social Fund; education, vocational training, youth and sport policies; cultural policy; public health; consumer protection; Trans-European Networks; industrial policy; economic,

social and territorial cohesion (reducing disparities in development); research and development and space policy; environmental policy; energy policy; tourism; civil protection; and administrative co-operation.[1]

Part 4, Association of the overseas countries and territories

Part 4 deals with association of overseas territories. Article 198 sets the objective of association as promoting the economic and social development of those associated territories as listed in annex 2. The following articles elaborate on the form of association such as customs duties.[1]

Part 5, External action by the Union

Part 5 deals with EU foreign policy. Article 205 states that external actions must be in accordance with the principles laid out in Chapter 1 Title 5 of the Treaty on European Union. Article 206 and 207 establish the common commercial (external trade) policy of the EU. Articles 208 to 214 deal with cooperation on development and humanitarian aid for third countries. Article 215 deals with sanctions while articles 216 to 219 deal with procedures for establishing international treaties with third countries. Article 220 instructs the High Representative and Commission to engage in appropriate cooperation with other international organisations and article 221 establishes the EU delegations. Article 222, the Solidarity clause states that members shall come to the aid of a fellow member who is subject to a terrorist attack, natural disaster or man-made disaster. This includes the use of military force.[1]

Part 6, Institutional and financial provisions

Part 6 elaborates on the institutional provisions in the Treaty on European Union. As well as elaborating on the structures, articles 288 to 299 outline the forms of legislative acts and procedures of the EU. Articles 300 to 309 establish the European Economic and Social Committee, the Committee of the Regions and the European Investment Bank. Articles 310 to 325 outline the EU budget. Finally, articles 326 to 334 establishes provision for enhanced co-operation.[1]

Part 7, General and final provisions

Part 7 deals with final legal points, such as territorial and temporal application, the seat of institutions (to be decided by member states, but this is enacted by a protocol attached to the treaties), immunities and the effect on treaties signed before 1958 or the date of accession.[1]

Protocols, annexes and declarations

There are 37 protocols, 2 annexes and 65 declarations that are attached to the treaties to elaborate details, often in connection with a single country, without being in the full legal text.

Protocols;[2]

- 1: on the role of National Parliaments in the European Union
- 2: on the application of the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality
- 3: on the statute of the Court of Justice of the European Union
- 4: on the statute of the European System of Central Banks and of the European Central Bank
- 5: on the statute of the European Investment Bank
- 6: on the location of the seats of the institutions and of certain bodies, offices, agencies and departments of the European Union
- 7: on the privileges and immunities of the European Union
- 8: relating to Article 6(2) of the Treaty on European Union on the accession of the Union to the European Convention on the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms
- 9: on the decision of the Council relating to the implementation of Article 16(4) of the Treaty on European Union and Article 238(2) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union between 1 November 2014 and 31 March 2017 on the one hand, and as from 1 April 2017 on the other
- 10: on permanent structured cooperation established by Article 42 of the Treaty on European Union
- 11: on Article 42 of the Treaty on European Union
- 12: on the excessive deficit procedure
- 13: on the convergence criteria
- 14: on the Euro Group
- 15: on certain provisions relating to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
- 16: on certain provisions relating to Denmark
- 17: on Denmark
- 18: on France
- 19: on the Schengen acquis integrated into the framework of the European Union
- 20: on the application of certain aspects of Article 26 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union to the United Kingdom and to Ireland
- 21: on the position of the United Kingdom and Ireland in respect of the area of freedom, security and justice
- 22: on the position of Denmark

- 23: on external relations of the Member States with regard to the crossing of external borders
- 24: on asylum for nationals of Member States of the European Union
- 25: on the exercise of shared competence
- 26: on services of general interest
- 27: on the internal market and competition
- 28: on economic, social and territorial cohesion
- 29: on the system of public broadcasting in the Member States
- 30: on the application of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union to Poland and to the United Kingdom
- 31: concerning imports into the European Union of petroleum products refined in the Netherlands Antilles
- 32: on the acquisition of property in Denmark
- 33: concerning Article 157 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union
- 34: on special arrangements for Greenland
- 35: on Article 40.3.3 of the Constitution of Ireland

- 36: on transitional provisions
- 37: on the financial consequences of the expiry of the ECSC treaty and on the Research fund for Coal and Steel

Annexes[3]

- Annex I lists agricultural and marine produce covered by the Common Agricultural Policy and the Common Fisheries Policy.
- Annex II lists the overseas countries and territories associated with the EU.

Declarations[4]

There are 65 declarations attached to the EU treaties. As examples, these include the following. Declaration 1 affirms that the charter, gaining legal force, reaffirms rights under the European Convention and does not allow the EU to act beyond its conferred competencies. Declaration 4 allocates an extra MEP to Italy. Declaration 7 outlines Council voting procedures to become active after 2014. Declaration 17 asserts the primacy of EU law. Declaration 27 reasserts that holding a legal personality does not entitle the EU to act beyond its competencies. Declaration 43 allows Mayotte to change to the status of "outermost region".

Euratom

As well as the two main treaties, their protocols and the Charter of Fundamental Rights; the Treaty Establishing a European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom) is still in force as a separate treaty.

Title one outlines the tasks of Euratom. Title two contains the core of the treaty on how cooperation in the field is to take place. Title three outlines institutional provisions and has largely been subsumed by the European Union treaties. Title four is on financial provisions and title five on the general and title six is on final provisions.[5]

Treaty on European Union

Following the preamble the treaty text is divided into six parts.

Title 1, Common Provisions

The first deals with common provisions. Article 1 establishes the European Union on the basis of the European Community and lays out the legal value of the treaties. The second article states that the EU is "founded on the values of respect for human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights, including the rights of persons belonging to minorities." The member states share a "society in which pluralism, non-discrimination, tolerance, justice, solidarity and equality between women and men prevail".

Article 3 then states the aims of the EU in six points. The first is simply to promote peace, European values and its citizen's well-being. The second relates to free movement with external border controls are in place. Point 3 deals with the internal market. Point 4 establishes the euro. Point 5 states the EU shall promote its values, contribute to eradicating poverty, observe human rights and respect the charter of the United Nations. The final sixth point states that the EU shall pursue these objectives by "appropriate means" according with its competences given in the treaties.

Article 4 relates to member states' sovereignty and obligations. Article 5 sets out the principles of conferral, subsidiarity and proportionality with respect to the limits of its powers. Article 6 binds the EU to the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union and the European Convention on Human Rights. Article 7 deals with the suspension of a member state and article 8 deals with establishing close relations with neighbouring states.

Title 2, Provisions on democratic principles

Article 9 establishes the equality of national citizens and citizenship of the European Union. Article 10 declares that the EU is founded in representative democracy and that decisions must be taken as closely as possible to citizens. It makes reference to European political parties and how citizens are represented: directly in the Parliament and by their governments in the Council and European Council – accountable to national parliaments. Article 11 establishes government transparency, declares that broad consultations must be made and introduces provision for a petition where at least 1 million citizens may petition the Commission to legislate on a matter. Article 12 gives national parliaments limited involvement in the legislative process.

Title 3, Provisions on the institutions

Article 13 establishes the institutions in the following order and under the following names: the European Parliament, the European Council, the Council, the European Commission, the Court of Justice of the European Union, the European Central Bank and the Court of Auditors. it obliges co-operation between these and limits their competencies to the powers within the treaties.

Article 14 deals with the workings of Parliament and its election, article 15 with the European Council and its president, article 16 with the Council and its configurations and article 17 with the Commission and its appointment. Article 18 establishes the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy and article 19 establishes the Court of Justice.

Title 4, Provisions on enhanced cooperations

Title 4 has only one article which allows a limited number of member states to co-operate within the EU if others are blocking integration in that field.

Title 5, General provisions on the Union's external action and specific provisions on the Common Foreign and Security Policy

Chapter 1 of this title includes articles 21 and 22. Article 21 deals with the principles that outline EU foreign policy; including compliance with the UN charter, promoting global trade, humanitarian support and global governance. Article 22 gives the European Council, acting unanimously, control over defining the EU's foreign policy.

Chapter 2 is further divided into sections. The first, common provisions, details the guidelines and functioning of the EU's foreign policy, including

establishment of the European External Action Service and member state's responsibilities. Section 2, articles 42 to 46, deal with military cooperation (including mutual defence).

Title 6, Final provisions

Article 47 establishes a legal personality for the EU. Article 48 deals with the method of treaty amendment; specifically the ordinary and simplified revision procedures. Article 49 deals with applications to join the EU and article 50 with withdrawal. Article 51 deals with the protocols attached to the treaties and article 52 with the geographic application of the treaty. Article 53 states the treaty is in force for an unlimited period, article 54 deals with ratification and 55 with the different language versions of the treaties.

Maastricht Treaty

The **Maastricht Treaty** (formally, the **Treaty on European Union** or **TEU**) was signed on 7 February 1992 by the members of the European Community in Maastricht, Netherlands.[1] On 9–10 December 1991, the same city hosted the European Council which drafted the treaty.[2] Upon its entry into force on 1 November 1993 during the Delors Commission,[3] it created the European Union and led to the creation of the single European currency, the euro. The Maastricht Treaty has been amended by the treaties of Amsterdam, Nice and Lisbon. See also Treaties of the European Union.

Content

The treaty led to the creation of the euro, and created what was commonly referred to as the pillar structure of the European Union. The treaty established the three pillars of the European Union — the European Community (EC) pillar, the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) pillar, and the Justice and Home Affairs (JHA) pillar. The first pillar was where the EU's supra-national institutions — the Commission, the European Parliament and the European Court of Justice — had the most power and influence. The other two pillars were essentially more intergovernmental in nature with decisions being made by committees composed of member states' politicians and officials. [4]

All three pillars were the extensions of pre-existing policy structures. The European Community pillar was the continuation of the European Economic Community with the "Economic" being dropped from the name to represent the wider policy base given by the Maastricht Treaty. Coordination in foreign

policy had taken place since the beginning of the 1970s under the name of European Political Cooperation (EPC), which had been first written into the treaties by the Single European Act but not as a part of the EEC. While the Justice and Home Affairs pillar extended cooperation in law enforcement, criminal justice, asylum, and immigration and judicial cooperation in civil matters, some of these areas had already been subject to intergovernmental cooperation under the Schengen Implementation Convention of 1990.

The creation of the pillar system was the result of the desire by many member states to extend the European Economic Community to the areas of foreign policy, military, criminal justice, judicial cooperation, and the misgiving of other member states, notably the United Kingdom, over adding areas which they considered to be too sensitive to be managed by the supra-national mechanisms of the European Economic Community. The compromise was that instead of renaming the European Economic Community as the European Union, the treaty would establish a legally separate European Union comprising the renamed European Economic Community, and the inter-governmental policy areas of foreign policy, military, criminal justice, judicial cooperation. The structure greatly limited the powers of the European Commission, the European Parliament and the European Court of Justice to influence the new intergovernmental policy areas, which were to be contained with the second and third pillars: foreign policy and military matters (the CFSP pillar) and criminal justice and cooperation in civil matters (the JHA pillar).

The Maastricht criteria

The Maastricht Treaty established the Maastricht criteria and the EU single market which ensures the free movement of goods, capital, people and services. (2003 German stamp commemorating the tenth anniversary of the enforcement of the Maastricht Treaty in 1993)

The Maastricht criteria (also known as the convergence criteria) are the criteria for European Union member states to enter the third stage of European Economic and Monetary Union (EMU) and adopt the euro as their currency. The 4 main criteria are based on Article 121(1) of the European Community Treaty.

1. Inflation rates: No more than 1.5 percentage points higher than the average of the three best performing (lowest inflation) member states of the EU.

2. Government finance:

Annual government deficit:

The ratio of the annual government deficit to gross domestic product (GDP) must not exceed 3% at the end of the preceding fiscal year. If not, it is at least required to reach a level close to 3%. Only exceptional and temporary excesses would be granted for exceptional cases.

Government debt:

The ratio of gross government debt to GDP must not exceed 60% at the end of the preceding fiscal year. Even if the target cannot be achieved due to the specific conditions, the ratio must have sufficiently diminished and must be approaching the reference value at a satisfactory pace. As of the end of 2010, only two EU member states, Poland and the Czech Republic, still meet this target.[citation needed]

3. Exchange rate: Applicant countries should have joined the exchange-rate mechanism (ERM II) under the European Monetary System (EMS) for two consecutive years and should not have devalued its currency during the period.

4. Long-term interest rates: The nominal long-term interest rate must not be more than 2 percentage points higher than in the three lowest inflation member states.

The purpose of setting the criteria is to maintain the price stability within the Eurozone even with the inclusion of new member states.

Content

The two principal treaties on which the EU is based are the Treaty on European Union (TEU; Maastricht Treaty, effective since 1993) and the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU; Treaty of Rome, effective since 1958). These main treaties (plus their attached protocols and declarations) have been altered by amending treaties at least once a decade since they each came into force, the latest being the Treaty of Lisbon which came into force in 2009. Lisbon also made the Charter of Fundamental Rights legally binding, though that is not a treaty per se. The troubled ratification of Lisbon has meant there is little climate for further reform in the next few years beyond accession treaties, which merely allow a new state to join.

Treaty of Asunción

The **Treaty of Asunción** was a treaty between the countries of Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, and Uruguay signed on March 26, 1991. The objective of the treaty, signed in Asunción, was to establish a common market among the participating countries, popularly called Mercosur (Southern Common Market). Later, the Treaty of Ouro Preto was signed to supplement the first treaty, establishing that the Treaty of Asunción was to be a legally and internationally recognized organization.

The treaty defined a program of gradual elimination of import/export fees that would reach a free commerce zone by the end of 1994. Even though the dates of the program were not followed and the free zone was not yet reached, the treaty established the bases for the "Mercado Común del Sur" (Mercosur).

History

Main article: Latin American integration

Since the Spanish American wars of independence, there have been various types of organizations and treaties with the intention of social and economic integration of South America. The Economic Commission of Latin America was created on February 25, 1948 with the object of conducting studies aimed to the integration of these countries, and increase the national markets and industrial development. The Latin American Free Trade Association (LAFTA) was created in 1960, with the same objective of regional integration, but during the 1970s, the LAFTA was unable to establish a common market among them. The South American countries could not compete with the international free markets, and the integration crisis worsened due to the 1973 oil crisis.

The Andean Pact, signed in 1969, the countries of Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, and Venezuela were integrated, while Chile and Panama participated as observers. The Latin American Integration Association was created in 1989 to establish economic integration between Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru, and Venezuela. Brazil and Argentina signed the Treaty of Buenos Aires that was to establish economic integration between the two countries, and the Treaty of Asunción was signed to complement the Treaty of Buenos Aires, with Uruguay and Paraguay joining them.

African Monetary Union

The **African Monetary Union** is the proposed creation of an economic and monetary union for the countries of the African Union, administered by the African Central Bank. Such a union would call for the creation of a new unified currency, similar to the euro; the hypothetical currency is sometimes referred to as the **afro**.

The Abuja Treaty, an international agreement signed on June 3, 1991 in Abuja, Nigeria, created the African Economic Community, and called for an African Central Bank to follow by 2028. The current plan is to establish an African Economic Community with a single currency by 2023.[1]

Brijuni Agreement

The **Brijuni Agreement** (Croatian: Brijunska deklaracija, Slovene: Brionska deklaracija) is a document signed on the Brijuni islands near Pula, Croatia, on 7 July 1991 by representatives of the Republic of Slovenia, Republic of Croatia and the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia under the political sponsorship of the European Community. With this document, the SFRY stopped all hostilities on Slovenian territory, thus ending the Slovenian War, whereas Slovenia and Croatia froze independence activities for a period of three months.

Participants in the negotiations

The delegation of the EC consisted of foreign ministers of three countries: Hans van den Broek (Netherlands), Jacques Poos (Luxembourg) and João de Deus Pinheiro (Portugal).

The Yugoslav delegation consisted of the President of Federal Government Ante Marković, Minister of the Interior Petar Gračanin, Minister of Foreign Affairs Budimir Lončar, vice-admiral Stane Brovet, assistant to the minister of defense, and members of the collective presidency of the SFRY, without both members of Serbian autonomous districts, but including the former President of the Presidency of SFRY Borisav Jović.

Slovenia was represented by the President of the Republic Milan Kučan, Prime Minister Lojze Peterle, Minister of Foreign Affairs Dimitrij Rupel, the Slovenian representative in the Yugoslav presidency Janez Drnovšek, and President of Slovenian National Assembly France Bučar.

Croatia was represented by the President of the Republic Franjo Tuđman.

Treaty on the Final Settlement with Respect to Germany

The **Treaty on the Final Settlement With Respect to Germany**, German: Vertrag über die abschließende Regelung in bezug auf Deutschland (or the **Two Plus Four Agreement**, German: Zwei-plus-Vier-Vertrag; short: **German Treaty**) was negotiated in 1990 between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic (the titular "Two"), and the Four Powers which occupied Germany at the end of World War II in Europe: France, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America.

The Treaty

The Treaty on the Final Settlement with Respect to Germany was signed in Moscow, USSR, on 12 September 1990, and it paved the way for German reunification on 3 October 1990.

Under the terms of the treaty, the Four Powers renounced all rights they formerly held in Germany, including in regard to the city of Berlin. As a result, the united Germany would become fully sovereign on 15 March 1991, with Berlin as its capital. It would be free to make and belong to alliances, and without any foreign influence in its politics. All Soviet forces were to leave Germany by the end of 1994. Before the Soviets withdrew, Germany would only deploy territorial defense units to areas where Soviet troops were stationed. After the Soviets withdrew, the Germans could freely deploy troops in those areas, with the exception of nuclear weapons. During the duration of the Soviet presence, Allied troops would remain stationed in Berlin upon Germany's request.

Germany was to limit its combined armed forces to no more than 370,000 personnel, no more than 345,000 of whom were to be in the Army and the Air Force. Germany also reaffirmed its renunciation of the manufacture, possession of, and control over nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons, and in particular, that the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty would continue to apply in full to the unified Germany (the Federal Republic of Germany). No foreign armed forces, nuclear weapons, or the carriers for nuclear weapons would be stationed or deployed in six states (the area of Berlin and the former East Germany), making them a permanent Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone. The German Army could deploy conventional weapons systems with nonconventional capabilities, provided that they were equipped and designed for a purely conventional role. Germany also agreed to use military force only in accordance with the United Nations Charter.

Another of the treaty's important terms was Germany's confirmation of the internationally recognized border with Poland and Russia, and other territorial changes that Germany had undergone since 1945, preventing any future claims to lost territory east of the Oder-Neisse line (see also former German territories east of the Oder-Neisse line) which had belonged to Germany before 1937. The treaty defined the territory of a 'united Germany' as being the territory of East and West Germany, prohibiting Germany from making any future territorial claims. Germany also agreed to sign a separate treaty with Poland reaffirming the present common border, binding under international law, effectively relinquishing territories to Poland. This was done on 14 November 1990 with the signing of the German-Polish Border Treaty.

Although the treaty was signed by the western and eastern German states as separate entities, it was ratified by the united Germany (the Federal Republic of Germany) per the terms of the treaty agreement.

1990 Chemical Weapons Accord

On June 1, 1990 Presidents George H.W. Bush and Mikhail Gorbachev signed the bilateral U.S.–Soviet Chemical Weapons Accord. The Accord is officially known as the **"Agreement on Destruction and Non-production of Chemical Weapons and on Measures to Facilitate the Multilateral Convention on Banning Chemical Weapons"**. This pact was signed during a summit meeting in Washington D.C.[1]

Criteria

The bilateral agreement required the destruction to begin before 1993 and to reduce Chemical weapon (CW) stockpiles to no more than 5,000 agent tons each by December 31, 2002. It also required both sides to halt CW production upon entry into force of the accord. Additionally on-site inspections were authorized to confirm that destruction has taken place and data exchanges on stockpile levels would occur to facilitate monitoring. The Accord also included a mutual pledge to support a global ban on CW.

Malaysia–Singapore Points of Agreement of 1990

Malaysia–Singapore Points of Agreement of 1990 (**POA**) is an agreement between the Southeast Asian countries of Malaysia and Singapore over the issue of the future of railway land owned by the Malaysian government through

Malayan Railways (Keretapi Tanah Melayu or KTM) in Singapore. It was signed by the then Prime Minister of Singapore Lee Kuan Yew and the then Finance Minister of Malaysia Tun Daim Zanuddin on behalf of their respective countries on 27 November 1990.

The implementation of the agreement was deadlocked for many years because of disputes over its interpretation. However, on 24 May 2010, Malaysian prime minister Najib Razak and his Singaporean counterpart Lee Hsien Loong, after a leaders' retreat in Singapore, announced that the two sides had reached an agreement on outstanding issues concerning the 1990 POA, thus breaking the 20-year-old deadlock.

Timor Gap Treaty

Officially known as the **Treaty between Australia and the Republic of Indonesia on the zone of cooperation in an area between the Indonesian province of East Timor and Northern Australia**, the **Timor Gap Treaty** is a treaty between the governments of Australia and Indonesia.[1] The signatories to the treaty were then Australian Foreign Affairs Minister Gareth Evans and then Indonesian Foreign Minister Ali Alatas. The treaty was signed on December 11, 1989 and came into force on February 9, 1991.

It provided for the joint exploitation of petroleum resources in a part of the Timor Sea seabed which were claimed by both Australia and Indonesia.

The portion of the seabed was known as the Timor Gap as it formed a break or gap in the Australia-Indonesia maritime border which had been earlier agreed to because the Portuguese who were the colonial masters of East Timor did not participate in boundary negotiations. After the Indonesia invasion and annexation of the colony in 1975-1976, East Timor was made a province of Indonesia and both Australia and Indonesia began negotiations to solve issues arising over claims to the seabed in the area. Critics argued that the negotiations and ultimate signing of the treaty affirmed Australia's de jure recognition of the Indonesian invasion and annexation of East Timor.

The treaty was no longer in force when East Timor seceded from Indonesia in 1998. A new treaty to replace the Timor Gap Treaty was negotiated, resulting in the Timor Sea Treaty.

Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe

The original **Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe** (**CFE**) was negotiated and concluded during the last years of the Cold War and established comprehensive limits on key categories of conventional military equipment in Europe (from the Atlantic to the Urals) and mandated the destruction of excess weaponry. The treaty proposed equal limits for the two "groups of states-parties", the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Warsaw Pact.

Content

Troop ceilings

The CFE Treaty sets equal ceilings for each bloc (NATO and the Warsaw Treaty), from the Atlantic to the Urals, on key armaments essential for conducting surprise attacks and initiating large-scale offensive operations. Collectively, the treaty participants have agreed that neither side may have more than:[4]

- 20,000 tanks;
- 20,000 artillery pieces;
- 30,000 armored combat vehicles (ACVs);
- 6,800 combat aircraft; and
- 2,000 attack helicopters.

To further limit the readiness of armed forces, the treaty sets equal ceilings on equipment that may be with active units. Other ground equipment must be in designated permanent storage sites. The limits for equipment each side may have in active units are:[4]

- 16,500 tanks;
- 17,000 artillery pieces; and
- 27,300 armored combat vehicles (ACVs);

The treaty further limits the proportion of armaments that can be held by any one country in Europe to about one-third of the total for all countries in Europe - the "sufficiency" rule. These limits are:[4]

- 13,300 tanks;
- 13,700 artillery pieces;
- 20,000 armored combat vehicles (ACVs);
- 5,150 combat aircraft; and
- 1,500 attack helicopters.

All sea-based Naval forces are excluded from CFE Treaty accountability.[6]

Regional arrangements

In addition to limits on the number of armaments in each category on each side, the treaty includes regional limits to prevent destabilizing force concentrations of ground equipment.[6]

Destruction

To meet required troop ceilings, equipment had to be destroyed or, if possible, converted to non-military purposes.[4]

Verification

The treaty included unprecedented provisions for detailed information exchanges, on-site inspections, challenge inspections, and on-site monitoring of destruction.[4] Treaty parties received an unlimited right to monitor the process of destruction.

Joint Consultative Group

Finally, the Treaty established in Vienna a body composed of all Treaty members, called the Joint Consultative Group (JCG),[3] which deals with questions relating to compliance with the provisions of the Treaty. The group aims to:[7]

- Resolve ambiguities and differences in interpretation
- Consider measures that enhance the Treaty's viability and effectiveness
- Resolve technical questions
- Look into disputes that may arise from the Treaty's implementation

Montreal Protocol

The **Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer** (a protocol to the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer) is an international treaty designed to protect the ozone layer by phasing out the production of numerous substances believed to be responsible for ozone depletion. The treaty was opened for signature on September 16, 1987, and entered into force on January 1, 1989, followed by a first meeting in Helsinki,

May 1989. Since then, it has undergone seven revisions, in 1990 (London), 1991 (Nairobi), 1992 (Copenhagen), 1993 (Bangkok), 1995 (Vienna), 1997 (Montreal), and 1999 (Beijing). It is believed that if the international agreement is adhered to, the ozone layer is expected to recover by 2050.[1] Due to its widespread adoption and implementation it has been hailed as an example of exceptional international co-operation, with Kofi Annan quoted as saying that "perhaps the single most successful international agreement to date has been the Montreal Protocol".[2] It has been ratified by 197 states and the European Union.[3]

Terms and purposes

The treaty[4] is structured around several groups of halogenated hydrocarbons that have been shown to play a role in ozone depletion. All of these ozone depleting substances contain either chlorine or bromine (substances containing only fluorine do not harm the ozone layer). For a table of ozone-depleting substances see: [2]

For each group, including group ST, the treaty provides a timetable on which the production of those substances must be phased out and eventually eliminated.

United Nations Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances

The **United Nations Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances** of 1988 is one of three major drug control treaties currently in force. It provides additional legal mechanisms for enforcing the 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs and the 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances. The Convention entered into force on November 11, 1990. As of January 1, 2012, there were 185 Parties to the Convention.[2] These include 182 out of 192 United Nations member states not Equatorial Guinea, Kiribati, Nauru, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Sudan, Timor-Leste and Tuvalu, and the European Union and the Cook Islands.

Nitrogen Oxide Protocol

Protocol to the 1979 Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution Concerning the Control of Emissions of Nitrogen Oxides or Their Transboundary Fluxes, opened for signature on 31 October 1988 and entered

into force on 14 February 1991, was to provide for the control or reduction of nitrogen oxides and their transboundary fluxes.

Parties: (28) Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, European Union, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Russia, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States

Countries that have signed, but not yet ratified: Poland

Joint Declaration on the Question of Macau

The **Joint Declaration on the Question of Macau**, or **Sino-Portuguese Joint Declaration**, was an important treaty between Portugal and the People's Republic of China over the status of Macau. The full name of the treaty is **Joint Declaration of the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Government of the Portuguese Republic on the question of Macao**. Signed in March, 1987 the Declaration established the process and conditions of the transfer of the territory from Portuguese rule to the People's Republic of China.[3] The process was similar to the transfer of Hong Kong to Chinese sovereignty by the United Kingdom in 1997.

Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty

The **Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty** (**INF**) is a 1987 agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union. Signed in Washington, D.C. by U.S. President Ronald Reagan and General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev on December 8, 1987, it was ratified by the United States Senate on May 27, 1988 and came into force on June 1 of that year. The treaty is formally titled **The Treaty Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles**.

The treaty eliminated nuclear and conventional ground-launched ballistic and cruise missiles with intermediate ranges, defined as between 500-5,500 km (300-3,400 miles).

China–Australia Migratory Bird Agreement

The **China–Australia Migratory Bird Agreement** is a treaty between Australia and China to minimise harm to the major areas used by migratory birds which migrate between the two countries. Towra Point Nature Reserve plays a role in the agreement, being an area in Australia used by migratory birds. CAMBA was first developed on October 20, 1986 and came into force on September 1, 1988.

There is also a Japan–Australia Migratory Bird Agreement. Towra Point is also a Ramsar wetland site (a protected wetland of international importance).

Treaty of Rarotonga

The **Treaty of Rarotonga** is the common name for the **South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty**, which formalizes a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the South Pacific. The treaty bans the use, testing, and possession of nuclear weapons within the borders of the zone.[1][2][3]

It was signed by the South Pacific nations of Australia, the Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, Nauru, New Zealand, Niue, Papua New Guinea, the Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu and Western Samoa on the island of Rarotonga (where the capital of the Cook Islands is located) on August 6, 1985, and has since been ratified by all of those states.

The Federated States of Micronesia, Marshall Islands, and Palau are not party to the treaties but are eligible to become parties should they decide to join the treaty in the future. [4]

Protocols binding other states

There are three protocols to the treaty, which have been signed by the five declared nuclear states, with the exception of Protocol 1 for China and Russia who have no territory in the Zone.

1. no manufacture, stationing or testing in their territories within the Zone
2. no use against the Parties to the Treaty, or against territories where Protocol 1 is in force
3. no testing within the Zone

In 1996 France and the United Kingdom signed and ratified the three protocols. The USA signed them the same year but never ratified them. China signed and ratified protocols 2 and 3 in 1987. Russia has also ratified protocols 2 and 3 with reservations.[5]

Sulphur Emissions Reduction Protocol

The **Protocol to the 1979 Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution on the Reduction of Sulphur Emissions or Their Transboundary Fluxes by at Least 30%** is an agreement to provide for a 30% reduction in sulphur emissions or transboundary fluxes by 1993.

opened for signature - July 8, 1985

entered into force - September 2, 1987

The **Protocol to the 1979 Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution on Further Reduction of Sulphur Emissions** is an agreement to provide for a further reduction in sulphur emissions or transboundary fluxes.

opened for signature - June 14, 1994

entered into force - August 5, 1998

Schengen Agreement

The **Schengen Agreement** is a treaty signed on 14 June 1985 near the town of Schengen in Luxembourg, between five of the ten member states of the European Economic Community. It was supplemented by the **Convention implementing the Schengen Agreement** five years later. Together these treaties created Europe's borderless Schengen Area, which operates very much like a single state for international travel with external border controls for travellers travelling in and out of the area, but with no internal border controls.

The Schengen Agreements and the rules adopted under them were, for the EU members of the Agreement, entirely separate from the EU structures until the 1997 Amsterdam Treaty, which incorporated them into the mainstream of European Union law. The borderless zone created by the Schengen Agreements, the Schengen Area, currently consists of 26 European countries, covering a population of over 400 million people and an area of 4,312,099 square kilometres (1,664,911 sq mi).[1]

Before 1914, it was possible to travel from Paris to Saint Petersburg without a passport.[2] When the First World War came to an end, the practice of issuing passports and performing routine passport controls at national frontiers remained and became the norm in Europe until the implementation of the Schengen Area in 1985.

There were several exceptions. After the secession of the Irish Free State from the United Kingdom in 1922, both countries passed laws that treated the other country as part of its own territory for immigration purposes. This Common Travel Area still exists today, albeit in a much more limited fashion.

In 1944, the governments-in-exile of Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg (Benelux) signed an agreement to eliminate border controls between themselves; this agreement was put into force in 1948. Similarly, the Nordic Passport Union was created in 1952 to permit free travel amongst the Nordic countries of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden and some of their associated territories. Both of these areas have largely been subsumed within the Schengen Area.

The Schengen Agreement was signed on 14 June 1985 on the river-boat Princess Marie-Astrid in the middle of the river Moselle where the territories of France, Germany and Luxembourg meet. The original signatories were Belgium, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and West Germany.[3] As Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg formed the "borderless Benelux" (s.a.), the agreement was in a way signed at the border triangle of all original signatories. It was created independently of the European Union, in part owing to the lack of consensus amongst EU members over whether or not the EU had the competence to abolish border controls,[4] and in part because those ready to implement the idea did not wish to wait for others (back then there was no Enhanced co-operation mechanism). The Agreement initially only provided for the replacement of passport checks with visual surveillance of private vehicles, which would be able to cross borders without stopping albeit at reduced speed.

In 1990, before the Schengen Agreement had been implemented, the same five states signed a Convention implementing the Schengen Agreement. It was this Convention that created the Schengen Area through the complete abolition of border controls between Schengen states, common rules on visas, and police and judicial cooperation.

The Schengen Agreement along with its implementing Convention was implemented in 1995 only for some signatories, but just over two years later during the Amsterdam Intergovernmental Conference, all European Union member states except the United Kingdom and Ireland, and two non-member states Norway and Iceland (part of the Nordic Passport Union along with EU

members Denmark, Finland, and Sweden) had signed the Schengen Agreement. It was during those negotiations, which led to Amsterdam Treaty, that the incorporation of the so-called Schengen-Acquis[5] into the main body of European Union law was agreed along with opt-outs for Ireland and the United Kingdom, which were to remain outside of the Schengen Area.

Now that the Schengen Agreement is part of the acquis communautaire, the Agreement has, for its EU members, lost the status of a treaty, which could only be amended according to its terms; instead, its amendments are made according to that legislative procedure of the EU that covers the rules to be amended as defined in the EU treaties.[6] Ratification by the former agreement signatory states is not required for altering or repealing some or all of the former Schengen-Acquis.[7] Legal acts setting out the conditions for entry into the Schengen Area are now enacted by majority vote in the legislative bodies of the European Union. New EU member states do not sign the Schengen Agreement as such; instead, they are bound to implement the Schengen rules as part of the pre-existing body of EU law, which every new entrant is required to accept.

This led to the result that the Schengen States that are not EU members have few formally binding options to influence the shaping and evolution of the Schengen rules; their options are effectively reduced to agreeing, or withdrawing from the agreement. Similarly to the European Economic Area practice, consultations with the affected countries are conducted informally, prior to the adoption of particular new legislation.[citation needed]

In 2006 the directive on the right to move freely (2004/38/EC) was implemented, meaning that passportless travel is allowed in the entire European Union, if having a national identity card from an EU country. For some a passport is necessary anyway, since not all countries issue such cards for their citizens, and because Sweden requires a passport when travelling from that country to EU countries outside Schengen.

Plaza Accord

The **Plaza Accord** or **Plaza Agreement** was an agreement between the governments of France, West Germany, Japan, the United States, and the United Kingdom, to depreciate the U.S. dollar in relation to the Japanese yen and German Deutsche Mark by intervening in currency markets. The five governments signed the accord on September 22, 1985 at the Plaza Hotel in New York City.

Treaty of Peace and Friendship of 1984 between Chile and Argentina

The **Treaty of Peace and Friendship of 1984 between Chile and Argentina** (Spanish: Tratado de Paz y Amistad de 1984 entre Chile y Argentina, see the text in the United Nations) was signed into agreement at the Vatican on 29 November 1984.

It was ratified

- on 30 December 1984 by the Argentine Chamber of Deputies
- on 15 March 1985 by the Argentine National Congress
- on 16 March 1985 by the Interim representant of the President of Argentina, who was abroad
- on 11 April 1985 by the Chilean Military Government Junta as Legislature

On 12 April 1985 it was signed by Augusto Pinochet and on 2 May 1985 the Foreign Ministers of both countries exchanged original documents.Due to the timing, the treaty is variously known as the 1984 Treaty or the 1985 Treaty.

The treaty contains a preamble, a maritime border definition, a comprehensive body of legislation on solving disputes, ship navigation rights and an exact definition of the border through the Straits of Magellan. Chile and Argentina, though never at war with each other, have named some of their border treaties as "peace treaties".

Arabic–African Union Treaty

The **Arabic–African Union Treaty** was signed on 13 August 1984 between King Hassan II of Morocco and Muammar Gaddafi of Libya. It was approved by Moroccan voters in a referendum on 31 August, and by the Libyan General People's Congress.[1] The aim was to establish a "union of states" between the two, and eventually to create a "Great Arab Maghreb".[1]

The treaty startled the administration of US president Ronald Reagan, and eventually led to the establishment of the African Union in 2002.

Nkomati Accord

The **Nkomati Accord** was a non-aggression pact signed on 16 March 1984 between the government of the People's Republic of Mozambique and the government of the Republic of South Africa. The event took place at the South African town of Komatipoort with the signatories being Samora Machel and

PW Botha. Despite repeated pleas from Machel for leaders of other SADCC nations to attend, the complete absence of any such heads of state demonstrated the derision the accord was viewed with from these nations. The treaty's stated focus was on preventing Mozambique from supporting the African National Congress on the one hand, and South Africa from supplying the RENAMO on the other.

However, Machel only partially honoured commitments to expel various ANC members from his territory, and the South African government continued to funnel arms and other supplies to RENAMO, allowing their destabilization of Mozambique to continue apace. A permanent peace accord, the Rome General Peace Accords, finally ended the Mozambican Civil War in 1992 and was supervised by the United Nations' ONUMOZ force until 1994.

Sino-British Joint Declaration

The **Sino-British Joint Declaration**, formally known as the **Joint Declaration of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the People's Republic of China on the Question of Hong Kong**, was signed by the Prime Ministers, Deng Xiaoping and Margaret Thatcher, of the People's Republic of China (PRC) and the United Kingdom (UK) governments on 19 December 1984 in Beijing.[1]

The Declaration entered into force with the exchange of instruments of ratification on 27 May 1985, and was registered by the PRC and UK governments at the United Nations on 12 June 1985. In the Joint Declaration, the PRC Government stated that it had decided to resume the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong (including Hong Kong Island, Kowloon, and the New Territories) with effect from 1 July 1997, and the UK Government declared that it would hand over Hong Kong to the PRC with effect from 1 July 1997. The PRC Government also declared its basic policies regarding Hong Kong in the document.

In accordance with the "One country, two systems" principle agreed between the UK and the PRC, the socialist system of PRC would not be practiced in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR), and Hong Kong's previous capitalist system and its way of life would remain unchanged for a period of 50 years until 2047. The Joint Declaration provides that these basic policies should be stipulated in the Hong Kong Basic Law and that the socialist system and socialist policies shall not be practised in HKSAR.

Closer Economic Relations

Closer Economic Relations (**CER**) is a free trade agreement between the governments of New Zealand and Australia. It is also known as the **Australia New Zealand Closer Economic Relations Trade Agreement** (ANZCERTA) and sometimes shortened to (CERTA). It came into force on 1 January 1983, but the actual treaty was not signed until 28 March 1983 by the Deputy Prime Minister of Australia and Minister for Trade, Lionel Bowen and the New Zealand High Commissioner to Australia, Laurie Francis in Canberra, Australia.

CER built on the earlier **New Zealand Australia Free Trade Agreement** (NAFTA), which was signed on 31 August 1965 and came into force on 1 January 1966. NAFTA had removed four-fifths of the tariffs between the two countries and quantitative restrictions on trade across the Tasman Sea. However, it came to be seen as too complex and bureaucratic, and in March 1980, a joint Prime Ministerial communiqué was released that called for "closer economic relations".

The two major sticking points in the negotiations were New Zealand's wish for better access for its dairy products in Australia and Australia's wish for New Zealand to remove export incentives and quantitative restrictions. After the two hurdles were overcome, the Heads of Agreement was signed on 14 December 1982 and came into force on 1 January of the following year.

One of the most important results of CER was the Protocol on the Acceleration of Free Trade in Goods, which resulted into the total elimination of tariffs or quantitative restrictions between the two countries by 1 July 1990, five years ahead of schedule.

Other parts of CER include:

- A good that can be legally sold in one country can also be legally sold in the other. Anyone registered to practise an occupation in one country may practise in the other (with some exemptions including medical practitioners)
- Service providers may provide services in either country (except in certain areas such as airway services)

The CER is complementary to the Trans-Tasman Travel Arrangement.

Moon Treaty

The **Agreement Governing the Activities of States on the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies**,[1] better known as the **Moon Treaty** or **Moon Agreement**, is an international treaty that turns jurisdiction of all celestial bodies (including the orbits around such bodies) over to the international community. Thus, all activities must conform to international law (notably this includes the UN Charter).

In practice, it is a failed treaty since it has not been ratified by any nation which engages in self-launched manned space exploration or has plans to do so (e.g. the United States, The United Kingdom, European Union, Russian Federation, People's Republic of China, Japan, and India) since its creation in 1979, and thus has a negligible effect on actual spaceflight.

Content

The treaty would apply to the Moon and to other celestial bodies within the Solar System, other than the Earth, including orbits around or other trajectories to or around them.[citation needed]

The treaty makes a declaration that the Moon should be used for the benefit of all states and all peoples of the international community. It also expresses a desire to prevent the Moon from becoming a source of international conflict. To those ends the treaty:[citation needed]

- Bans any military use of celestial bodies, including weapon testing or as military bases.
- Bans all exploration and uses of celestial bodies without the approval or benefit of other states under the common heritage of mankind principle (article 11).
- Requires that the Secretary-General must be notified of all celestial activities (and discoveries developed thanks to those activities).
- Declares all states have an equal right to conduct research on celestial bodies.
- Declares that for any samples obtained during research activities, the state that obtained them must consider making part of it available to all countries/scientific communities for research.
- Bans altering the environment of celestial bodies and requires that states must take measures to prevent accidental contamination.
- Bans any state from claiming sovereignty over any territory of celestial bodies.
- Bans any ownership of any extraterrestrial property by any organization or person, unless that organization is international and governmental.

- Requires all resource extraction and allocation be made by an international regime.

Ratification

The treaty was finalized in 1979 and entered into force for the ratifying parties in 1984. As a follow-on to the Outer Space Treaty, the Moon Treaty intended to establish a regime for the use of the Moon and other celestial bodies similar to the one established for the sea floor in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

As of December 19, 2008, only 13 states; Australia, Austria, Belgium, Chile, Kazakhstan, Lebanon, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, and Uruguay, have ratified it. France, Guatemala, India and Romania have signed but have not ratified it.[2] On March 30, 2012, Turkey acceded to it, as the 8th acceder and 17th party.[3][4] As it is unratified by any major space-faring powers (including India) and unsigned by most of them (except India), it is of no direct relevance to current space activities.[citation needed]

Egypt–Israel Peace Treaty

The **1979 Egypt–Israel Peace Treaty** was signed in Washington, D.C. on the 26th of March 1979, following the 1978 Camp David Accords. The Egypt-Israel treaty was signed by Egyptian President Anwar El Sadat and Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin, and witnessed by United States President Jimmy Carter.[1]

Treaty of Peace and Friendship between Japan and the People's Republic of China

The **Treaty of Peace and Friendship between Japan and the People's Republic of China** was concluded on August 12, 1978.

Camp David Accords

The **Camp David Accords** were signed by Egyptian President Anwar El Sadat and Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin on September 17, 1978, following

thirteen days of secret negotiations at Camp David.[1] The two framework agreements were signed at the White House, and were witnessed by United States President Jimmy Carter. The second of these frameworks, A Framework for the Conclusion of a Peace Treaty between Egypt and Israel, led directly to the 1979 Egypt-Israel Peace Treaty, and resulted in Sadat and Begin sharing the 1978 Nobel Peace Prize. Little progress was achieved on the first framework however, A Framework for Peace in the Middle East, which dealt with the Palestinian territories.

Torrijos–Carter Treaties

The **Torrijos–Carter Treaties** (sometimes referred to in the singular as the **Torrijos-Carter Treaty**) are two treaties signed by the United States and Panama in Washington, D.C., on September 7, 1977, which abrogated the Hay-Bunau Varilla Treaty of 1903. The treaties guaranteed that Panama would gain control of the Panama Canal after 1999, ending the control of the canal that the U.S. had exercised since 1903. The treaties are named after the two signatories, U.S. President Jimmy Carter and the Commander of Panama's National Guard, General Omar Torrijos. Although Torrijos was not democratically elected as he had seized power in a coup in 1968, it is generally considered that he had widespread support in Panama to justify his signing of the treaties.

This first treaty is officially titled The Treaty Concerning the Permanent Neutrality and Operation of the Panama Canal and is commonly known as the Neutrality Treaty. Under this treaty, the U.S. retained the permanent right to defend the canal from any threat that might interfere with its continued neutral service to ships of all nations. The second treaty is titled The Panama Canal Treaty, and provided that as from 12:00 on December 31, 1999, Panama would assume full control of canal operations and become primarily responsible for its defense.

Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia

The **Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia** is a peace treaty among Southeast Asian countries established by the founding members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), a geo-political and economic organization of 10 countries located in Southeast Asia.

History

On February 24, 1976, the treaty was signed into force by the leaders of the original members of ASEAN,[1] Lee Kuan Yew, Ferdinand Marcos, Datuk Hussein Onn, Kukrit Pramoj, and Suharto.[2] Other members acceded to it upon or before joining the bloc. It was amended on December 15, 1987 by a protocol to open the document for accession by states outside Southeast Asia,[3] and again on July 25, 1998, to condition such accession on the consent of all member states.[4] On July 23, 2001, the parties established the rules of procedure of the treaty's High Council, which was stipulated in Article 14 of the document.[5] On October 7, 2003, during the annual summit, a declaration was released that says:[6]

> "A High Council of [the treaty] shall be the important component in the ASEAN Security Community since it reflects ASEAN's commitment to resolve all differences, disputes and conflicts peacefully."

India was the first country, followed by India, outside ASEAN to sign the treaty. As of July 2009, sixteen countries outside the bloc have acceded to the treaty. On July 22, 2009, Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton signed the TAC on behalf of the United States.[7] The European Union intends to accede as soon as the treaty is amended to allow for the accession of non-states.[8][9][10] The treaty has been endorsed by the General Assembly stating that:[11]

> "The purposes and principles of the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia and its provisions for the pacific settlement of regional disputes and for regional cooperation in order to achieve peace, amity and friendship among the peoples of Southeast Asia [are] in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations."

Principles

The purpose of the Treaty is to promote perpetual peace, everlasting amity and cooperation among the people of Southeast Asia which would contribute to their strength, solidarity, and closer relationship. In their relations with one another, the High Contracting Parties shall be guided by the following fundamental principles;[2]

> a. mutual respect for the independence, sovereignty, equality, territorial integrity and national identity of all nations,

b. the right of every State to lead its national existence free from external interference, subversion or coercion,

c. non-interference in the internal affairs of one another,

d. settlement of differences or disputes by peaceful means,

e. renunciation of the threat or use of force, and

f. effective cooperation among themselves.

Environmental Modification Convention

The **Environmental Modification Convention** (**ENMOD**), formally the **Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques** is an international treaty prohibiting the military or other hostile use of environmental modification techniques. It opened for signature on 18 May 1977 in Geneva and entered into force on 5 October 1978. The Convention bans weather warfare, which is the use of weather modification techniques for the purposes of inducing damage or destruction. The Convention on Biological Diversity of 2010 would also ban some forms of weather modification or geoengineering.[2]

Treaty of Lagos

The Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) was created by the **Treaty of Lagos** on May 28, 1975, in Lagos, Lagos State, Nigeria. ECOWAS was established to promote cooperation and integration in order to create an economic and monetary union for promoting economic growth and development in West Africa.

Treaty of Osimo

The **Treaty of Osimo** was signed on 10 November 1975 by the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Italian Republic in Osimo, Italy, to definitely divide the Free Territory of Trieste between the two states. The treaty was written in French and became effective on 11 October 1977.

The treaty was based on the memorandum of understanding signed in London in 1954, which had handed over the provisional civil[citation needed] administration of Zone A to Italy, and of Zone B to Yugoslavia. The Treaty of Osimo merely made this situation definite[citation needed]. Zone A, including the city of Trieste, became the Italian Province of Trieste, but Yugoslavia was granted free access to the port of Trieste.

The Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs was never involved in the negotiation, which was carried on almost single-handedly by Eugenio Carbone, then Director General of the Ministry of Industry and Commerce, who also signed the Treaty on behalf of the Italian government. For Yugoslavia the treaty was signed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs Miloš Minić.

Threshold Test Ban Treaty

The **Treaty on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Weapon Tests**, also known as the **Threshold Test Ban Treaty** (or **TTBT**), was signed in July 1974 by the USA and the USSR. It establishes a nuclear "threshold," by prohibiting nuclear tests of devices having a yield exceeding 150 kilotons (equivalent to 150,000 tons of TNT).

The threshold is militarily important since it removes the possibility of testing new or existing nuclear weapons going beyond the fractional-megaton range. In the 1960s, many tests above 150 kilotons were conducted by both countries. The mutual restraint imposed by the Treaty reduced the explosive force of new nuclear warheads and bombs which could otherwise be tested for weapons systems. Of particular significance was the relationship between explosive power of reliable, tested warheads and first-strike capability. Agreement on the Threshold Test Ban Treaty was reached during the summit meeting in Moscow in July 1974.

Provisions

The treaty included a protocol which detailed technical data to be exchanged and which limited weapon testing to specific designated test sites to assist verification. The data to be exchanged included information on the geographical boundaries and geology of the testing areas. Geological data—including such factors as density of rock formation, water saturation, and depth of the water table—are useful in verifying test yields because the seismic signal produced by a given underground nuclear explosion varies with these factors at the test

location. After an actual test has taken place, the geographic coordinates of the test location are to be furnished to the other party, to help in placing the test in the proper geological setting and thus in assessing the yield.

The treaty also stipulates that data will be exchanged on a certain number of tests for calibration purposes. By establishing the correlation between stated yields of explosions at the specified sites and the seismic signals produced, this exchange improved assessments by both parties of the yields of nuclear explosions based primarily on the measurements derived from their seismic instruments. The tests used for calibration purposes may be tests conducted in the past or new tests.

Agreement to exchange the detailed data described above represented a significant degree of direct cooperation by the two major nuclear powers in the effort to control nuclear weapons. For the first time, each party agreed to make available to the other data relating to its nuclear weapons test program.

Technical issues

The technical problems associated with a yield threshold were recognized by the sides in the spring of 1974. In this context the Soviet Union mentioned the idea of some misunderstandings concerning occasional, minor, unintended breaches. Discussions on the subject of such an understanding took place in the autumn of 1974 and in the spring of 1976. The Soviet Union was informed by the United States that the understanding reached would be included as part of the public record associated with submitting the Treaty to the Senate for advice and consent to ratification. The entire understanding is as follows:

Both Parties will make every effort to comply fully with all the provisions of the TTB Treaty. However, there are technical uncertainties associated with predicting the precise yields of nuclear weapons tests. These uncertainties may result in slight, unintended breaches of the 150 kiloton threshold. Therefore, the two sides have discussed this problem and agreed that: (1) one or two slight, unintended breaches per year would not be considered a violation of the Treaty; (2) such breaches would be a cause for concern, however, and, at the request of either Party, would be the subject for consultations.

Japan–Australia Migratory Bird Agreement

The **Japan Australia Migratory Bird Agreement** (**JAMBA**) is a treaty between Australia and Japan to minimise harm to the major areas used by birds which migrate between the two countries. Towra Point Nature Reserve plays a

role in the agreement, being an area in Australia used by migratory birds. JAMBA was first developed on February 6, 1974 and came into force on April 30, 1981.

JAMBA provides for cooperation between Japan and Australia on measures for the management and protection of migratory birds, birds in danger of extinction, and the management and protection of their environments, and requires each country to take appropriate measures to preserve and enhance the environment of birds protected under the provisions of the agreement.

There is also a China Australia Migratory Bird Agreement, known as CAMBA. Towra Point is also a Ramsar wetland site (a protected wetland of international importance).

Vientiane Treaty

The **Vientiane Treaty** was a cease-fire agreement between the two warring Lao factions - the monarchial government of Laos and the communist Pathet Lao - signed in Vientiane (the capital of Laos), on February 21, 1973.

The Vientiane Treaty was in some sense a corollary to the Paris Peace Accords, signed the month before, which had ended U.S. involvement in the Vietnam war. Just as the Paris Accords had mandated the withdrawal of all US forces in Vietnam, the Vientiane Treaty called for the removal from Laos of all foreign forces allied to each side.

Under the terms of the treaty, a new coalition government was to be created; security in major cities (such as Vientiane) was to be undertaken by joint forces from both sides.

There were no outside guarantees to the terms, as the agreement was only between the Lao factions; the ICC (which had overseen the 1954 Geneva Accords ending the First Indochina War) was more powerless than before to monitor compliance.

The coalition government envisaged by the treaty did not long outlast it; as with the treaty itself, events in Laos emulated those in Vietnam. Shortly after the fall of the South Vietnamese government in April 1975, the Pathet Lao took over Laos in November 1975.

Paris Peace Accords

The **Paris Peace Accords** of 1973 intended to establish peace in Vietnam and an end to the Vietnam War, ended direct U.S. military involvement, and temporarily stopped the fighting between North and South Vietnam. The governments of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam (North Vietnam), the Republic of Vietnam (South Vietnam), and the United States, as well as the Provisional Revolutionary Government (PRG) that represented indigenous South Vietnamese revolutionaries, signed the Agreement on Ending the War and Restoring Peace in Vietnam on January 27, 1973.

The negotiations that led to the accord began in 1968 after various lengthy delays. As a result of the accord, the International Control Commission (ICC) was replaced by International Commission of Control and Supervision (ICCS) to carry out the agreement. The main negotiators of the agreement were United States National Security Advisor Dr. Henry Kissinger and Vietnamese politburo member Lê Đức Thọ; the two men were awarded the 1973 Nobel Peace Prize for their efforts, although Lê Đức Thọ refused to accept it.

European Patent Convention

The **Convention on the Grant of European Patents** of 5 October 1973, commonly known as the **European Patent Convention** (EPC), is a multilateral treaty instituting the European Patent Organisation and providing an autonomous legal system according to which **European patents** are granted. The term European patent is used to refer to patents granted under the European Patent Convention. However, after grant a European patent is not a unitary right, but a group of essentially independent nationally-enforceable, nationally-revocable patents,[1] subject to central revocation or narrowing as a group pursuant to two types of unified, post-grant procedures: a time-limited opposition procedure, which can be initiated by any person except the patent proprietor, and limitation and revocation procedures, which can be initiated by the patent proprietor only.

The EPC provides a legal framework for the granting of European patents,[2] via a single, harmonized procedure before the European Patent Office. A single patent application, in one language,[3] may be filed at the European Patent Office at Munich,[4] at its branches at The Hague[4] or Berlin[5] or at a national patent office of a Contracting State, if the national law of the State so permits.[6]

There is currently no single, centrally enforceable, European Union-wide patent. Since the 1970s, there has been concurrent discussion towards the creation of a

Community patent in the European Union. In May 2004 however, this has led to a stalemate.

Legal nature and content

The European Patent Convention is "a special agreement within the meaning of Article 19 of the Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, signed in Paris on 20 March 1883 and last revised on 14 July 1967, and a regional patent treaty within the meaning of Article 45, paragraph 1, of the Patent Cooperation Treaty of 19 June 1970."[16]

The content of the Convention includes several texts in addition to the main 178 articles. These additional texts, which are integral parts of the Convention,[17] are

- the "Implementing Regulations to the Convention on the Grant of European patents", commonly known as the "Implementing Regulations";
- the "Protocol on Jurisdiction and the recognition of decisions in respect of the right to the grant of a European patent", commonly known as the "Protocol on Recognition". This protocol deals with the right to the grant of a European patent but exclusively applies to European patent applications.
- the "Protocol on Privileges and Immunities of the European Patent Organisation", commonly known as the "Protocol on Privileges and Immunities";
- the "Protocol on the Centralisation of the European Patent System and on its Introduction", commonly known as the "Protocol on Centralisation";
- the "Protocol on the Interpretation of Article 69 of the Convention".

Substantive patent law

One of the most important articles of the Convention, Article 52(1) EPC, entitled "Patentable inventions", states:

> "European patents shall be granted for
>
> - any inventions, in all fields of technology,
> - providing that they are new,[18]
> - involve an inventive step,
> - and are susceptible of industrial application."

This article constitutes the "fundamental provision of the EPC which governs the patentability of inventions".[19]

However, the EPC provides further indications on what is patentable. There are exclusions under Article 52(2) and (3) EPC and exclusions under Article 53 EPC.

First, discoveries, scientific theories, mathematical methods,[20] aesthetic creations,[21] schemes, rules and methods for performing mental acts, playing games or doing business, programs for computers[22] and presentations of information[23] are not regarded as inventions[24] and are excluded from patentability only to the extent that the invention relates to those areas as such.[25] This is "a negative, non-exhaustive list of what should not be regarded as an invention within the meaning of Article 52(1) EPC."[19] (For further information, see also: Software patents under the EPC).

The second set of exclusions, or exceptions, include

- inventions contrary to "ordre public" or morality,[26]
- plant or animal varieties and essentially biological processes for the production of plants and animals,[27] and
- methods for treatment of the human or animal body by surgery or therapy, and diagnostic methods practised on the human or animal body,[28] which have been excluded for "socio-ethical considerations and considerations of public health".[29]

Simla Agreement

The **Simla Agreement** was signed between India and Pakistan at 12:40am[1] on July 2, 1972.[2] It followed from the war between the two nations in the previous year that had led to the independence of East Pakistan as Bangladesh. The agreement laid down the principles that should govern their future relations. It also conceived steps to be taken for further normalization of mutual relations. Most importantly, it bound the two countries "to settle their differences by peaceful means through bilateral negotiations"[citation needed]. The Kashmir dispute again came to the core-issue when India and Pakistan signed the controversial Simla Accord in July 1972 in the wake of the Indo-Pak war on 1971. The accord converted the 1949 UN "Cease-fire Line" into the Line of Control (LOC) between Pakistan and India which however did not affect the status of the disputed territory:

> "In Jammu and Kashmir, the line of control resulting from the ceasefire of December 17, 1971, shall be respected by both sides without prejudice to the recognized position of either side. Neither side shall seek to alter it

unilaterally, irrespective of mutual differences and legal interpretations." (citation from the agreement)
-Para 6 of the Agreement lists " a final settlement of Jammu and Kashmir " as one of the outstanding question awaiting for a settlement.
i) Para 4 (ii) talks of a " Line of Conflict" as distinguished from an international border . Further it explicitly protects " the recognized position of either side". The recognized position of Pakistan is the one which is recognized by the United Nations and the world community.[citation needed]
ii) Article 1(iv) obviously refers to the Kashmir region when it talks of " the basic issues and causes of the conflict which have bedeviled the relations between the two countries for the last thirty years."
Both sides further underook "to refrain from threat or the use of force in violation of this Line."

The treaty was signed in Simla, India, by Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto, the President of Pakistan, and Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister of India. The agreement also paved the way for diplomatic recognition of Bangladesh by Pakistan. The agreement has been the basis of all subsequent bilateral talks between India and Pakistan.

The agreement did not mention prisoners of war, and a supplementary Simla agreement on repatriation was signed in 1974. Subsequently India released 90,368 Pakistani military prisoners of war, including 195 accused of war crimes or genocide, and a similar number of civilian internees captured in East Pakistan.

The agreement has not prevented the relationship between the two countries from deteriorating to the point of armed conflict, most recently in the Kargil War of 1999. In Operation Meghdoot of 1984 India seized most of the inhospitable Siachen Glacier region where the frontier had not been clearly defined in the agreement (possibly as the area was thought too barren to be controversial), though most of the subsequent deaths in the Siachen Conflict have been from natural disasters, eg avalanches in 2010 and 2012.

Joint Communiqué of the Government of Japan and the Government of the People's Republic of China

The **Joint Communiqué of the Government of Japan and the Government of the People's Republic of China** was signed in Beijing on September 29, 1972. This established diplomatic relations between Japan and the People's Republic of China and resulted in the severing of official relations between

Japan and the Republic of China (Taipei/Taiwan). Specifically, the treaty ended the "abnormal relations between Japan and China", recognized the People's Republic of China as the "sole government of China" and renounced any claim for war reparations from World War II. It firmly maintains its stand under Article 8 of the Potsdam Declaration.

Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes and Other Matter

The **Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes and Other Matter** 1972, commonly called the "**London Convention**" or "LC '72" and also abbreviated as **Marine Dumping**, is an agreement to control pollution of the sea by dumping and to encourage regional agreements supplementary to the Convention. It covers the deliberate disposal at sea of wastes or other matter from vessels, aircraft, and platforms. It does not cover discharges from land-based sources such as pipes and outfalls, wastes generated incidental to normal operation of vessels, or placement of materials for purposes other than mere disposal, providing such disposal is not contrary to aims of the Convention. It entered into force in 1975. As of 2005, there were 81 Parties to the Convention.

Background

The Convention was called for by the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment (June 1972, Stockholm), the treaty was drafted at the Intergovernmental Conference on the Convention on the Dumping of Wastes at Sea (November 13, 1972, London) and it was opened for signature on December 29, 1972. It entered into force on August 30, 1975 when 15 nations ratified. As of October 1, 2001, there were 78 Contracting Parties to the Convention. International Administration of the Convention functions through Consultative Meetings held at International Maritime Organization (IMO) headquarters in London.

The London Convention consists of 22 Articles and three Annexes. It follows a "black list/grey list" approach to regulating ocean dumping; Annex I materials (black list) generally may not be ocean dumped (though for certain Annex I materials dumping may be permissible if present only as "trace contaminants" or "rapidly rendered harmless" and Annex II materials (grey list) require "special care". Annex III lays out general technical factors to be considered in establishing criteria for issuance of ocean dumping permits.

The main objective of the London Convention is to prevent indiscriminate disposal at sea of wastes that could be liable for creating hazards to human health; harming living resources and marine life; damaging amenities; or interfering with other legitimate uses of the sea. The 1972 Convention extends its scope over "all marine waters other than the internal waters" of the States and prohibits the dumping of certain hazardous materials. It further requires a prior special permit for the dumping of a number of other identified materials and a prior general permit for other wastes or matter.

Implementation

A spray-painted sign above a sewer in Colorado Springs, Colorado warning people to not pollute the local stream by dumping.

Since its entering into force in 1975, the Convention has provided a framework for international control and prevention of marine pollution within which the Contracting Parties have achieved continuous progress in keeping the oceans clean. Among its milestones are the 1993 ban on ocean disposal of low-level radioactive wastes and the resolutions to end the dumping and incineration of industrial wastes. The efforts of the Parties are supported by a permanent Secretariat hosted by the International Maritime Organization (IMO). The Consultative Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the London Convention is the governing and political decision-making body of the Convention. It takes advice on issues needing multidisciplinary expertise from the Joint Group of Experts on Scientific Aspects of Marine Environmental Protection (GESAMP) which is composed of specialized experts nominated by the IMO, FAO, UNESCO, IOC, WMO, WHO, IAEA, UN, and UNEP. A Scientific Group on Dumping, composed of government experts from the parties to the Convention a responsible to address any scientific requests from the Consultative Meeting, including the preparation of lists of hazardous substances, developing guide-lines on the implementation of the Convention, and maintaining awareness of the impacts on the marine environments of inputs from all waste sources.

The Convention is implemented in the United States through Title I of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act (MPRSA) which directs that implementing regulations are to apply binding requirements of LC to the extent that this would not relax the MPRSA.

1996 Protocol

On November 17, 1996, a special meeting of the Contracting Parties adopted the "1996 Protocol to the Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by

Dumping of Wastes and Other Matter, 1972" which is to replace the 1972 Convention, subject to ratification. In line with UNCED's Agenda 21, the 1996 Protocol reflects the global trend towards precaution and prevention with the Parties agreeing to move from controlled dispersal at sea of a variety of land-generated wastes towards integrated land-based solutions for most, and controlled sea disposal of few, remaining categories of wastes or other matter.

Among the most important innovations brought by the 1996 Protocol is the codification of the "precautionary approach" and the "polluter pays principle." Reflecting these principles, the Protocol embodies a major structural revision of the Convention—the so-called "reverse list" approach. Now, instead of prohibiting the dumping of certain (listed) hazardous materials, the Parties are obligated to prohibit the dumping of any waste or other matter that is not listed in Annex 1 ("the reverse list") of the 1996 Protocol. Dumping of wastes or other matter on this reverse list requires a permit. Parties to the Protocol are further obligated to adopt measures to ensure that the issuance of permits and permit conditions for the dumping of reverse list substances comply with Annex 2 (the Waste Assessment Annex) of the Protocol. The substances on the reverse list include dredged material; sewage sludge; industrial fish processing waste; vessels and offshore platforms or other man-made structures at sea; inert, inorganic geological material; organic material of natural origin; and bulky items including iron, steel, concrete and similar materials for which the concern is physical impact, and limited to those circumstances where such wastes are generated at locations with no land-disposal alternatives. In addition, the 1996 protocol prohibits altogether the practice of incineration at sea, except for emergencies, and prohibits the exports of wastes or other matter to non-Parties for the purpose of dumping or incineration at sea.

The 1996 Protocol has effectively moved the scope of the original London Convention landwards, relating it to the policy and management issues of land as well as sea wastes disposal. Indicative for this shift are such elements as the codification of the precautionary approach and the establishment of requirements such as the "waste prevention audit," the identification and control of the sources of contamination for certain materials, and the collaboration with relevant local and national agencies that are involved in point and non-point source pollution control. In this context, Integrated Coastal Management (ICM) comes as a natural framework for effective implementation of the objectives of the Protocol. Relaying on its vast ICM technical expertise, the National Ocean Service (NOS) is to contribute to the creation of the necessary foundation for the U.S. accession to the 1996 Protocol and, further on, to the Protocol's implementation. Through its International Program Office, NOS would also contribute to the international cooperation efforts towards meeting the objectives of the 1996 Protocol.

Convention for the Conservation of Antarctic Seals

The **Convention for the Conservation of Antarctic Seals** is part of the Antarctic Treaty System. It was signed at the conclusion of a multilateral conference in London on February 11, 1972. [1]

Abbreviated as the "Antarctic Seals" agreement, the convention had the objective to promote and achieve the protection, scientific study, and rational use of Antarctic seals, and to maintain a satisfactory balance within the ecological system of Antarctica. It was opened for ratification on June 1, 1972 and entered into force on March 11, 1978.

The 16 parties to the convention are Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Norway, Poland, Russia, South Africa, United Kingdom, United States. New Zealand has signed, but not ratified the convention.

Biological Weapons Convention

The **Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction** (usually referred to as the **Biological Weapons Convention**, abbreviation: **BWC**, or **Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention**, abbreviation: **BTWC**) was the first multilateral disarmament treaty banning the production of an entire category of weapons.[1]

The Convention was the result of prolonged efforts by the international community to establish a new instrument that would supplement the 1925 Geneva Protocol. The Geneva Protocol prohibited use but not possession or development of chemical and biological weapons.

A draft of the BWC, submitted by the British[2] was opened for signature on April 10, 1972 and entered into force March 26, 1975 when twenty-two governments had deposited their instruments of ratification. It currently commits the 165[3] states that are party to it to prohibit the development, production, and stockpiling of biological and toxin weapons. However, the absence of any formal verification regime to monitor compliance has limited the

effectiveness of the Convention. (Note: As of October 2011, an additional 12 states have signed the BWC but have yet to ratify it)

The scope of the BWC's prohibition is defined in Article 1 (the so-called general purpose criterion). This includes all microbial and other biological agents or toxins and their means of delivery (with exceptions for medical and defensive purposes in small quantities). Subsequent Review Conferences have reaffirmed that the general purpose criterion encompasses all future scientific and technological developments relevant to the Convention. It is not the objects themselves (biological agents or toxins), but rather certain purposes for which they may be employed which are prohibited; similar to Art.II, 1 in the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC). Permitted purposes under the BWC are defined as prophylactic, protective and other peaceful purposes. The objects may not be retained in quantities that have no justification or which are inconsistent with the permitted purposes.

As stated in Article 1 of the BWC:

"Each State Party to this Convention undertakes never in any circumstances to develop, produce, stockpile or otherwise acquire or retain:

- (1) Microbial or other biological agents, or toxins whatever their origin or method of production, of types and in quantities that have no justification for prophylactic, protective or other peaceful purposes;

- (2) Weapons, equipment or means of delivery designed to use such agents or toxins for hostile purposes or in armed conflict."

Summary

- **Article I**: Never under any circumstances to acquire or retain biological weapons.
- **Article II**: To destroy or divert to peaceful purposes biological weapons and associated resources prior to joining.
- **Article III**: Not to transfer, or in any way assist, encourage or induce anyone else to acquire or retain biological weapons.
- **Article IV**: To take any national measures necessary to implement the provisions of the BWC domestically.
- **Article V**: To consult bilaterally and multilaterally to solve any problems with the implementation of the BWC.
- **Article VI**: To request the UN Security Council to investigate alleged breaches of the BWC and to comply with its subsequent decisions.
- **Article VII**: To assist States which have been exposed to a danger as a result of a violation of the BWC.

- **Article X**: To do all of the above in a way that encourages the peaceful uses of biological science and technology.

Basic Treaty, 1972

The **Basic Treaty** (German: Grundlagenvertrag) is the short-hand name for the Treaty concerning the basis of relations between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic (German: Vertrag über die Grundlagen der Beziehungen zwischen der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik). West Germany (FRG) and East Germany (GDR) recognized each other as sovereign states for the first time, an abandonment of West Germany's Hallstein Doctrine in favor of Ostpolitik.

After the entry into force of the Four-Power Agreement from 1971, both states began negotiations over a Basic Treaty. Like the Transit Agreement of 1972, the discussions were led by the Under-Secretaries of State Egon Bahr (for the FRG) and Michael Kohl (for the GDR). As part of the Ostpolitik of Federal Chancellor Willy Brandt, the treaty was signed on December 21, 1972 in East Berlin. It was ratified the next year in West Germany, despite opposition from hard-line conservatives. It came into effect in June 1973.

The signing of the treaty paved the way for both German nations to be recognised by the international community. Diplomatic relations were opened between the German Democratic Republic and:

- Australia (December 1972),
- the United Kingdom, France and the Netherlands (February 1973),
- the Federal Republic of Germany (February 1974) and the United States of America (December 1974).

Both German nations were also admitted to the United Nations on 18 September 1973.

Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty

The **Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty** (**ABM Treaty** or **ABMT**) was a treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union on the limitation of the anti-

ballistic missile (ABM) systems used in defending areas against missile-delivered nuclear weapons.

Signed in 1972, it was in force for the next 30 years until the US unilaterally withdrew from it in June 2002.

Background

Throughout the late 1950s and into the 1960s, the United States and the Soviet Union had been developing a series of missile systems with the ability to shoot down incoming ICBM warheads. During this period the US considered the defense of the US as a part of reducing the overall damage inflicted in a full nuclear exchange. As part of this defense, Canada and the US established the North American Air Defense Command (now called North American Aerospace Defense Command NORAD).

By the early 1960s, US research on the Nike Zeus missile system had developed to the point where small improvements would allow it to be used as the basis of a "real" ABM system. Work started on a short-range, high-speed counterpart known as the Sprint to provide defense for the ABM sites themselves. By the mid-1960s, both systems showed enough promise to start development of base selection for a limited ABM system dubbed **Sentinel**. However, due to political debate, **Sentinel** never expanded beyond defense of missile-bases.

An intense debate broke out in public over the merits of such a system. A number of serious concerns about the technical abilities of the system came to light, many of which reached popular magazines such as Scientific American. This was based on lack of intelligence information and reflected the American nuclear warfare theory and military doctrines. The Soviet doctrine called for development of their own ABM system and return to strategic parity with the US. This was achieved with the operational deployment of the A-35 ABM system and its successors, which remain operational to this day.

As this debate continued, a new development in ICBM technology essentially rendered the points moot. This was the deployment of the Multiple Independently targetable Reentry Vehicle (MIRV) system, allowing a single ICBM to deliver as many as ten separate warheads at a time. This way, any ABM defense system could be overwhelmed with the sheer numbers of warheads. Upgrading it to counter the additional warheads would be economically infeasible—the defenders required one rocket per incoming warhead, whereas the attackers could place 10 warheads on a single missile at a reasonable cost. To further protect against ABM systems, the Soviet MIRV missiles were equipped with electronic countermeasures and heavy decoys. R-

36M heavy missiles were carrying as many as 40 of them.[1] These decoys would appear as warheads to ABM, effectively requiring engagement of 50 times more targets than before and rendering defense even less effective.

At about the same time, the USSR reached strategic parity with the US in terms of ICBM forces. A nuclear war would no longer be a favorable exchange for the US, as both countries would be devastated. This led in the West to the concept of mutually assured destruction, **MAD**, in which any changes to the strategic balance had to be carefully weighed. To the U.S., ABMs now seemed far too risky—it was better to have no defense than one that might trigger a war.

ABM Treaty

As relations between the US and USSR warmed in the later years of the 1960s, the US first proposed an ABM treaty in 1967. This proposal was rejected. Following the proposal of the Sentinel and Safeguard decisions on American ABM systems, the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks began in November 1969 (SALT I). By 1972 an agreement had been reached to limit strategic defensive systems. Each country was allowed two sites at which it could base a defensive system, one for the capital and one for ICBM silos (Art. III).

The treaty was signed in Moscow on May 26, 1972 by the President of the United States, Richard Nixon and the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Leonid Brezhnev; and ratified by the US Senate on August 3, 1972.

The 1974 Protocol reduced the number of sites to one per party, largely because neither country had developed a second site.[2] The sites were Moscow for the USSR and Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, since its Safeguard facility was already under construction, for the US.

It was seen by many in the West as a key piece in nuclear arms control, being an implicit recognition of the need to protect the nuclear balance by ensuring neither side could hope to reduce the effects of retaliation to acceptable levels.

In the East, however, it was seen as a way to avoid having to maintain an anti-missile technology race at the same time as maintaining a missile race.[citation needed]

For many years the ABM Treaty was, in the West, considered one of the landmarks in arms limitations. It was perceived as requiring two enemies to agree not to deploy a potentially useful weapon, deliberately to maintain the balance of power and as such, was also taken as confirmation of the Soviet adherence to the MAD doctrine.

Missiles limited by the treaty

The Treaty limited only ABMs capable of defending against "strategic ballistic missiles", without attempting to define "strategic". It was understood that both ICBMs and SLBMs are obviously "strategic".[3] Both countries did not intend to stop the development of counter-tactical ABMs. The topic became disputable as soon as most potent counter-tactical ABMs started to be capable of shooting down SLBMs (SLBMs naturally tend to be much slower than ICBMs), nevertheless both sides continued counter-tactical ABM development.[3]

After the SDI announcement

The treaty was undisturbed until Ronald Reagan announced his Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) on March 23, 1983. On the one hand, Reagan stated that SDI was "consistent with... the ABM Treaty", but on the other hand, he viewed it as a defensive system that would help reduce the possibility that mutual assured destruction (MAD) would become reality; he even suggested that the Soviets would be given access to the SDI technology. Nevertheless, SDI was against the spirit—if not the letter—of the ABM Treaty, which sought to pursue the principle of MAD.

The project was a blow to Yuri Andropov's so-called "peace offensive". Andropov said that "It is time they [Washington] stopped... search[ing] for the best ways of unleashing nuclear war... Engaging in this is not just irresponsible. It is insane".[4]

SDI research went ahead, although it did not achieve the hoped-for result. SDI research was cut back following the end of Reagan's presidency, and in 1995 it was reiterated in a presidential joint statement that "missile defense systems may be deployed... [that] will not pose a realistic threat to the strategic nuclear force of the other side and will not be tested to... [create] that capability." This was reaffirmed in 1997.

Regardless of the opposition, Reagan gave every indication that SDI would not be used as a bargaining chip and that the United States would do all in its power to build the system. The Soviets were threatened because the Americans might have been able to make a nuclear first strike possible. The Nuclear Predicament explains that one of the central goals of Soviet diplomacy was to terminate SDI. A surprise attack from the Americans would destroy much of the Soviet ICBM fleet, allowing SDI to defeat a “ragged” Soviet retaliatory response. Furthermore, if the Soviets chose to enter this new arms race, they would further cripple their economy. The Soviets could not afford to ignore Reagan’s new endeavor, therefore they had to enter negotiations with the Americans.[5]

US withdrawal

After the dissolution of the Soviet Union in December 1991 the status of the treaty became unclear, debated by members of Congress and professors of law.[6][7][8] In 1997, a memorandum of understanding[9] between the US and four of the former USSR states was signed and subject to ratification by each signatory, but it was not presented to the US Senate for advice and consent by Bill Clinton.

On December 13, 2001, George W. Bush gave Russia notice of the United States' withdrawal from the treaty, in accordance with the clause that required six months' notice before terminating the pact—the first time in recent history that the United States has withdrawn from a major international arms treaty. This led to the eventual creation of the American Missile Defense Agency.[10]

Supporters of the withdrawal argued that it was a necessity in order to test and build a limited National Missile Defense to protect the United States from nuclear blackmail by a rogue state. The withdrawal had many critics as well as supporters. John Rhinelander, a negotiator of the ABM treaty, predicted that the withdrawal would be a "fatal blow" to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and would lead to a "world without effective legal constraints on nuclear proliferation." The construction of a missile defense system was also feared to enable the US to attack with a nuclear first strike.

Reaction to the withdrawal by both the Russian Federation and the People's Republic of China was much milder than many had predicted[dubious – discuss], following months of discussion with both Russia and China aimed at convincing both that development of a National Missile Defense was not directed at them. In the case of Russia, the United States stated that it intended to discuss a bilateral reduction in the numbers of nuclear warheads, which would allow Russia to reduce its spending on missiles without decrease of comparative strength. Discussions led to the signing of the Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty in Moscow on May 24, 2002. This treaty mandates cuts in deployed strategic nuclear warheads, but without actually mandating cuts to total stockpiled warheads, and without any mechanism for enforcement.

The American Missile Defense Agency started a no AMD treaty with Russia, Europe and the USA in July 2003. There was much dispute about the questionability of the reason why there was another AMD treaty when one had failed not many years before. There were union conferences about this matter held in August 2009 which reached the conclusion to keep the treaty until pending investigation.

Addis Ababa Agreement (1972)

The **Addis Ababa Agreement**, also known as the Addis Ababa Accord, was a set of compromises within a 1972 treaty that ended the First Sudanese Civil War (1955–1972) fighting in Sudan. [1] The Addis Ababa accords were incorporated in the Constitution of Sudan.

Indo-Soviet Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation

The **Indo–Soviet Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation** was a treaty signed between India and the Soviet Union in August 1971 that specified mutual strategic cooperation. The treaty was a significant deviation from India's previous position of Non-alignment in the Cold War[1] and in the prelude to the Bangladesh war, it was a key development in a situation of increasing Sino-American ties and American pressure.[2][3] The treaty was later adopted to the Indo-Bangladesh Treaty of Friendship and cooperation in 1972.[4]

Seabed Arms Control Treaty

The **Seabed Arms Control Treaty** (or **Seabed Treaty**) is a multilateral agreement between the United States, Soviet Union, United Kingdom, and 84 other countries banning the emplacement of nuclear weapons or "weapons of mass destruction" on the ocean floor beyond a 12-mile (22.2 km) coastal zone. It allows signatories to observe all seabed "activities" of any other signatory beyond the 12-mile zone in order to ensure compliance.

The full name of the treaty is the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof.

Like the Antarctic Treaty, the Outer Space Treaty, and the Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone treaties, the Seabed Arms Control Treaty sought to prevent the introduction of international conflict and nuclear weapons into an area hitherto free of them. Reaching agreement on the seabed, however, involved problems not met in framing the other two agreements.

In the 1960s, advances in the technology of oceanography and greatly increased interest in the vast and virtually untapped resources of the ocean floor led to concern that the absence of clearly established rules of law might lead to strife. And there were concurrent fears that nations might use the seabed as a new environment for military installations, including those capable of launching nuclear weapons.

In keeping with a proposal submitted to the U.N. Secretary General by Ambassador Pardo of Malta in August 1967, the U.N. General Assembly, on December 18, 1967, established an ad hoc committee to study ways of reserving the seabed for peaceful purposes, with the objective of ensuring "that the exploration and use of the seabed and the ocean floor should be conducted in accordance with the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations, in the interests of maintaining international peace and security and for the benefit of all mankind." The Committee was given permanent status the following year. At the same time, seabed-related military and arms control issues were referred to the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament (ENDC) and its successor, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD). In a message of March 18, 1969, President Nixon said the American delegation to the ENDC should seek discussion of the factors necessary for an international agreement prohibiting the emplacement of weapons of mass destruction on the seabed and ocean floor and pointed out that an agreement of this kind would, like the Antarctic and Outer Space treaties, "prevent an arms race before it has a chance to start."

The Seabed Arms Control Treaty was opened for signature in Washington, London, and Moscow on February 11, 1971. It entered into force May 18, 1972, when the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and more than 22 nations had deposited instruments of ratification.

Strasbourg Agreement Concerning the International Patent Classification

The **Strasbourg Agreement Concerning the International Patent Classification** (or **IPC**), also known as the **IPC Agreement**, was signed in Strasbourg, France, on March 24, 1971 and entered into force on October 7, 1975. It establishes a common classification for patents for invention, inventors' certificates, utility models and utility certificates, known as the "International Patent Classification" (IPC). [1] The Agreement was amended on September 28, 1979.

States party to the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property (1883) may become party to the Strasbourg Agreement.[2] As of September 2009, there were 61 contracting parties to the Strasbourg Agreement.[3] The Agreement will enter into force for Serbia, the 61st Contracting State, on July 15, 2010.[3] The Holy See, the Islamic Republic of Iran and Liechtenstein signed the Agreement in 1971 [4] but have not (or not yet) ratified it.[3]

Ramsar Convention

The **Ramsar Convention** (**The Convention on Wetlands of International Importance, especially as Waterfowl Habitat**) is an international treaty for the conservation and sustainable utilization of wetlands,[1] i.e., to stem the progressive encroachment on and loss of wetlands now and in the future, recognizing the fundamental ecological functions of wetlands and their economic, cultural, scientific, and recreational value. It is named after the town of Ramsar in Iran.

Convention

The convention was developed and adopted by participating nations at a meeting in Ramsar, Mazandaran, Iran on February 2, 1971, hosted by the Iranian Department of Environment, and came into force on December, 21 1975.

The Ramsar List of Wetlands of International Importance now includes 1,950 sites (known as Ramsar Sites) covering around 1,900,000 km^2 (730,000 sq mi),[1] up from 1,021 sites in 2000. The nation with the highest number of sites is the United Kingdom at 168; the nation with the greatest area of listed wetlands is Canada, with over 130,000 km^2 (50,000 sq mi), including the Queen Maud Gulf Migratory Bird Sanctuary at 62,800 km^2 (24,200 sq mi).[2]

Presently there are 161 contracting parties, up from 119 in 1999 and from 21 initial signatory nations in 1971. Signatories meet every three years as the Conference of the Contracting Parties (COP), the first held in Cagliari, Italy in 1981. Amendments to the original convention have been agreed to in Paris (in 1982) and Regina (in 1987).[3]

There is a standing committee, a scientific review panel, and a secretariat. The headquarters is located in Gland, Switzerland, shared with the IUCN.

International Organization Partners

The Ramsar Convention works closely with five other organisations known as International Organization Partners (IOPs). These are Birdlife International, the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), the International Water Management Institute (IWMI), Wetlands International and WWF International. These support the work of the Convention by providing expert technical advice, helping implement field studies and providing financial support. The IOPs also participate regularly as observers in all meetings of the Conference of the Parties and as full members of the Scientific and Technical Review Panel. For example, at the 2008 Convention of Parties, IWMI scientists contributed directly to a number of resolutions including those relating to wetlands' links to human health, biofuels, poverty reduction, biogeographic regionalization and biodiversity in rice paddies.

Five Power Defence Arrangements

The **Five Power Defence Arrangements** (**FPDA**) are a series of defence relationships established by a series of bilateral agreements between the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, Malaysia and Singapore signed in 1971, whereby the five states will consult each other in the event of external aggression or threat of attack against Peninsular Malaysia (East Malaysia is not included as part of the area of responsibilities under the FPDA) or Singapore.

The FPDA was set up following the termination of the United Kingdom's defence guarantees of Malaysia and Singapore (Anglo-Malayan Defence Agreement as a result of Britain's decision in 1967 to withdraw its armed forces east of Suez. The FPDA provides for defence co-operation, and for an Integrated Air Defence System (IADS) for Malaysia and Singapore based in RMAF Butterworth under the command of an Australian Air Vice-Marshal (2-star). RMAF Butterworth, until 1988 under the control of the Royal Australian Air Force, is now owned by the Royal Malaysian Air Force, but hosts rotating detachments of aircraft and personnel from all five countries.

In 1981, the five powers organised the first annual land and naval exercises. Since 1997, the naval and air exercises have been combined. In 2001, HQ IADS was redesignated Headquarters Integrated "Area" Defence System. It now has personnel from all three branches of the armed services, and co-ordinates the annual five-power naval and air exercises, while moving towards the fuller integration of land elements.

John Moore, then Minister for Defence of Australia said, "As an established multilateral security framework, the FPDA has a unique role in Asia. It is of strategic benefit to all member nations and, in Australia's view, to the wider Asia-Pacific region."[1]

40th Anniversary

On 1 November 2011, Singapore hosted FPDA's 40th anniversary celebrations, with the defence ministers, aircraft and servicemen from all five signatory countries converging on Changi Air Base (East) to participate in the event. Later, a gala dinner was hosted by Singapore's defence minister - Dr Ng Eng Hen at Singapore's Istana whereupon they called on the Prime Minister of Singapore - Mr Lee Hsien Loong to discuss a multitude of issues. Codenamed Exercise Bersama Lima, the three days joint exercise is expected to test the readiness and cooperation between all participating countries and should conclude on 4 November 2011.[2]

Convention on Psychotropic Substances

The **Convention on Psychotropic Substances** of 1971 is a United Nations treaty designed to control psychoactive drugs such as amphetamines, barbiturates, benzodiazepines, and psychedelics signed at Vienna on February 21, 1971. The Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961 could not ban the many newly discovered psychotropics, since its scope was limited to drugs with cannabis-, coca-, and opium-like effects.

During the 1960s such drugs became widely available, and government authorities opposed this for numerous reasons, arguing that along with negative health effects, drug use led to lowered moral standards. The Convention, which contains import and export restrictions and other rules aimed at limiting drug use to scientific and medical purposes, came into force on August 16, 1976. Today, 175 nations are Parties to the treaty. Many laws have been passed to implement the Convention, including the U.S. Psychotropic Substances Act, the UK Misuse of Drugs Act 1971, and the Canadian Controlled Drugs and Substances Act. Adolf Lande, under the direction of the United Nations Office of Legal Affairs, prepared the Commentary on the Convention on Psychotropic Substances. The Commentary, published in 1976, is an invaluable aid to interpreting the treaty and constitutes a key part of its legislative history.

Provisions to end the international trafficking of drugs covered by this Convention are contained in the United Nations Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances. This treaty, signed in

1988, regulates precursor chemicals to drugs controlled by the Single Convention and the Convention on Psychotropic Substances. It also strengthens provisions against money laundering and other drug-related crimes.

Treaty of Warsaw (1970)

The **Treaty of Warsaw** (German: Warschauer Vertrag) was a treaty between West Germany (Federal Republic of Germany) and the People's Republic of Poland. It was signed by Chancellor Willy Brandt and Prime Minister Józef Cyrankiewicz at the Presidential Palace on 7 December 1970, and it was ratified by the German Bundestag on 17 May 1972.

In the treaty, both sides committed themselves to nonviolence and accepted the existing border—the Oder-Neisse line, imposed on Germany by the Allied powers at the 1945 Potsdam Conference following the end of World War II. This had been a quite sensitive topic since then, as Poland was concerned that a German government might seek to reclaim some of the former eastern territories. From the Polish perspective, the transfer of these regions was considered to be a compensation for the former Polish territory east of the Curzon Line ("Kresy"), which had been annexed by the Soviet Union in 1939.

In West Germany, Brandt was heavily criticized by the conservative CDU/CSU opposition, who marked his policy as a betrayal of national interests. At the time the treaty was signed, it was not seen as the last word on the Polish border in West Germany,[1] because Article IV of this treaty stated that previous treaties like the Potsdam Agreement were **not** superseded by this latest agreement, so the provisions of this treaty could be changed by a final peace treaty between Germany and the Allies of World War II—as provided for in the Potsdam Agreement.[1]

The Treaty of Warsaw was an important element of the Ostpolitik, put forward by Chancellor Brandt and supported by his ruling Social Democratic Party of Germany. In the aftermath of the 1990 Treaty on the Final Settlement with Respect to Germany, the Oder-Neisse line was reaffirmed without any reservation with the German-Polish Border Treaty, signed on 14 November 1990 by re-united Germany and Poland.

Boundary Treaty of 1970

The **1970 Boundary Treaty** between the United States and Mexico settled all then pending boundary disputes and uncertainties related to the Rio Grande (Río Bravo del Norte) border. The most significant dispute remaining after the Chamizal Settlement in 1963 involved the location of the boundary in the area of Presidio, Texas, and Ojinaga, Chihuahua. The river channel was jointly relocated to approximate conditions existing prior to the dispute which arose from changes in the course of the river in 1907. The International Boundary and Water Commission was charged with its implementation. The American-Mexican Treaty Act of October 25, 1972 authorized the United States Section's participation. The project was undertaken in 1975 and completed in 1977.

The river was relocated in two reaches by construction of a new channel 4.7 miles (8 km) in length in one reach and 3.6 miles (6 km) in the other. The relocated channel was aligned in the reach above Presidio-Ojinaga so as to transfer from north to the south side of the river 1,606.19 acres (650.00 ha) and in the second reach downstream from the two cities so as to transfer from the south to the north side 252 acres (102 ha). It is an earth channel with dimensions patterned after the natural channel. The United States acquired 1,969.22 acres (796.92 ha) of agricultural land for transfer of lands to Mexico and for half of the river relocation.

Also, the channel of the Rio Grande in the Hidalgo–Reynosa area was relocated to transfer from Mexico to the United States 481.68 acres (1.9493 km^2) by constructing a new earth channel 1.6 miles (3 km) in length. This transfer was made in exchange for the transfer from the United States to Mexico of two tracts of land, the Horcon Tract and Beaver Island (Isla Morteritos), located south of the Rio Grande, comprising 481.68 acres (194.93 ha).

The total costs of these two relocations were equally shared by the two governments, with the United States performing the greater part of the work required in the Presidio-Ojinaga area, and Mexico performing the work required in the Hidalgo-Reynosa area and a small part of the work required in the Presidio-Ojinaga area.

The final provision of the treaty transferred the city of Rio Rico, Tamaulipas to Mexico.

Patent Cooperation Treaty

The **Patent Cooperation Treaty** (**PCT**) is an international patent law treaty, concluded in 1970. It provides a unified procedure for filing patent applications

to protect inventions in each of its contracting states. A patent application filed under the PCT is called an **international application**, or **PCT application**.

A single filing of an international application is made with a Receiving Office (RO) in one language. It then results in a search performed by an International Searching Authority (ISA), accompanied by a written opinion regarding the patentability of the invention, which is the subject of the application. It is optionally followed by a preliminary examination, performed by an International Preliminary Examining Authority (IPEA).[1] Finally, the relevant national or regional authorities administer matters related to the examination of application (if provided by national law) and issuance of patent.

A PCT application does not itself result in the grant of a patent, since there is no such thing as an "international patent", and the grant of patent is a prerogative of each national or regional authority.[2] In other words, a PCT application must be followed up with the step of entering into national or regional phases in order to proceed towards grant of one or more patents. The PCT procedure essentially leads to a standard national or regional patent application, which may be granted or rejected according to applicable law, in each jurisdiction in which a patent is desired. However, although a PCT application is not a request for a patent, if it is followed up with requests for (national) patents, in most countries the filing date for requests is considered to be the PCT application's publication date.[3]

The contracting states,[4] the states which are parties to the PCT, constitute the **International Patent Cooperation Union**.[4]

Arusha Agreement

The **Arusha Agreement** was a treaty signed on September 24, 1969 in Arusha, Tanzania, between the European Community and the three East African states of Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania. The agreement entered into force on January 1, 1971, concomitant with the second Yaoundé Convention, with the aim of establishing better economic relations between the EC and the African states. At the end of their validity time, the Lomé Convention was signed which substituted the previous agreements and enlarged them to 46 ACP countries.[1]

Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties

The **Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties** (or **VCLT**) is a treaty concerning the international law on treaties between states. It was adopted on 22 May 1969[2] and opened for signature on 23 May 1969.[1] The Convention entered into force on 27 January 1980.[1] The VCLT has been ratified by 111 states as of November 2010.[3] Some countries that have not ratified the Convention recognize it as a restatement of customary law and binding upon them as such.

History

The VCLT was drafted by the International Law Commission (ILC) of the United Nations, which began work on the Convention in 1949.[2] During the twenty years of preparation, several draft versions of the convention and commentaries were prepared by special rapporteurs of the ILC.[2] James Brierly, Sir Hersch Lauterpacht, Sir Gerald Fitzmaurice and Sir Humphrey Waldock were the four special rapporteurs.[2] In 1966, the ILC adopted 75 draft articles which formed the basis for the final work.[4] Over two sessions in 1968 and 1969, the Vienna Conference completed the Convention, which was adopted on 22 May 1969 and opened for signature the following day.[2][4]

Content and effects

The Convention codifies several bedrocks of contemporary international law. It defines a treaty as "an international agreement concluded between states in written form and governed by international law," as well as affirming that "every state possesses the capacity to conclude treaties." Most nations, whether they are party to it or not, recognize it as the preeminent "Treaty of Treaties"; it is widely recognized as the authoritative guide vis-à-vis the formation and effects of treaties.

Scope

The scope of the Convention is limited. It applies only to treaties concluded between states, so it does not cover agreements between states and international organizations or between international organizations themselves, though if any of its rules are independently binding on such organizations, they remain so.[5] It does apply, however, to treaties between states within an intergovernmental organization.[6] Agreements between states and international organizations, or between international organizations themselves, will be governed by the 1986 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties between States and International Organizations or Between International Organizations if it ever enters into

force. Also, in treaties between states and international organizations, the terms of the Convention still apply between the state members.[5] The Convention does not apply to agreements not in written form.[5]

Vienna formula

International treaties and conventions contain rules about what entities could sign, ratify or accede to them. Some treaties are restricted to states members of the UN or parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice. In rare cases there is an explicit list of the entities that the treaty is restricted to. More commonly the aim of the founding signatories is that the treaty is not restricted to particular states only and so a wording like "this treaty is open for signature to States willing to accept its provisions" is used (the so-called "All States formula"[8]).

When a treaty is open to "States", for the depositary authority[9] it is difficult or impossible to determine which entities are States. If the treaty is restricted to Members of the United Nations or Parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice, there is no ambiguity. However, a difficulty has occurred as to possible participation in treaties when entities which appeared otherwise to be States could not be admitted to the United Nations, nor become Parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice owing to the opposition, for political reasons, of a permanent member of the Security Council or haven't applied for ICJ or UN membership. Since that difficulty did not arise as concerns membership in the specialized agencies, where there is no "veto" procedure, a number of those States became members of specialized agencies, and as such were in essence recognized as States by the international community. Accordingly, and in order to allow for as wide a participation as possible, a number of conventions then provided that they were also open for participation to States members of specialized agencies. The type of entry-into-force clause utilized in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties was later called the "Vienna formula" and its wording was utilized by various treaties, conventions and organizations.[10]

Some treaties that utilize it include provisions that in addition to these States any other State invited by a specified authority or organization (commonly the UNGA or an institution created by the treaty in question) can also participate, thus making the scope of potential signatories even broader.

Treaty "pillars"

The NPT is commonly described as having three main "pillars": non-proliferation, disarmament, and peaceful use.[6] This "pillars" concept has been questioned by some who believe that the NPT is, as its name suggests, principally about nonproliferation, and who worry that "three pillars" language misleadingly implies that the three elements have equivalent importance.[7][dead link]

First pillar: non-proliferation

Five states are recognized by the Non-Proliferation Treaty as nuclear weapon states (NWS): China (signed 1992), France (1992), the Soviet Union (1968; obligations and rights now assumed by the Russian Federation), the United Kingdom (1968), and the United States (1968) (The United States, UK, and the Soviet Union were the only states openly possessing such weapons among the original ratifiers of the treaty, which entered into force in 1970). These five nations are also the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council. These five NWS agree not to transfer "nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices" and "not in any way to assist, encourage, or induce" a non-nuclear weapon state (NNWS) to acquire nuclear weapons (Article I). NNWS parties to the NPT agree not to "receive," "manufacture" or "acquire" nuclear weapons or to "seek or receive any assistance in the manufacture of nuclear weapons" (Article II). NNWS parties also agree to accept safeguards by the **International Atomic Energy Agency** (IAEA) to verify that they are not diverting nuclear energy from peaceful uses to nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices (Article III).

The five NWS parties have made undertakings not to use their nuclear weapons against a non-NWS party except in response to a nuclear attack, or a conventional attack in alliance with a Nuclear Weapons State. However, these undertakings have not been incorporated formally into the treaty, and the exact details have varied over time. The U.S. also had nuclear warheads targeted at North Korea, a non-NWS, from 1959 until 1991. The previous United Kingdom Secretary of State for Defence, Geoff Hoon, has also explicitly invoked the possibility of the use of the country's nuclear weapons in response to a non-conventional attack by "rogue states".[8] In January 2006, President Jacques Chirac of France indicated that an incident of state-sponsored terrorism on France could trigger a small-scale nuclear retaliation aimed at destroying the "rogue state's" power centers.[9][10]

Second pillar: disarmament

Article VI of the NPT represents the only binding commitment in a multilateral treaty to the goal of disarmament by the nuclear-weapon States. The NPT's preamble contains language affirming the desire of treaty signatories to ease international tension and strengthen international trust so as to create someday the conditions for a halt to the production of nuclear weapons, and treaty on general and complete disarmament that liquidates, in particular, nuclear weapons and their delivery vehicles from national arsenals.

The wording of the NPT's Article VI arguably imposes only a vague obligation on all NPT signatories to move in the general direction of nuclear and total disarmament, saying, "Each of the Parties to the Treaty undertakes to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, and on a treaty on general and complete disarmament."[11] Under this interpretation, Article VI does not strictly require all signatories to actually conclude a disarmament treaty. Rather, it only requires them "to negotiate in good faith."[12]

On the other hand, some governments, especially non-nuclear-weapon states belonging to the Non-Aligned Movement, have interpreted Article VI's language as being anything but vague. In their view, Article VI constitutes a formal and specific obligation on the NPT-recognized nuclear-weapon states to disarm themselves of nuclear weapons, and argue that these states have failed to meet their obligation.[citation needed] The International Court of Justice (ICJ), in its advisory opinion on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons, issued 8 July 1996, unanimously interprets the text of Article VI as implying that

"There exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control."

The ICJ opinion notes that this obligation involves all NPT parties (not just the nuclear weapon states) and does not suggest a specific time frame for nuclear disarmament.[13]

Critics of the NPT-recognized nuclear-weapon states[who?] sometimes argue that what they view as the failure of the NPT-recognized nuclear weapon states to disarm themselves of nuclear weapons, especially in the post–Cold War era, has angered some non-nuclear-weapon NPT signatories of the NPT. Such failure, these critics add, provides justification for the non-nuclear-weapon signatories to quit the NPT and develop their own nuclear arsenals. [14]

Other observers have suggested that the linkage between proliferation and disarmament may also work the other way, i.e., that the failure to resolve proliferation threats in Iran and North Korea, for instance, will cripple the prospects for disarmament.[citation needed] No current nuclear weapons state, the argument goes, would seriously consider eliminating its last nuclear weapons without high confidence that other countries would not acquire them. Some observers have even suggested that the very progress of disarmament by the superpowers—which has led to the elimination of thousands of weapons and delivery systems[15]—could eventually make the possession of nuclear weapons more attractive by increasing the perceived strategic value of a small arsenal. As one U.S. official and NPT expert warned in 2007, "logic suggests that as the number of nuclear weapons decreases, the 'marginal utility' of a nuclear weapon as an instrument of military power increases. At the extreme, which it is precisely disarmament's hope to create, the strategic utility of even one or two nuclear weapons would be huge."[16]

Third pillar: peaceful use of nuclear energy

The third pillar allows for and agrees upon the transfer of nuclear technology and materials to NPT signatory countries for the development of civilian nuclear energy programs in those countries, as long as they can demonstrate that their nuclear programs are not being used for the development of nuclear weapons.

Since very few of the states with nuclear energy programs are willing to abandon the use of nuclear energy, the third pillar of the NPT under Article IV provides other states with the possibility to do the same, but under conditions intended to make it difficult to develop nuclear weapons.

The treaty recognizes the inalienable right of sovereign states to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, but restricts this right for NPT parties to be exercised "in conformity with Articles I and II" (the basic nonproliferation obligations that constitute the "first pillar" of the Treaty). As the commercially popular light water reactor nuclear power station uses enriched uranium fuel, it follows that states must be able either to enrich uranium or purchase it on an international market. Mohamed ElBaradei, then Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency, has called the spread of enrichment and reprocessing capabilities the "Achilles' heel" of the nuclear nonproliferation regime. As of 2007 13 states have an enrichment capability.[17] Because the availability of fissile material has long been considered the principal obstacle to, and "pacing element" for, a country's nuclear weapons development effort, it was declared a major emphasis of U.S. policy in 2004 to prevent the further spread of uranium enrichment and plutonium reprocessing (a.k.a. "ENR")

technology.[18] Countries possessing ENR capabilities, it is feared, have what is in effect the option of using this capability to produce fissile material for weapons use on demand, thus giving them what has been termed a "virtual" nuclear weapons program. The degree to which NPT members have a "right" to ENR technology notwithstanding its potentially grave proliferation implications, therefore, is at the cutting edge of policy and legal debates surrounding the meaning of Article IV and its relation to Articles I, II, and III of the Treaty.

Countries that have signed the treaty as Non-Nuclear Weapons States and maintained that status have an unbroken record of not building nuclear weapons. However, Iraq was cited by the IAEA with punitive sanctions enacted against it by the UN Security Council for violating its NPT safeguards obligations; North Korea never came into compliance with its NPT safeguards agreement and was cited repeatedly for these violations,[19] and later withdrew from the NPT and tested multiple nuclear devices; Iran was found in non-compliance with its NPT safeguards obligations in an unusual non-consensus decision because it "failed in a number of instances over an extended period of time" to report aspects of its enrichment program;[20][21] and Libya pursued a clandestine nuclear weapons program before abandoning it in December 2003. In 1991 Romania reported previously undeclared nuclear activities by the former regime and the IAEA reported this non-compliance to the Security Council for information only. In some regions, the fact that all neighbors are verifiably free of nuclear weapons reduces any pressure individual states might feel to build those weapons themselves, even if neighbors are known to have peaceful nuclear energy programs that might otherwise be suspicious. In this, the treaty works as designed.

In 2004, Mohamed ElBaradei said that by some estimates thirty-five to forty states could have the knowledge to develop nuclear weapons.[22]

Key articles

Article I:[23] Each nuclear-weapons state (NWS) undertakes not to transfer, to any recipient, nuclear weapons, or other nuclear explosive devices, and not to assist any non-nuclear weapon state to manufacture or acquire such weapons or devices.

Article II: Each non-NWS party undertakes not to receive, from any source, nuclear weapons, or other nuclear explosive devices; not to manufacture or acquire such weapons or devices; and not to receive any assistance in their manufacture.

Article III: Each non-NWS party undertakes to conclude an agreement with the IAEA for the application of its safeguards to all nuclear material in all of the state's peaceful nuclear activities and to prevent diversion of such material to nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices.

Article IV: 1. Nothing in this Treaty shall be interpreted as affecting the inalienable right of all the Parties to the Treaty to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination and in conformity with Articles I and II of this Treaty.

2. All the Parties to the Treaty undertake to facilitate, and have the right to participate in, the fullest possible exchange of equipment, materials and scientific and technological information for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Parties to the Treaty in a position to do so shall also co-operate in contributing alone or together with other States or international organizations to the further development of the applications of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, especially in the territories of non-nuclear-weapon States Party to the Treaty, with due consideration for the needs of the developing areas of the world.

Article VI: The states undertake to pursue "negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament", and towards a "Treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control".

Article X. Establishes the right to withdraw from the Treaty giving 3 months' notice. It also establishes the duration of the Treaty (25 years before 1995 Extension Initiative).

Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons

The **Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons**, commonly known as the **Non-Proliferation Treaty** or **NPT**, is a landmark international treaty whose objective is to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and weapons technology, to promote cooperation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and to further the goal of achieving nuclear disarmament and general and complete disarmament. Opened for signature in 1968, the Treaty entered into force in 1970. On 11 May 1995, the Treaty was extended indefinitely. A total of 190 parties have joined the Treaty, including the five nuclear-weapon States: the United States, Russia, the United Kingdom, France, and China (also the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council). More countries have ratified the NPT than any other arms limitation and disarmament agreement, a testament to the Treaty's significance.[1] Four non-parties to the

treaty are known or believed to possess nuclear weapons: India, Pakistan and North Korea have openly tested and declared that they possess nuclear weapons, while Israel has had a policy of opacity regarding its own nuclear weapons program. North Korea acceded to the treaty in 1985, but never came into compliance, and announced its withdrawal in 2003.

The NPT consists of a preamble and eleven articles. Although the concept of "pillars" is not expressed anywhere in the NPT, the treaty is nevertheless sometimes interpreted as a three-pillar system, with an implicit balance among them:

1. non-proliferation,
2. disarmament, and
3. the right to peacefully use nuclear technology.[2]

The NPT is often seen to be based on a central bargain: "the NPT non-nuclear-weapon states agree never to acquire nuclear weapons and the NPT nuclear-weapon states in exchange agree to share the benefits of peaceful nuclear technology and to pursue nuclear disarmament aimed at the ultimate elimination of their nuclear arsenals".[3] The treaty is reviewed every five years in meetings called Review Conferences of the Parties to the Treaty of Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Even though the treaty was originally conceived with a limited duration of 25 years, the signing parties decided, by consensus, to extend the treaty indefinitely and without conditions during the Review Conference in New York City on May 11, 1995.

At the time the NPT was proposed, there were predictions of 25-30 nuclear weapon states within 20 years. Instead, over forty years later, only four states are not parties to the NPT, and they are the only additional states believed to possess nuclear weapons.[3] Several additional measures have been adopted to strengthen the NPT and the broader nuclear nonproliferation regime and make it difficult for states to acquire the capability to produce nuclear weapons, including the export controls of the Nuclear Suppliers Group and the enhanced verification measures of the IAEA Additional Protocol. However, critics argue that the NPT cannot stop the proliferation of nuclear weapons or the motivation to acquire them. They express disappointment with the limited progress on nuclear disarmament, where the five authorized nuclear weapons states still have 22,000 warheads in their combined stockpile and have shown a reluctance to disarm further.[dubious – discuss] Several high-ranking officials within the United Nations have said that they can do little to stop states using nuclear reactors to produce nuclear weapons.

Outer Space Treaty

The **Outer Space Treaty**, formally the **Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies**, is a treaty that forms the basis of international space law. The treaty was opened for signature in the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union on January 27, 1967, and entered into force on October 10, 1967. As of October 2011, 100 countries are states parties to the treaty, while another 26 have signed the treaty but have not completed ratification.[1]

Key points

The Outer Space Treaty represents the basic legal framework of international space law. Among its principles, it bars States Parties to the Treaty from placing nuclear weapons or any other weapons of mass destruction in orbit of Earth, installing them on the Moon or any other celestial body, or to otherwise station them in outer space. It exclusively limits the use of the Moon and other celestial bodies to peaceful purposes and expressly prohibits their use for testing weapons of any kind, conducting military maneuvers, or establishing military bases, installations, and fortifications (Art.IV). However, the Treaty does not prohibit the placement of conventional weapons in orbit. The treaty also states that the exploration of outer space shall be done to benefit all countries and shall be free for exploration and use by all the States.

The treaty explicitly forbids any government from claiming a celestial resource such as the Moon or a planet, claiming that they are the Common heritage of mankind.[2] Art. II of the Treaty states that "outer space, including the Moon and other celestial bodies, is not subject to national appropriation by claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means". However, the State that launches a space object retains jurisdiction and control over that object.[3] The State is also liable for damages caused by their space object and must avoid contaminating space and celestial bodies.[4]

Responsibility for activities in space

Article VI of the Outer Space Treaty deals with international responsibility, stating that "the activities of non-governmental entities in outer space, including the Moon and other celestial bodies, shall require authorization and continuing supervision by the appropriate State Party to the Treaty" and that States Parties shall bear international responsibility for national space activities whether carried out by governmental or non-governmental entities.

As a result of discussions arising from Project West Ford in 1963, a consultation clause was included in Article IX of the Outer Space Treaty: "A State Party to the Treaty which has reason to believe that an activity or experiment planned by another State Party in outer space, including the Moon and other celestial bodies, would cause potentially harmful interference with activities in the peaceful exploration and use of outer space, including the Moon and other celestial bodies, may request consultation concerning the activity or experiment.

Convention Establishing the World Intellectual Property Organization

The **Convention Establishing the World Intellectual Property Organization**, or **WIPO Convention**, was signed at Stockholm, Sweden, on July 14, 1967 and entered into force on April 26, 1970. As its name suggests, it established the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). [1] WIPO Convention has 184 Contracting Parties. [2] The Convention is written in English, French, Russian and Spanish, all texts being equally authentic. [3] The Convention was amended on September 28, 1979.

ASEAN Declaration

ASEAN Declaration or **Bangkok Declaration** is the founding document of Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). It was signed in Bangkok on August 8, 1967 by the five ASEAN founding members - Indonesia, Singapore, Philippines, Malaysia and Thailand as a display of solidarity against Communist expansion in Vietnam and communist insurgency within their own borders (nowadays the ASEAN is also home to communist Southeast Asian states after they joined the organization). It states the basic principles of ASEAN such as cooperation, amity and non-interference.[1] The date is now celebrated as **ASEAN Day**.[2]

Treaty of Tlatelolco

The **Treaty of Tlatelolco** is the conventional name given to the **Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean**. It is

embodied in **the OPANAL** (Spanish: el Organismo para la Proscripción de las Armas Nucleares en la América Latina y el Caribe, English: the Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean).

Provisions

Under the treaty, the states parties agree to prohibit and prevent the "testing, use, manufacture, production or acquisition by any means whatsoever of any nuclear weapons" and the "receipt, storage, installation, deployment and any form of possession of any nuclear weapons."

There are two additional protocols to the treaty: Protocol I binds those overseas countries with territories in the region (the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and the Netherlands) to the terms of the treaty. Protocol II requires the world's declared nuclear weapons states to refrain from undermining in any way the nuclear-free status of the region; it has been signed and ratified by the USA, the UK, France, China, and Russia.

The treaty also provides for a comprehensive control and verification mechanism, overseen by the Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (OPANAL), based in Mexico City.

Merger Treaty

The **Merger Treaty** (or **Brussels Treaty**[1]) was a European treaty which combined the executive bodies of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom) and the European Economic Community (EEC) into a single institutional structure.

The treaty was signed in Brussels on 8 April 1965 and came into force on 1 July 1967. It set out that the Commission of the EEC and the Council of the EEC should replace the Commission and Council of Euratom and the High Authority and Council of the ECSC. Although each Community remained legally independent, they shared common institutions (prior to this treaty, they already shared a Parliamentary Assembly and Court of Justice) and were together known as the European Communities. This treaty is regarded by some as the real beginning of the modern European Union.

This treaty was abrogated by the Amsterdam Treaty signed in 1997:

Without prejudice to the paragraphs following hereinafter, which have as their purpose to retain the essential elements of their provisions, the Convention of

25 March 1957 on certain institutions common to the European Communities and the Treaty of 8 April 1965 establishing a Single Council and a Single Commission of the European Communities, but with the exception of the Protocol referred to in paragraph 5, shall be repealed.
Article 9(1) of the Amsterdam Treaty

Convention on the Unification of Certain Points of Substantive Law on Patents for Invention

The **Convention on the Unification of Certain Points of Substantive Law on Patents for Invention**, also called **Strasbourg Convention** or **Strasbourg Patent Convention**, is a multilateral treaty signed by Member States of the Council of Europe on November 27, 1963 in Strasbourg, France. It entered into force on August 1, 1980 and led to a significant harmonization of patent laws across European countries.

This Convention establishes patentability criteria, i.e. specifies on which grounds an inventions can be rejected as not patentable. It intended to harmonize substantive patent law but not procedural law. This Convention is quite different from the European Patent Convention (EPC), which establishes an independent system for granting European Patents.

The Strasbourg Convention has had a significant impact on the EPC, on national patent laws across Europe, on the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT), on the Patent Law Treaty (PLT) and on the WTO's TRIPS.

Ratifications and accessions

Thirteen countries ratified the treaty or acceded to it: Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland, and United Kingdom.

Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty

The **treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water**, often abbreviated as the **Partial Test Ban Treaty** (**PTBT**), **Limited Test Ban Treaty** (**LTBT**), or **Nuclear Test Ban Treaty** (**NTBT**) (although the latter also refers to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty) is a treaty prohibiting all test detonations of nuclear weapons except underground. It was

developed both to slow the arms race (nuclear testing was, at the time, necessary for continued nuclear weapon advancements), and to stop the excessive release of nuclear fallout into the planet's atmosphere.

It was signed by the governments of the Soviet Union (represented by Andrei Gromyko), the United Kingdom (represented by Lord Home) and the United States (represented by Dean Rusk), named the "Original Parties", at Moscow on August 5, 1963 and opened for signature by other countries. It was ratified by the U.S. Senate on September 24, 1963 by a vote of 80 to 19. The treaty went into effect on October 10, 1963.[1] [2]

Vienna Convention on Civil Liability for Nuclear Damage

Background

In September 1997, many of the world's governments took a significant step forward in improving the liability regime for nuclear damage. At a Diplomatic Conference at International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Headquarters in Vienna, 8-12 September 1997, delegates from over 80 States adopted a Protocol to Amend the 1963 Vienna Convention on Civil Liability for Nuclear Damage and also adopted a Convention on Supplementary Compensation for Nuclear Damage.

The Protocol sets the possible limit of the operator's liability at not less than 300 million special drawing rights (SDRs) (roughly equivalent to 400 million US dollars[1]). The Convention on Supplementary Compensation defines additional amounts to be provided through contributions by States Parties on the basis of installed nuclear capacity and United Nations rate of assessment. The Convention is an instrument to which all States may adhere regardless of whether they are parties to any existing nuclear liability conventions or have nuclear installations on their territories. The Protocol contains inter alia a better definition of nuclear damage (now also addressing the concept of environmental damage and preventive measures), extends the geographical scope of the Vienna Convention, and extends the period during which claims may be brought for loss of life and personal injury. It also provides for jurisdiction of coastal states over actions incurring nuclear damage during transport. Taken together, the two instruments should substantially enhance the global framework for compensation well beyond that foreseen by existing Conventions.Before the action in September 1997, the international liability regime was embodied primarily in two instruments, i.e. the Vienna Convention on Civil Liability for Nuclear Damage of 1963 and the Paris Convention on

Third Party Liability in the Field of Nuclear Energy of 1960 linked by the Joint Protocol adopted in 1988. The Paris Convention was later built up by the 1963 Brussels Supplementary Convention. These Conventions are based on the civil law concept and share the following main principles:

1. Liability is channeled exclusively to the operators of the nuclear installations
2. Liability of the operator is absolute, i.e. the operator is held liable irrespective of fault
3. Liability is limited in amount. Under the Vienna Convention, it may be limited to not less than US$ 5 million (value in gold on 29 April 1963), but an upper ceiling is not fixed. The Paris Convention sets a maximum liability of 15 million SDR provided that the installation State may provide for a greater or lesser amount but not below 5 million SDR staking into account the availability of insurance coverage. The Brussels Supplementary Convention established additional funding beyond the amount available under the Paris Convention up to a total of 300 million SDRs, consisting of contributions by the installation State and contracting parties
4. Liability is limited in time. Compensation rights are extinguished under both Conventions if an action is not brought within ten years from the date of the nuclear incident. Longer periods are permissible if, under the law of the installation State, the liability of the operator is covered by financial security. National law may establish a shorter time limit, but not less than two years (the Paris Convention) or three years (the Vienna Convention) from the date the claimant knew or ought to have known of the damage and the operator liable
5. The operator must maintain insurance of other financial security for an amount corresponding to his liability; if such security is insufficient, the installation State is obliged to make up the difference up to the limit of the operator's liability
6. Jurisdiction over actions lies exclusively with the courts of the Contracting Party in whose territory the nuclear incident occurred
7. Non-discrimination of victims on the grounds of nationality, domicile or residence.

Following the Chernobyl accident, the IAEA initiated work on all aspects of nuclear liability with a view to improving the basic Conventions and establishing a comprehensive liability regime. In 1988, as a result of joint efforts by the IAEA and OECD/NEA, the Joint Protocol Relating to the Application of the Vienna Convention and the Paris Convention was adopted. The Joint Protocol established a link between the Conventions combining them into one expanded liability regime. Parties to the Joint Protocol are treated as

though they were Parties to both Conventions and a choice of law rule is provided to determine which of the two Conventions should apply to the exclusion of the other in respect of the same incident.

- Date of adoption: 21 May 1963
- Place of adoption: Vienna, Austria
- Date of entry into force: 12 November 1977
- Languages: English, French, Russian and Spanish
- Depositary Governments: International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)

Vienna Convention on Consular Relations

The **Vienna Convention on Consular Relations** of 1963 is an international treaty that defines a framework for consular relations between independent countries. A consul normally operates out of an embassy in another country, and performs two functions: (1) protecting in the host country the interests of their countrymen, and (2) furthering the commercial and economic relations between the two countries. While a consul is not a diplomat,[citation needed] they work out of the same premises, and under this treaty they are afforded most of the same privileges, including a variation of diplomatic immunity called consular immunity. The treaty has been ratified by 173 countries.[1]

Key provisions

The treaty is an extensive document, containing 79 articles. Following is a basic overview of its key provisions. For a comprehensive enumeration of all articles, consult the original text.[2]

- Article 5. Thirteen functions of a consul are listed, including protecting in the receiving state the interests of the sending state and its nationals, as well as developing the commercial, economic, cultural, and scientific relations between the two countries.
- Article 23. The host nation may at any time and for any reason declare a particular member of the consular staff to be persona non grata. The sending state must recall this person within a reasonable period of time, or otherwise this person may lose their consular immunity.
- Article 31. The host nation may not enter the consular premises, and must protect the premises from intrusion or damage.

- Article 35. Freedom of communication between the consul and their home country must be preserved. A consular bag must never be opened. A consular courier must never be detained.
- Article 36. Foreign nationals who are arrested or detained be given notice "without delay" of their right to have their embassy or consulate notified of that arrest. If the detained foreign national so requests, the police must fax that notice to the embassy or consulate, which can then check up on the person. The notice to the consulate can be as simple as a fax, giving the person's name, the place of arrest, and, if possible, something about the reason for the arrest or detention.

Nassau Agreement

The **Nassau Agreement**, concluded on 22 December 1962, was a treaty negotiated between President John F. Kennedy for the United States and Prime Minister Harold Macmillan for the United Kingdom. The agreement enabled the UK Polaris programme.

It was the result of a series of meetings by the two leaders over three days in the Bahamas following the U.S.'s cancellation of the AGM-48 Skybolt, the planned basis for the UKs entire nuclear deterrent in the 1960s. Under the agreement the US was to provide the UK with a supply of nuclear-capable Polaris missiles (under the terms of the Polaris Sales Agreement), in return for which the UK was to lease the Americans a nuclear submarine base in the Holy Loch, near Glasgow. The agreement was clear that the UK's Polaris missiles were part of a 'multi-lateral force' within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and could be used independently only when 'supreme national interests' intervened

1961 Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness

The Convention was originally intended as a Protocol to the Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, while the 1954 Convention Relating to the Status of Stateless Persons was adopted to cover stateless persons who are not refugees and therefore not within the scope of the Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees.[citation needed]

Statelessness prior to World War II

The Nansen International Office For Refugees, was an organization of the League of Nations, which was internationally in charge of refugees from war areas from 1930 to 1939. It received the Nobel Peace Prize in 1938. Their Nansen passports, designed in 1922 by founder Fridtjof Nansen were internationally recognized identity cards first issued by the League of Nations to stateless refugees. In 1942 they were honored by governments in 52 countries and were the first Refugee travel documents.

Statelessness prior to World War II

The Nansen International Office For Refugees, was an organization of the League of Nations, which was internationally in charge of refugees from war areas from 1930 to 1939. It received the Nobel Peace Prize in 1938. Their Nansen passports, designed in 1922 by founder Fridtjof Nansen were internationally recognized identity cards first issued by the League of Nations to stateless refugees. In 1942 they were honored by governments in 52 countries and were the first Refugee travel documents.

Background to UN action addressing the problem of statelessness

Migrations forced from political instability during World War II and its immediate aftermath highlighted the international dimensions of problems presented by unprecedented volumes of displaced persons including those rendered effectively stateless.

Dating from December 1948, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights at Article 15 affirms that:

- Everyone has the right to a nationality.
- No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality nor denied the right to change his nationality.

At the Fourth United Nations General Assembly Session in October–December 1949, the International Law Commission included the topic "Nationality, including statelessness" in its list of topics of international law provisionally selected for codification. At the behest of ECOSOC in its 11th Session soon after, that item was given priority.

The Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees was done on 28 July 1951. It was originally desired to cover 'refugees and stateless persons', however agreement was not reached with respect to the latter.

The International Law Commission at its fifth session in 1953 produced both a Draft Convention on the Elimination of Future Statelessness, and a Draft Convention on the Reduction of Future Statelessness. ECOSOC approved both drafts.

The 1954 Convention Relating to the Status of Stateless Persons was done in September 1954 (The Status Convention).[1] This completed the unfinished work of the Refugee Convention three years prior.

On 4 December 1954 the UN General Assembly by Resolution[2] adopted both drafts as the basis of its desire for a conference of plenipotentiaries and an eventual Convention.

General principles

The Convention works to create norms and to codify and confirm certain presumptions and principles of customary international law existing at the time of its formation. Among these would be:

- States have absolute sovereignty to confer their nationality on any person for any reason
- otherwise stateless persons may take the nationality of the place of their birth or of the place where they were found (in the case of a foundling), otherwise they may take the nationality of one of their parents (in each case possibly subject to a qualifying period of residence in that State)
- a stateless person has some time beyond attaining adulthood to seek to claim the benefit of the Convention. That time is always at least three years from the age of eighteen.
- the benefit of the Convention may be claimed by guardians on behalf of children
- States may impose a period of residence qualification for granting nationality to persons who may be otherwise stateless. That period is a maximum five years immediately prior to application and maximum of ten years overall.
- disloyal or certain criminal conduct may limit an individual's ability to avail the benefit of the Convention
- birth on a sea vessel or aircraft may attract the nationality of the flag of that vessel or craft

How the Convention works to reduce statelessness

In respect of Contracting States:

- 'stateless birth' on their territory attracts the grant of their nationality

- transfer of territory between states must occur in a manner that avoids the occurrence of statelessness for persons residing in the territory transferred. When a State acquires territory, the inhabitants of that territory presumptively acquire the nationality of that State.
- persons otherwise stateless shall be able to take the nationality of one of their parents (possibly subject to a period of prior residence not more than three years)
- absent circumstances of fraudulent application or disloyalty toward the Contracting State, deprivations and renunciations of citizenship shall only take effect where a person has or subsequently obtains another nationality in replacement
- the UNHCR will issue travel documents evidencing nationality to persons, otherwise stateless, having a claim of nationality under the Convention

Substantive Provisions of the Convention (summarised)

There are 21 Articles, summarised below:

Article 1(1)

Contracting States shall grant their nationality to persons, otherwise stateless, born in their territory (subject to Article 1(2)).

The grant may be by virtue of the birth, or upon application by or on behalf of the person so born.

Article 1(2)

An applicant may have up until at least the age of 21 to claim their citizenship by birth.

For grant of citizenship by birth, a Contracting State may require proof of habitual residence in their territory for a period not exceeding 5 years immediately prior to application, or 10 years in total.

Grant of citizenship by birth may be contingent upon the applicant's not having been convicted of an offence against national security nor having been sentenced to imprisonment for a term of five years or more. Grant of citizenship by birth may be contingent upon the applicant having always been stateless.

Article 1(3)

A child born in wedlock in a Contracting State shall take the nationality of its mother.

Article 1(4)

A Contracting State shall give its nationality to a person, otherwise stateless, who is legally precluded from assuming his/her birth nationality, where that State's nationality was held by either parent at the time of the birth.

Article 1(5)

An applicant has until at least the age of 23 to claim a nationality by Article 1(4).

For conferral of nationality by Article 1(4) a contracting State may impose a residence requirement not exceeding three years immediately prior to application.

For conferral of nationality by Article 1(4) it may be required that the applicant has always been stateless.

Article 2

For the purpose of assigning nationality, a foundling shall be considered to have been born in the State where it was found and from parents of that State's nationality. That presumption may be displaced by proof to the contrary.

Article 3

For the purpose of assigning nationality, birth on a ship or aircraft shall amount to birth in the territory of the State that gives its flag to that ship or aircraft.

Article 4

A Contracting State shall grant its nationality to a person, not born in its territory, if either parent had that State's nationality and the person would be otherwise stateless.

A person may make such a claim for nationality at least up until the age of 23. They may also be required to have a period of residence up to three

years immediately prior to application. The claim may be refused where a person has been convicted of an offence against the national security of the State.

Article 5

If a law entails loss of nationality, such loss shall be conditional upon the person acquiring another nationality. This only applies to loss by marriage, legitimation, divorce, recognition or adoption. A child that loses nationality by recognition or affiliation shall be given opportunity to reacquire by written application under terms not more rigorous than provided by Article 1(2).

Article 6

If a law entails loss of nationality by a spouse or child by virtue of the loss of nationality by the other spouse or a parent, such loss shall be conditional on the person's possession or acquisition of another nationality.

Article 7

Laws for the renunciation of a nationality shall be conditional upon a person's acquisition or possession of another nationality. (Exceptions: not to frustrate freedom of movement of nationals within a country, not to frustrate return of nationals to their country, not to frustrate a person's ability to seek asylum)

Article 8

Contracting States shall not deprive people of their nationality so as to render them stateless. (Exceptions: where otherwise provided in the Convention; where nationality has been acquired by misrepresentation or fraud; disloyalty to the Contracting State).

Article 9

Nationality will not be deprived on racial, ethnic, political or religious grounds.

Article 10

Treaties providing for transfer of territory between States shall make provisions to preclude the occurrence of statelessness. Absent such provisions, a Contracting State taking territory will give its nationality to persons, otherwise stateless, in that territory.

Article 11

Persons may apply to the UNHCR to claim the benefit of the Convention.

Article 12

The Convention applies to persons born either before or after it goes into force. (Exception: only applies to foundlings found after going into force)

Article 13

The Convention is not to be construed to detract from any law or treaty provision otherwise aiding the reduction of statelessness.

Article 14

Disputes by Contacting States concerning the Convention are susceptible to final adjudication by the International Court of Justice.

Article 15

The Convention applies to all trust, non-self-governing, colonial, and non-metropolitan territories of Contracting States.

Articles 16-21

Process of signature and ratification.

Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs

The **Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs** of 1961 is an international treaty to prohibit production and supply of specific (nominally narcotic) drugs and of drugs with similar effects except under licence for specific purposes, such as medical treatment and research. As noted below, its major effects included updating the Paris Convention of 13 July 1931 to include the vast number of synthetic opioids invented in the intervening 30 years and a mechanism for more easily including new ones. From 1931 to 1961 most of the families of synthetic opioids had been developed, including drugs in whatever way related

to methadone, pethidine, morphinans and dextromoramide & related drugs; research on fentanyls and piritramide were also nearing fruition at this point.

Earlier treaties had only controlled opium, coca, and derivatives such as morphine, heroin and cocaine. The Single Convention, adopted in 1961, consolidated those treaties and broadened their scope to include cannabis and drugs whose effects are similar to those of the drugs specified. The Commission on Narcotic Drugs and the World Health Organization were empowered to add, remove, and transfer drugs among the treaty's four Schedules of controlled substances. The International Narcotics Control Board was put in charge of administering controls on drug production, international trade, and dispensation. The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) was delegated the Board's day-to-day work of monitoring the situation in each country and working with national authorities to ensure compliance with the Single Convention. This treaty has since been supplemented by the Convention on Psychotropic Substances, which controls LSD, Ecstasy, and other psychoactive pharmaceuticals, and the United Nations Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances, which strengthens provisions against money laundering and other drug-related offenses.

Alliance for Progress

The **Alliance for Progress** (Alianza para el Progreso) initiated by U.S. President John F. Kennedy in 1961 aimed to establish economic cooperation between the U.S. and Latin America.

Origin and goals

In March 1961, President Kennedy proposed a ten-year plan for Latin America:

> “ ...we propose to complete the revolution of the Americas, to build a hemisphere where all men can hope for a suitable standard of living and all can live out their lives in dignity and in freedom. To achieve this goal political freedom must accompany material progress...Let us once again transform the American Continent into a vast crucible of revolutionary ideas and efforts, a tribute to the power of the creative energies of free men and women, an example to all the world that liberty and progress walk hand in hand. Let us once again awaken our American revolution until it guides the struggles of people everywhere- ”

> not with an imperialism of force or fear but the rule of courage and freedom and hope for the future of man.[1]

The program was signed at an inter-American conference at Punta del Este, Uruguay, in August 1961. The charter called for:

- an annual increase of 2.5% in per capita income,
- the establishment of democratic governments,
- the elimination of adult illiteracy by 1970
- price stability, to avoid inflation or deflation
- more equitable income distribution, land reform, and
- economic and social planning.[2][3]

First, the plan called for Latin American countries to pledge a capital investment of $80 billion over 10 years. The United States agreed to supply or guarantee $20 billion within one decade.[3]

Second, Latin American delegates required the participating countries to draw up comprehensive plans for national development. These plans were then to be submitted for approval by an inter-American board of experts.

Third, tax codes had to be changed to demand "more from those who have most" and land reform was to be implemented.[2]

Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations

The **Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations** of 1961 is an international treaty that defines a framework for diplomatic relations between independent countries. It specifies the privileges of a diplomatic mission that enable diplomats to perform their function without fear of coercion or harassment by the host country. This forms the legal basis for diplomatic immunity. Its articles are considered a cornerstone of modern international relations. It has been ratified by 186 countries. The 1961 UN Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations marked its 50th anniversary in April 2011. [1]

History

Throughout the history of sovereign nations, diplomats have enjoyed a special status. Their function to negotiate agreements between states demands certain special privileges. An envoy from another nation is traditionally treated as a guest, their communications with their home nation treated as confidential, and

their freedom from coercion and subjugation by the host nation treated as essential.

The first attempt to codify diplomatic immunity into diplomatic law occurred with the Congress of Vienna in 1815. This was followed much later by the Convention regarding Diplomatic Officers (Havana, 1928).

The present treaty on the treatment of diplomats was the outcome of a draft by the International Law Commission. The treaty was adopted on April 18, 1961, by the United Nations Conference on Diplomatic Intercourse and Immunities held in Vienna, Austria, and first implemented on April 24, 1964. The same Conference also adopted the Optional Protocol concerning Acquisition of Nationality, the Optional Protocol concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes, the Final Act and four resolutions annexed to that Act.

Two years later, the United Nations adopted a closely related treaty, the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations.

Summary of provisions

The treaty is an extensive document, containing 53 articles. Following is a basic overview of its key provisions.[2] For a comprehensive enumeration of all articles, consult the original text.[3]

- Article 9. The host nation may at any time and for any reason declare a particular member of the diplomatic staff to be persona non grata. The sending state must recall this person within a reasonable period of time, or otherwise this person may lose their diplomatic immunity.
- Article 22. The premises of a diplomatic mission, such as an embassy, are inviolate and must not be entered by the host country except by permission of the head of the mission. Furthermore, the host country must protect the mission from intrusion or damage. The host country must never search the premises, nor seize its documents or property. Article 30 extends this provision to the private residence of the diplomats.
- Article 27. The host country must permit and protect free communication between the diplomats of the mission and their home country. A diplomatic bag must never be opened even on suspicion of abuse. A diplomatic courier must never be arrested or detained.
- Article 29. Diplomats must not be liable to any form of arrest or detention. They are immune from civil or criminal prosecution, though the sending country may waive this right under Article 32. Under Article 34, they are exempt from most taxes, and under Article 36 they are exempt from most customs duties.

- Article 31.1c Actions not covered by diplomatic immunity: professional activity outside diplomat's official functions.
- Article 37. The family members of a diplomat that are living in the host country enjoy most of the same protections as the diplomats themselves.

Optional protocols

In the same year that the treaty was adopted, two amendment protocols were added. Countries may ratify the main treaty without necessarily ratifying these optional agreements.

- Concerning acquisition of nationality. The head of the mission, the staff of the mission, and their families, shall not acquire the nationality of the receiving country.
- Concerning compulsory settlement of disputes. Disputes arising from the interpretation of this treaty may be brought before the International Court of Justice.

State parties to the convention

There are 187 state parties, where the convention is ratified.

The states which neither signed nor ratified the convention are: Antigua and Barbuda, Sultanate of Brunei, Cook Islands, Republic of Gambia, Niue, Republic of Palau, Solomon Islands, Republic of Vanuatu and the states with limited recognition.

Columbia River Treaty

The **Columbia River Treaty** is an agreement between Canada and the United States on the development and operation of dams in the upper Columbia River basin for power and flood control benefits in both countries. Four dams were constructed under this treaty: three in Canada (Duncan Dam, Mica Dam, Keenleyside Dam) and one in the United States (Libby Dam). The treaty provided for both the construction of these dams as well as the regulation of the power produced in the Columbia River generating complex. The long-term impacts of the treaty have been mixed: while the dams provided economic benefits through hydroelectric generation and flood control, there are longstanding concerns regarding social costs to the local aboriginal

communities, and the environmental effects associated with the construction of large dams.

Treaty provisions

Under the terms of the agreement, Canada was required to provide 19.12 km³ (15.5 million acre-feet (Maf)) of usable reservoir storage behind three large dams. This was accomplished with 1.73 km³ (1.4 Maf) provided by Duncan Dam (1967), 8.76 km³ (7.1 Maf) provided by Arrow Dam (1968) [subsequently renamed the Hugh Keenleyside Dam], and 8.63 km³ (7.0 Maf) provided by Mica Dam (1973). The latter dam, however, was built higher than required by the Treaty, and provides a total of 14.80 km³ (12 Maf) including 6.17 km³ (5.0) Maf of Non Treaty Storage space. Unless otherwise agreed, the three Canadian Treaty projects are required to operate for flood protection and increased power generation at-site and downstream in both Canada and the United States, although the allocation of power storage operations among the three projects is at Canadian discretion.

The Treaty also allowed the U.S. to build the Libby Dam on the Kootenai River in Montana which provides a further 6.14 km³ (4.98 Maf) of active storage in the Koocanusa reservoir. Although the name sounds like it might be of aboriginal origins, it is actually a concatenation of the first three letters from **Koo**tenai / **Koo**tenay, **Can**ada and **USA**, and was the winning entry in a contest to name the reservoir. Water behind the Libby dam floods back 42 miles (68 km) into Canada, while the water released from the dam returns to Canada just upstream of Kootenay Lake. Libby Dam began operation in March 1972 and is operated for power, flood control, and other benefits at-site and downstream in both Canada and the United States, and neither country makes any payment for resulting downstream benefits.

With the exception of the Mica Dam, which was designed and constructed with a powerhouse, the Canadian Treaty projects were initially built for the sole purpose of regulating water flow. In 2002, however, a joint venture between the Columbia Power Corporation and the Columbia Basin Trust constructed the 185 MW Arrow Lakes Hydro project in parallel with the Keenleyside Dam near Castlegar, 35 years after the storage dam was originally completed. The Duncan Dam remains a pure storage project, and has no at-site power generation facilities.

The Canadian and U.S. Entities defined by the Treaty, and appointed by the national governments, manage most of the Treaty required activities. The Canadian Entity is B.C. Hydro and Power Authority, and the U.S. Entity is the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration and the Northwestern

Division Engineer for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The Treaty also established a Permanent Engineering Board, consisting of equal members from Canada and the U.S., that reports to the governments annually on Treaty results, any deviations from the operating plans, and assists the Entities in resolving any disputes.

Arms Control and Disarmament Agency

The U.S. **Arms Control and Disarmament Agency** (**ACDA**) was established as an independent agency of the United States government by the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (75 Stat. 631), September 26, 1961, a bill drafted by presidential adviser John J. McCloy. Its predecessor was the **U.S. Disarmament Administration**, part of the Department of State (1960–61). Its mission was to strengthen United States national security by "formulating, advocating, negotiating, implementing and verifying effective arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament policies, strategies, and agreements."

In so doing, ACDA ensured that arms control was fully integrated into the development and conduct of United States national security policy. ACDA also conducted, supported, and coordinated research for arms control and disarmament policy formulation, prepared for and managed U.S. participation in international arms control and disarmament negotiations, and prepared, operated, and directed U.S. participation in international arms control and disarmament systems.

Early mission

In the 1970s emphasis of the agency was placed upon gaining an understanding of the strategic weapons capabilities of the Soviet Union and People's Republic of China. The electronic reconnaissance capability of the United States was expanded through federal agency research and private contract research, utilizing radio frequency as well as optical technologies. The theory of this mission was that a clearer understanding of other nations' strategic capabilities was an important initial step in prevention of nuclear war.

1997 Reorganization

In 1997, the Clinton administration announced the full integration of the ACDA with the State Department as part of the reinvention of the agencies which implement the nation’s foreign policy.[1]

The ACDA Director served as both the Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security Affairs and a Senior Adviser to the President and the Secretary of State for Arms Control, Nonproliferation, and Disarmament. He communicated with the President through the Secretary of State. In his capacity as senior advisor to the president, the Under Secretary attended and participated, at the direction of the president, in National Security Council (NSC) and subordinate meetings pertaining to arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament and had the right to communicate, through the Secretary of State, with the President and members of the NSC on arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament concerns.

1999-2000 Reorganization

As of April, 1999, ACDA was merged into the Department of State. ACDA's four Bureaus were merged with the Bureau of Political-Military Affairs to form three new Bureaus, for Political-Military Affairs (PM), Arms Control (AC), and Nonproliferation (NP). In 2000, a fourth Bureau for Verification and Compliance (VC) was added by statute. All four Bureaus reported to the Secretary and Deputy Secretary of State through the Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security Affairs.

2005-2006 Reorganization

In 2004, the State Department's Inspector General (IG) conducted a review of three of these Bureaus: NP, AC, and VC. The IG recommended merging AC and NP to move resources from arms control areas that were relatively inactive to higher priority nonproliferation issues. The IG also recommended reducing the VC Bureau to a more focused Office reporting to the Secretary of State. These recommendations were held in abeyance until Robert Joseph was sworn in as the new Under Secretary for Arms Control and International Security Affairs in June 2005.

In late 2005, Under Secretary Joseph decided to accept the IG recommendation to merge the AC and NP Bureaus into the new Bureau of International Security and Nonproliferation (ISN). Rather than scaling back the VC Bureau, however, he decided to expand it into the new Bureau of Verification, Compliance, and Implementation (VCI). Not only was this contrary to the recommendation of the Inspector General, but by merging implementation with verification and compliance it undercut the purpose of the VC Bureau to provide independent review of implementation.[citation needed] Furthermore, though the ISN Bureau was somewhat larger than the NP Bureau, its mission was also expanded and staff resources available for most nonproliferation functions were actually reduced. A number of senior nonproliferation experts have left the Bureau as a result,

further exacerbating the staffing shortage. One of the Office Directors in the new structure told his staff that one purpose of the reorganization was to eliminate vestiges of ACDA from the Department of State.[citation needed] In a Washington Post article in March 2006, an unnamed official confirmed that one reason for the reorganization was to respond to what he called "rank insubordination" by some "disloyal" career staff, contradicting the official statement that the reorganization was intended to realign the organization with changed circumstances and priorities.[1]

Under Secretary's Responsibilities

The Under Secretary leads the interagency policy process on nonproliferation and manages global U.S. security policy, principally in the areas of nonproliferation, arms control, regional security and defense relations, and arms transfers and security assistance. The Under Secretary provides policy direction in the following areas: nonproliferation, including the missile and nuclear areas, as well as chemical, biological, and conventional weapons proliferation; arms control, including negotiation, ratification, verification and compliance, and implementation of agreements on strategic, non-conventional, and conventional forces; regional security and defense relations, involving policy regarding U.S. security commitments worldwide as well as on the use of U.S. military forces in unilateral or international peacekeeping roles; and arms transfers and security assistance programs and arms transfer policies. By delegation from the Secretary, the Under Secretary performs a range of functions under the Foreign Assistance Act, Arms Export Control Act, and related legislation. The Bureaus of Arms Control, Nonproliferation, and Political-Military Affairs are under the policy oversight of the Under Secretary for Arms Control and International Security. By statute, the Assistant Secretary for Verification and Compliance reports to the Under Secretary for Arms Control and International Security.

Current Programs

- Stopping Nuclear Testing
- Banning Chemical Weapons
- Reducing Strategic Nuclear Arms
- Keeping Nuclear Weapons out of the hands of rogue states
- Preventing the use of disease as a weapon of war[2]

Zürich and London Agreement

The **Zürich and London Agreement** for the constitution of Cyprus started with an agreement on the 19 February 1959 in Lancaster House in London, between Turkey, Greece, the United Kingdom and Cypriot community leaders (Archbishop Makarios III for Greek Cypriots and Dr. Fazıl Küçük for Turkish Cypriots). On that basis, a constitution was drafted and agreed together with two further Treaties of Alliance and Guarantee in Zürich on 11 February 1960.

Cyprus was accordingly proclaimed an independent state on 16 August 1960.

Following the failure of the Agreement in 1963 and subsequent de facto military partition of Cyprus into Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot regions, the larger Greek-Cypriot Region, controlled by the Cyprus Government, claims that the 1960 Constitution basically remains in force, whereas the Turkish-Cypriot region claims to have seceded by the Declaration of Independence of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus in 1983.

Treaty of Montevideo

There have been several treaties signed in Montevideo such as:

- 1828 Treaty of Montevideo in which Brazil and Argentina recognized the independence of Uruguay, after British mediation.
- 1890 Treaty of Montevideo signed between Argentina and Brazil to solve the so-called question of Palmas.
- 1960 Treaty of Montevideo established the Latin American Free Trade Association (LAFTA).
- 1979 Treaty of Montevideo (Act of Montevideo) signed between Chile and Argentina to allow the Papal mediation in the Beagle conflict.
- 1980 Treaty of Montevideo transformed LAFTA into Latin American Integration Association (ALADI).

Indus Waters Treaty

The **Indus Waters Treaty** is a water-sharing treaty between the Republic of India and Islamic Republic of Pakistan, brokered by the World Bank (then the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development). The treaty was signed

in Karachi on September 19, 1960 by Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru and President of Pakistan Mohammad Ayub Khan. The treaty was a result of Pakistani fear that since the source rivers of the Indus basin were in India, it could potentially create droughts and famines in Pakistan, especially at times of war. However, India did not revoke the treaty during any of three later Indo-Pakistani Wars.[1]

Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security between the United States and Japan

The **Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security between the United States and Japan**(日本国とアメリカ合衆国との間の相互協力及び安全保障条約 Nippon-koku to Amerika-gasshūkoku to no Aida no Sōgo Kyōryoku oyobi Anzen Hoshō Jōyaku?) was signed between the United States and Japan in Washington, D.C. on January 19, 1960. It strengthened Japan's ties to the West during the Cold War era. The treaty also included general provisions on the further development of international cooperation and on improved future economic cooperation.

Antarctic Treaty System

The **Antarctic Treaty** and related agreements, collectively called the **Antarctic Treaty System** or **ATS**, regulate international relations with respect to Antarctica, Earth's only continent without a native human population. For the purposes of the treaty system, Antarctica is defined as all of the land and ice shelves south of 60°S latitude. The treaty, entering into force in 1961 and currently having 49 signatory nations, sets aside Antarctica as a scientific preserve, establishes freedom of scientific investigation and bans military activity on that continent. The treaty was the first arms control agreement established during the Cold War. The Antarctic Treaty Secretariat headquarters have been located in Buenos Aires, Argentina, since September 2004.[1]

The Antarctic Treaty System

The main treaty was opened for signature on December 1, 1959, and officially entered into force on June 23, 1961.[2] The original signatories were the 12 countries active in Antarctica during the International Geophysical Year (IGY) of 1957–58. The 12 countries had significant interests in Antarctica at the time:

Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Chile, France, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, South Africa, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and the United States. These countries had established over 50 Antarctic stations for the IGY. The treaty was a diplomatic expression of the operational and scientific cooperation that had been achieved "on the ice".

Articles of the Antarctic Treaty

- **Article 1** – The area to be used for peaceful purposes only; military activity, such as weapons testing, is prohibited but military personnel and equipment may be used for scientific research or any other peaceful purpose;
- **Article 2** – Freedom of scientific investigations and cooperation shall continue;
- **Article 3** – Free exchange of information and personnel in cooperation with the United Nations and other international agencies;
- **Article 4** – The treaty does not recognize, dispute, nor establish territorial sovereignty claims; no new claims shall be asserted while the treaty is in force;
- **Article 5** – The treaty prohibits nuclear explosions or disposal of radioactive wastes;
- **Article 6** – Includes under the treaty all land and ice shelves but not the surrounding waters south of 60 degrees 00 minutes south;
- **Article 7** – Treaty-state observers have free access, including aerial observation, to any area and may inspect all stations, installations, and equipment; advance notice of all activities and of the introduction of military personnel must be given;
- **Article 8** – Allows for jurisdiction over observers and scientists by their own states;
- **Article 9** – Frequent consultative meetings take place among member nations;
- **Article 10** – All treaty states will discourage activities by any country in Antarctica that are contrary to the treaty;
- **Article 11** – All disputes to be settled peacefully by the parties concerned or, ultimately, by the International Court of Justice;
- **Articles 12, 13, 14** – Deal with upholding, interpreting, and amending the treaty among involved nations.

The main objective of the ATS is to ensure in the interests of all humankind that Antarctica shall continue forever to be used exclusively for peaceful purposes and shall not become the scene or object of international discord. The treaty forbids any measures of a military nature, but not the presence of military personnel.

Other agreements

Disposal of waste by simply dumping it at the shoreline such as here at the Russian Bellingshausen base is no longer permitted by the Protocol on Environmental Protection

Other agreements — some 200 recommendations adopted at treaty consultative meetings and ratified by governments — include:

- Agreed Measures for the Conservation of Antarctic Fauna and Flora (1964) (entered into force in 1982)
- The Convention for the Conservation of Antarctic Seals (1972)
- The Convention for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (1980)
- The Convention on the Regulation of Antarctic Mineral Resource Activities (1988) (signed in 1988, not in force)
- The Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty was signed October 4, 1991 and entered into force January 14, 1998; this agreement prevents development and provides for the protection of the Antarctic environment through five specific annexes on marine pollution, fauna and flora, environmental impact assessments, waste management, and protected areas. It prohibits all activities relating to mineral resources except scientific. A sixth annex — on liability arising from environmental emergencies — was adopted in 2005 but is yet to enter into force.

Convention on the Territorial Sea and Contiguous Zone

The **Convention on the Territorial Sea and Contiguous Zone** of 1958 is an international treaty which entered into force on 10 September 1964, one of four agreed upon at the first United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS I).

Many states have ratified the UNCLOS III convention, which came into force in 1994, superseding this convention.

1958 US–UK Mutual Defence Agreement

The 1958 **US–UK Mutual Defence Agreement** is a bilateral treaty between the United States and the United Kingdom on nuclear weapons cooperation.

It was signed after the UK successfully tested its first hydrogen bomb during Operation Grapple. While the U.S. has nuclear cooperation agreements with other countries, including France and some NATO countries, this agreement is by far the most comprehensive[citation needed].

The treaty is renewed every ten years, most recently extending the treaty to 2014.[1]

Details of the agreement

The agreement enables the U.S. and the UK to exchange classified information with the objective of improving each party's "atomic weapon design, development, and fabrication capability".

This includes development of defence plans; training personnel in the use and defence against nuclear weapons; evaluation of enemy capabilities; development of nuclear delivery systems; and research, development and design of military reactors. The agreement also provides for the transfer of special nuclear material (e.g. plutonium, highly enriched uranium, tritium), components, and equipment between the two countries, and the transfer of "non-nuclear parts of atomic weapons" to the UK.

The agreement also covered the export of one complete U.S. submarine nuclear propulsion plant and its enriched uranium fuel which was installed in the UK's first nuclear powered submarine, HMS Dreadnought.

The UK was able to carry out underground nuclear tests at the U.S. Nevada Test Site, the first taking place on 1 March 1962, following this agreement.[2]

There are also confidential intelligence matters covered by the agreement. The UK government has not published these sections "because of the necessity for great confidentiality and because ... it might well assist proliferation".[3]

This agreement replaced the earlier "Agreement for Cooperation Regarding Atomic Information for Mutual Defense Purposes" of 1955. A separate Polaris Sales Agreement was signed on 6 April 1963.

Assistance to UK nuclear weapons development

An early benefit of the agreement was to allow the UK to "Anglicise" the U.S. W28 nuclear warhead as the Red Snow thermonuclear weapon for the Blue Steel missile by 1961.[4] In 1974 a CIA proliferation assessment noted that "In many cases [Britain's sensitive technology in nuclear and missile fields] is based

on technology received from the U.S. and could not legitimately be passed on without U.S. permission."[5]

The U.S. President authorised the transfer of "nuclear weapon parts" to the UK between at least the years 1975 to 1996.[6][7]

The UK National Audit Office noted that most of the UK Trident warhead development and production expenditure was incurred in the U.S. who would supply "certain warhead-related components".[8][9] Some of the fissile materials for the UK Trident warhead were purchased from the U.S.[9] There is evidence that the warhead design of the British Trident system is similar to, or even based on, the U.S. W76 warhead fitted in some U.S. Navy Trident missiles, with design and blast model data supplied to the UK.[10][11]

Special nuclear materials barter

Under the agreement 5.37 tonnes (11,800 lb) of UK-produced plutonium was sent to the U.S. in return for 6.7 kilograms (15 lb) of tritium and 7.5 tonnes (17,000 lb) of highly enriched uranium over the period 1960–79. A further 470 kilograms (1,000 lb) of plutonium was swapped between the U.S. and the UK for reasons that remain classified.[12] Some of the UK produced plutonium was used in 1962 by the U.S. for the only known nuclear weapon test of reactor-grade plutonium .[13]

The plutonium sent to the U.S. included some produced in UK civil Magnox reactors, and the U.S. gave assurances that this civil plutonium was not used in the U.S. nuclear weapons program. It was used in civil programmes which included californium production and reactor research.[12] However, the UK did obtain military nuclear material in return, so via this barter UK civil power stations probably provided weapons material.[14] In the same way, all civil economic activity provided weapons material by providing money and skills with which the plants were built, thereby involving everyone everywhere in the production of nuclear weapons.

International Atomic Energy Agency

The **International Atomic Energy Agency** (**IAEA**) is an international organization that seeks to promote the peaceful use of nuclear energy, and to inhibit its use for any military purpose, including nuclear weapons. The IAEA was established as an autonomous organization on 29 July 1957. Though established independently of the United Nations through its own international

treaty, the IAEA Statute,[1] the IAEA reports to both the UN General Assembly and Security Council.

The IAEA has its headquarters in Vienna, Austria. The IAEA has two "Regional Safeguards Offices" which are located in Toronto, Canada, and in Tokyo, Japan. The IAEA also has two liaison offices which are located in New York City, United States, and in Geneva, Switzerland. In addition, the IAEA has three laboratories located in Vienna and Seibersdorf, Austria, and in Monaco.

The IAEA serves as an intergovernmental forum for scientific and technical cooperation in the peaceful use of nuclear technology and nuclear power worldwide. The programs of the IAEA encourage the development of the peaceful applications of nuclear technology, provide international safeguards against misuse of nuclear technology and nuclear materials, and promote nuclear safety (including radiation protection) and nuclear security standards and their implementation.

The IAEA and its former Director General, Mohamed ElBaradei, were jointly awarded the Nobel Peace Prize that was awarded on October 7, 2005. The IAEA's current Director General is Yukiya Amano.

Treaty of Rome

The **Treaty of Rome**, officially the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community (TEEC), was an international agreement that led to the founding of the European Economic Community (EEC) on 1 January 1958. It was signed on 25 March 1957 by Belgium, France, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and West Germany. The word Economic was deleted from the treaty's name by the Maastricht Treaty in 1993, and the treaty was repackaged as the Treaty on the functioning of the European Union on the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon in 2009.

The TEEC proposed the progressive reduction of customs duties and the establishment of a customs union. It proposed to create a common market of goods, workers, services and capital within the EEC's member states. It also proposed the creation of common transport and agriculture policies and a European social fund. It also established the European Commission.

Anglo-Malayan Defence Agreement

The **Anglo-Malayan Defence Agreement** (AMDA) was set up in 1957 to provide a security umbrella for the newly independent Malaya. AMDA was a bilateral defence agreement. When Malaysia was created in 1963, AMDA was renamed the **Anglo-Malaysian Defence Agreement** and continued to provide some measure of security to the new federation. AMDA was later replaced with FPDA.

Soviet–Japanese Joint Declaration of 1956

The Soviet Union did not sign the Treaty of Peace with Japan in 1951. On October 19, 1956, Japan and the Soviet Union signed a **Joint Declaration** providing for the end of the state of war, and for restoration of diplomatic relations between USSR and Japan.[1][2] The two parties also agreed to continue negotiations for a peace treaty, including territorial issues. In addition, the Soviet Union pledged to support Japan for UN membership and waive all World War II reparations claims. The joint declaration was accompanied by a trade protocol that granted reciprocal most-favored-nation treatment and provided for the development of trade. Japan derived few apparent gains from the normalization of diplomatic relations. The second half of the 1950s saw an increase in cultural exchanges.

The Joint Declaration did not settle the Kuril Islands territorial dispute between Japan and the Soviet Union, whose resolution was postponed until the conclusion of a permanent peace treaty. However, Article 9 of the Joint Declaration stated: "The U.S.S.R. and Japan have agreed to continue, after the establishment of normal diplomatic relations between them, negotiations for the conclusion of a peace treaty. Hereby, the U.S.S.R., in response to the desires of Japan and taking into consideration the interest of the Japanese state, agrees to hand over to Japan the Habomai and the Shikotan Islands, provided that the actual changing over to Japan of these islands will be carried out after the conclusion of a peace treaty".[1]

On November 14, 2004, the head of the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs Sergei Lavrov along with the former President of the Russian Federation Vladimir Putin, have visited Japan. Lavrov said that Russia as a state-successor of the Soviet Union recognizes the Declaration in 1956, and is ready to have territorial talks with Japan on its basis. [3]

Warsaw Pact

The **Warsaw Treaty Organization of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance** (1955–1991), more commonly referred to as the **Warsaw Pact**, was a mutual defense treaty between eight communist states of Eastern Europe in existence during the Cold War. The founding treaty was established under the initiative of the Soviet Union and signed on 14 May 1955, in Warsaw. The Warsaw Pact was the military complement to the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CoMEcon), the regional economic organization for the communist states of Eastern Europe. The Warsaw Pact was a Soviet military response to the integration of West Germany[1] into NATO in 1955, per the Paris Pacts of 1954.[2][3][4]

Structure

The Warsaw Treaty's organization was two-fold: the Political Consultative Committee handled political matters, and the Combined Command of Pact Armed Forces controlled the assigned multi-national forces, with headquarters in Warsaw, Poland. Furthermore, the Supreme Commander of the Unified Armed Forces of the Warsaw Treaty Organization was also a First Deputy Minister of Defense of the USSR, and the head of the Warsaw Treaty Combined Staff also was a First Deputy Chief of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the USSR. Therefore, although ostensibly an international collective security alliance, the USSR dominated the Warsaw Treaty armed forces.[5]

Strategy

The strategy of the Warsaw Pact was dominated by the desire to prevent, at all costs, the recurrence of an invasion of Russian territory as had occurred under Napoleon in 1812, German forces in 1918 (ended with the Treaty of Brest Litovsk) as well as Hitler in 1941, leading to extreme devastation and human losses in all cases, but especially in the third; the USSR emerged from the Second World War with the greatest total losses in life of any participant in the war except China.

History

On 14 May 1955, the USSR established the Warsaw Pact in response to the integration of the Federal Republic of Germany into NATO in October 1954 – only nine years after the defeat of Nazi Germany (1933–45) that ended with the Soviet and Allied invasion of Germany in 1944/45 during World War II in Europe. The reality was that a "Warsaw"-type pact had been in existence since 1945, when Soviet forces initially occupied Eastern Europe, and maintained there after the war. The Warsaw Pact merely formalized the arrangement.

The eight member countries of the Warsaw Pact pledged the mutual defense of any member who would be attacked; relations among the treaty signatories were based upon mutual non-intervention in the internal affairs of the member countries, respect for national sovereignty, and political independence.

The founding signatories to the **Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance** consisted of the following communist governments:

For 36 years, NATO and the Warsaw Treaty never directly waged war against each other in Europe; the United States and the Soviet Union and their respective allies implemented strategic policies aimed at the containment of each other in Europe, while working and fighting for influence within the wider Cold War on the international stage.

In 1956, following the declaration of the Imre Nagy government of withdrawal of Hungary from the Warsaw Pact, Soviet troops entered the country and removed the government.

The multi-national Communist armed forces' sole joint action was the Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia in August 1968. All member countries, with the exception of the Socialist Republic of Romania and the People's Republic of Albania participated in the invasion.

Beginning at the Cold War's conclusion, in late 1989, popular civil and political public discontent forced the Communist governments of the Warsaw Treaty countries from power – independent national politics made feasible with the perestroika- and glasnost-induced institutional collapse of Communist government in the USSR.[6] In the event the populaces of Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Albania, East Germany, Poland, Romania, and Bulgaria deposed their Communist governments in the period from 1989–91.

On 25 February 1991 the Warsaw Pact was declared disbanded at a meeting of defense and foreign ministers from Pact countries meeting in Hungary.[7] On the 1 July 1991, in Prague, the Czechoslovak President Václav Havel formally ended the 1955 Warsaw Treaty Organization of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance and so disestablished the Warsaw Treaty after 36 years of military alliance with the USSR. Five months later, the USSR disestablished itself in December 1991.

Central and Eastern Europe after the Warsaw Treaty

On 12 March 1999, the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland joined NATO; Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, and Slovakia joined in March 2004; Croatia and Albania joined on 1 April 2009.

Russia and some other post-USSR states joined in the Collective Security Treaty Organisation (CSTO).

In November 2005, the Polish government opened its Warsaw Treaty archives to the Institute of National Remembrance who published some 1,300 declassified documents in January 2006. Yet the Polish government reserved publication of 100 documents, pending their military declassification. Eventually, 30 of the reserved 100 documents were published; 70 remained secret, and unpublished. Among the documents published is the Warsaw Treaty's nuclear war plan, Seven Days to the River Rhine – a short, swift attack capturing Western Europe, using nuclear weapons, in self-defense, after a NATO first strike. The plan originated as a 1979 field training exercise war game, and metamorphosed into official Warsaw Treaty battle doctrine, until the late 1980s – thus why the People's Republic of Poland was a nuclear weapons base, first, to 178, then, to 250 tactical-range rockets. Doctrinally, as a Soviet-style (offensive) battle plan, Seven Days to the River Rhine gave commanders few defensive-war strategies for fighting NATO in Warsaw Treaty territory.

Simonstown Agreement

The **Simonstown Agreement** was a naval cooperation agreement between the United Kingdom and the (then-officially) Union of South Africa signed 30 June 1955. Under the agreement, the Royal Navy gave up its naval base at Simonstown, South Africa, and transferred command of the South African Navy to the government of South Africa. In return, South Africa promised the use of the Simonstown base to Royal Navy ships [1] The agreement also permitted South Africa to buy naval vessels from the UK valued at £18 million over the next eight years. In effect, the agreement was a mutual defence arrangement aimed at protecting sea routes between the UK and the Middle East. The agreement was controversial because of South Africa's policy of racial separation known as apartheid.

The government of the UK terminated the agreement on 16 June 1975. Ships of the Royal Navy continued to call periodically at Simon's Town and other South African ports, however the Royal Navy was not able to use any South African ports during the Falklands War.

South Africa was a member of the Commonwealth at the time the agreement was signed, so the UK and South Africa took the position that the agreement was not an international treaty requiring registration with the United Nations under Article 102 of the United Nations Charter.

Austrian State Treaty

The **Austrian State Treaty** (German: Österreichischer Staatsvertrag (help·info)) or **Austrian Independence Treaty** re-established Austria as a sovereign state. It was signed on May 15, 1955, in Vienna at the Schloss Belvedere among the Allied occupying powers (France, the United Kingdom, the United States, and the Soviet Union) and the Austrian government. It officially came into force on July 27, 1955.

Its full title is "Treaty for the re-establishment of an independent and democratic Austria, signed in Vienna on the 15 May 1955" (German: Staatsvertrag betreffend die Wiederherstellung eines unabhängigen und demokratischen Österreich, unterzeichnet in Wien am 15. Mai).

Generalities and structure

The treaty re-established a free, sovereign and democratic Austria. The basis for the treaty was the Moscow Declaration of October 30, 1943.

The signators of the treaty were the foreign ministers of the time: Vyacheslav Molotov (Soviet Union), John Foster Dulles (USA), Harold Macmillan (United Kingdom) and Antoine Pinay (France) on behalf of the Allies, and Leopold Figl as the Austrian foreign minister, as well as the four High Commissioners of the occupying powers: Ivan I. Ilitchov (Soviet Union), Geoffrey Arnold Wallinger (United Kingdom), Llewellyn E. Thompson Jr. (USA), Roger Lalouette (France).

The treaty is divided into 9 parts:

- Preamble
- Political and territorial provisions
- Military and air travel provisions
- Reparations
- Ownership, Law and Interests
- Economic relations
- Rules for disputes
- Economic provisions
- Final provisions

Non-Aligned Movement

The **Non-Aligned Movement** (**NAM**) is a group of states considering themselves not aligned formally with or against any major power bloc. As of 2011, the movement had 120 members and 17 observer countries.[1]

The organization was founded in Belgrade in 1961, and was largely the brainchild of Yugoslavia's President, Josip Broz Tito, India's first Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, Egypt's second President, Gamal Abdel Nasser, Ghana's first president Kwame Nkrumah, Indonesia's first President, Sukarno and Ethiopia's emperor Haile Selassie. All five leaders were prominent advocates of a middle course for states in the Developing World between the Western and Eastern blocs in the Cold War. The phrase itself was first used to represent the doctrine by Indian diplomat and statesman V.K. Krishna Menon in 1953, at the United Nations.[3]

The purpose of the organization as stated in the speech given by Fidel Castro during the Havana Declaration of 1979 is to ensure "the national independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and security of non-aligned countries" in their "struggle against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism, and all forms of foreign aggression, occupation, domination, interference or hegemony as well as against great power and bloc politics."[4] The countries of the Non-Aligned Movement represent nearly two-thirds of the United Nations's members and contain 55% of the world population. Membership is particularly concentrated in countries considered to be developing or part of the Third World.[5]

Members have, at various times, included: SFR Yugoslavia, Argentina, SWAPO, Cyprus, and Malta. Brazil has never been a formal member of the movement, but shares many of the aims of Non-Aligned Movement and frequently sends observers to the Non-Aligned Movement's summits. While many of the Non-Aligned Movement's members were actually quite closely aligned with one or another of the super powers, the movement still maintained surprising amounts of cohesion throughout the Cold War. Additionally, some members were involved in serious conflicts with other members (e.g., India and Pakistan, Iran and Iraq). The movement fractured from its own internal contradictions when the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan in 1979. While the Soviet allies supported the invasion, other members of the movement (particularly predominantly Muslim states) condemned it.

Because the Non-Aligned Movement was formed as an attempt to thwart the Cold War,[6] it has struggled to find relevance since the Cold War ended. After the breakup of Yugoslavia, a founding member, its membership was suspended[7] in 1992 at the regular Ministerial Meeting of the Movement, held in New York during the regular yearly session of the General Assembly of the

United Nations.[8][9] The successor states of the SFR Yugoslavia have expressed little interest in membership, though some have observer status. In 2004, Malta and Cyprus ceased to be members and joined the European Union. Belarus remains the sole member of the Movement in Europe. Turkmenistan, Belarus and the Dominican Republic are the most recent entrants. The applications of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Costa Rica were rejected in 1995 and 1998.[9]

Asian–African Conference

The first large-scale **Asian–African** or **Afro–Asian Conference**—also known as the **Bandung Conference**—was a meeting of Asian and African states, most of which were newly independent, which took place on April 18–24, 1955 in Bandung, Indonesia. The twenty-nine countries that participated at the Bandung Conference represented nearly one-fourth of the Earth's land surface and a total population of 1.5 billion people.[1] The conference was organised by Indonesia, Burma, Pakistan, Ceylon (Sri Lanka), and India and was coordinated by Ruslan Abdulgani, secretary general of the Indonesian Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The conference's stated aims were to promote Afro-Asian economic and cultural cooperation and to oppose colonialism or neocolonialism by either the United States or the Soviet Union in the Cold War, or any other imperialistic nations. The conference was an important step toward the crystallisation of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Background

The conference of Bandung was preceded by the Bogor Conference (1954) and was followed by the Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Conference in Cairo[2] in September (1957) and the Belgrade Conference (1961), which led to the establishment of the Non-Aligned Movement.[3] In later years, conflicts between the nonaligned nations eroded the solidarity expressed at Bandung.

The conference reflected what the organisers regarded as a reluctance by the Western powers to consult with them on decisions affecting Asia in a setting of Cold War tensions; their concern over tension between the People's Republic of China and the United States; their desire to lay firmer foundations for China's peace relations with themselves and the West; their opposition to colonialism, especially French influence in North Africa and its colonial rule in Algeria; and Indonesia's desire to promote its case in the dispute with the Netherlands over western New Guinea (Irian Barat).

Sukarno, the first president of the Republic of Indonesia, portrayed himself as the leader of this group of states, naming it **NEFOS** (Newly Emerging Forces).[4]

Discussion

Major debate centered around the question of whether Soviet policies in Eastern Europe and Central Asia should be censured along with Western colonialism. A consensus was reached in which "colonialism in all of its manifestations" was condemned, implicitly censuring the Soviet Union, as well as the West.[5] China played an important role in the conference and strengthened its relations with other Asian nations. Having survived an assassination attempt on the way to the conference, the Chinese premier, Zhou Enlai, displayed a moderate and conciliatory attitude that tended to quiet fears of some anticommunist delegates concerning China's intentions.

Later in the conference, Zhou Enlai signed on to the article in the concluding declaration stating that overseas Chinese owed primary loyalty to their home nation, rather than to China – a highly sensitive issue for both his Indonesian hosts and for several other participating countries. Zhou also signed an agreement on dual nationality with Indonesian foreign minister Sunario.

Outcome

A 10-point "declaration on promotion of world peace and cooperation," incorporating the principles of the United Nations Charter was adopted unanimously:

1. Respect for fundamental human rights and for the purposes and principles of the charter of the United Nations
2. Respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all nations
3. Recognition of the equality of all races and of the equality of all nations large and small
4. Abstention from intervention or interference in the internal affairs of another country
5. Respect for the right of each nation to defend itself, singly or collectively, in conformity with the charter of the United Nations
6. (a) Abstention from the use of arrangements of collective defence to serve any particular interests of the big powers
   (b) Abstention by any country from exerting pressures on other countries
7. Refraining from acts or threats of aggression or the use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any country

8. Settlement of all international disputes by peaceful means, such as negotiation, conciliation, arbitration or judicial settlement as well as other peaceful means of the parties own choice, in conformity with the charter of the United Nations
9. Promotion of mutual interests and cooperation
10. Respect for justice and international obligations.[6]

The final Communique of the Conference underscored the need for developing countries to loosen their economic dependence on the leading industrialized nations by providing technical assistance to one another through the exchange of experts and technical assistance for developmental projects, as well as the exchange of technological know-how and the establishment of regional training and research institutes.

Controversy

The United States of America, through its Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, shunned the conference and was not officially represented. However, Representative Adam Clayton Powell, Jr. (D-N.Y.) attended the conference and spoke at some length in favor of American foreign policy there which assisted the United States's standing with the Non-Aligned. When Powell returned to the United States to report on the conference, the House of Representatives honored him for his contributions.[citation needed]

Legacy

To mark the fiftieth anniversary of the Conference, Heads of State and Government of Asian-African countries attended a new Asian-African Summit from 20–24 April 2005 in Bandung and Jakarta. Some sessions of the new conference took place in Gedung Merdeka (Independence Building), the venue of the original conference. The conference concluded by establishing the New Asian-African Strategic Partnership (NAASP).[citation needed]

The 2005 Asian African Summit yielded, inter-alia, the Declaration on the New Asian African Strategic Partnership (NAASP), the Joint Ministerial Statement on the New Asian African Strategic Partnership Plan of Action, and the Joint Asian African Leaders' Statement on Tsunami, Earthquake and other Natural Disaster. The aforementioned declaration of NAASP is a manifestation of intra-regional bridge-building forming a new strategic partnership commitment between Asia and Africa, standing on three pillars, i.e. political solidarity, economic cooperation, and socio-cultural relations, within which governments, regional/sub-regional organizations, as well as peoples of Asian and African nations interact.

The 2005 Asian African Summit was attended by 106 countries, comprising 54 Asian countries and 52 African countries . The Summit concluded a follow-up mechanism for institutionalization process in the form of Summit concurrent with Business Summit every four years, Ministerial Meeting every two years, and Sectoral Ministerial as well as Technical Meeting if deemed necessary.

A fascinating literary account, which brings out some overlap between the internationalist aims of African-American politics in the period with Third-world movements can be found in Richard Wright's The Color Curtain: A Report on the Bandung Conference.

Southeast Asia Treaty Organization

The **South East Asia Treaty Organization** (**SEATO**) was an international organization for collective defense in Southeast Asia created by the **Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty**, or **Manila Pact**, signed in September 1954 in Manila, Philippines. The formal institution of SEATO was established on 19 February 1955 at a meeting of treaty partners in Bangkok, Thailand.[1] The organization's headquarters were also located in Bangkok.

Primarily created to block further communist gains in Southeast Asia, SEATO is generally considered a failure because internal conflict and dispute hindered general use of the SEATO military; however, SEATO-funded cultural and educational programs left long-standing effects in Southeast Asia. SEATO was dissolved on 30 June 1977 after multiple members lost interest and withdrew.

Origins and structure

The Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, or Manila Pact, was signed on 8 September 1954 in Manila,[2] as part of the American Truman Doctrine of creating anti-communist bilateral and collective defense treaties.[3] These treaties and agreements were intended to create alliances that would contain communist powers (Communist China, in SEATO's case).[4] This policy was considered to have been largely developed by American diplomat and Soviet expert George F. Kennan. President Dwight D. Eisenhower's Secretary of State John Foster Dulles (1953–1959) is considered to be the primary force behind the creation of SEATO, which expanded the concept of anti-communist collective defense to Southeast Asia,[2] and then-Vice President Richard Nixon advocated an Asian equivalent of NATO upon returning from his late-1953 Asia trip.[5] The organization, headquartered in Bangkok, was created in 1955 at the first meeting of the Council of Ministers set up by the treaty, contrary to Dulles's preference to call the organization "ManPac".

SEATO was intended to be a Southeast Asian version of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO),[6] in which the military forces of each member would be coordinated to provide for the collective defense of the members' country. Organizationally, SEATO was headed by the Secretary General, whose office was created in 1957 at a meeting in Canberra,[7][8] with a council of representatives from member nations and an international staff. Also present were committees for economics, security, and information.[8] SEATO's first Secretary General was Pote Sarasin, a Thai diplomat and politician who had served as Thailand's ambassador to the U.S. between 1952 and 1957,[9][10] and as Prime Minister of Thailand from September 1957 to 1 January 1958.[11]

Unlike the NATO alliance, SEATO had no joint commands with standing forces.[12] In addition, SEATO's response protocol in the event of communism presenting a "common danger" to the member nations was vague and ineffective, though membership in the SEATO alliance did provide a rationale for a large-scale U.S. military intervention in the region during the Vietnam War (1955–1975).[13]

Membership

SEATO's members included Australia, France, New Zealand, Pakistan (including East Pakistan, now Bangladesh), the Philippines, Thailand, the United Kingdom, and the United States.[12] The membership reflected a mid-1950s combination of anti-communist Western nations and such nations in Southeast Asia. The United Kingdom, Australia and the United States, the latter of which joined after the U.S. Senate ratified the treaty by a 82–1 vote,[14] represented the strongest Western powers.[15]

Because of the 1954 Geneva Conference settling the First Indochina War (1946–1954), South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos were not SEATO members.[12] They were, however, granted military protection,[12] though Cambodia rejected the protection in 1956.[16] Canada considered joining, but decided against it in order to concentrate on its NATO responsibilities.[17]

Military aspects

After its creation, SEATO quickly became insignificant militarily, as most of its member nations contributed very little to the alliance.[17] While SEATO military forces held joint military training, they were never employed because of internal disagreements. SEATO was unable to intervene in conflicts in Laos because France and Britain rejected use of military action.[16] As a result, the U.S. provided unilateral support for Laos after 1962.[16] Though sought by the U.S.,

involvement of SEATO in the Vietnam War was denied because of lack of British and French cooperation.[14][16]

Both the United States and Australia cited the alliance as justification for involvement in Vietnam.[17] American membership in SEATO provided the United States with a rationale for a large-scale U.S. military intervention in Southeast Asia.[13] Other countries, such as Great Britain and key nations in Asia, accepted the rationale.[13] In 1962, as part of its commitment to SEATO, the Royal Australian Air Force deployed CAC Sabres of its No. 79 Squadron to Ubon Royal Thai Air Force Base, Thailand. The Sabres began to play a role in the Vietnam War in 1965, when their air defence responsibilities expanded to include protection of USAF aircraft using Ubon as a base for strikes against North Vietnam.[18][19]

Cultural effects

In addition to joint military training, SEATO member states worked on improving mutual social and economic issues.[20] Such activities were overseen by SEATO's Committee of Information, Culture, Education, and Labor Activities, and proved to be some of SEATO's greatest successes.[20] In 1959, SEATO's first Secretary General, Pote Sarasin, created the SEATO Graduate School of Engineering (currently the Asian Institute of Technology) in Thailand to train engineers.[9] SEATO also sponsored the creation of the Teacher Development Center in Bangkok, as well as the Thai Military Technical Training School, which offered technical programs for supervisors and workmen.[21] SEATO's Skilled Labor Project (SLP) created artisan training facilities, especially in Thailand, where ninety-one training workshops were established.[21]

SEATO also provided research funding and grants in agriculture and medical fields.[22] In 1959, SEATO set up the Cholera Research Laboratory in Bangkok, later establishing a second Cholera Research Laboratory in Dhaka, Bangladesh.[22] The Dhaka laboratory soon became the world's leading cholera research facility and was later renamed the International Centre for Diarrhoeal Disease Research, Bangladesh.[23] SEATO was also interested in literature, and a SEATO Literature Award was created and given to writers from member states.[24]

Criticism and dissolution

Though Secretary of State Dulles considered SEATO an essential element in American foreign policy in Asia, historians have considered the Manila Pact a failure and the pact is rarely mentioned in history books.[2] In The Geneva

Conference of 1954 on Indochina, Sir James Cable, a diplomat and naval strategist,[25] described SEATO as "a fig leaf for the nakedness of American policy", citing the Manila Pact as a "zoo of paper tigers".[2]

Consequently, questions of dissolving the organization arose. Pakistan withdrew in 1972 after the Bangladesh Liberation War of 1971, in which East Pakistan successfully seceded with the aid of India.[8] France withdrew financial support in 1975.[12] After a final exercise on 20 February 1976, the organization was formally dissolved on 30 June 1977.[12]

Central Treaty Organization

The **Central Treaty Organization** (also referred to as **CENTO** (Central Eastern Treaty Organisation); original name was **Middle East Treaty Organization** or **METO**; also known as the **Baghdad Pact**) was formed in 1955 by Iran, Iraq, Pakistan, Turkey, and the United Kingdom. It was dissolved in 1979.

U.S. pressure and promises of military and economic aid were key in the negotiations leading to the agreement, although the United States could not initially participate "for purely technical reasons of budgeting procedures."[1] In 1958, the United States joined the military committee of the alliance. It is generally viewed as one of the least successful of the Cold War alliances.[2] The organization's headquarters were initially located in Baghdad (Iraq) 1955–1958 and Ankara (Turkey) 1958–1979. Cyprus was also an important location for CENTO due to its positioning within the Middle East and the British Sovereign Base Areas situated on the island.[3]

Korean War

The **Korean War** was a war between the Republic of Korea (supported primarily by the United States of America, with contributions from allied nations under the aegis of the United Nations) and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (supported by the People's Republic of China, with military and material aid from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics). The Korean War was primarily the result of the political division of Korea by an agreement of the victorious Allies at the conclusion of the Pacific War at the end of World War II. The Korean Peninsula was ruled by the Empire of Japan from 1910 until the end of World War II. Following the surrender of the Empire of Japan in September 1945, American administrators divided the peninsula along the 38th

parallel, with U.S. military forces occupying the southern half and Soviet military forces occupying the northern half.[12]

The failure to hold free elections throughout the Korean Peninsula in 1948 deepened the division between the two sides; the North established a communist government, while the South established a capitalist one. The 38th parallel increasingly became a political border between the two Korean states. Although reunification negotiations continued in the months preceding the war, tension intensified. Cross-border skirmishes and raids at the 38th Parallel persisted. The situation escalated into open warfare when North Korean forces invaded South Korea on 25 June 1950.[13] It was the first significant armed conflict of the Cold War.[14] In 1950 the Soviet Union boycotted the United Nations security council, in protest at representation of China by the Kuomintang / Republic of China government, which had taken refuge in Taiwan following defeat in the Chinese Civil War. In the absence of a dissenting voice from the Soviet Union, who could have vetoed it, the United States and other countries passed a security council resolution authorizing military intervention in Korea.

The United States of America provided 88% of the 341,000 international soldiers which aided South Korean forces in repelling the invasion, with twenty other countries of the United Nations offering assistance. Suffering severe casualties, within two months the defenders were pushed back to a small area in the south of the Korean Peninsula, known as the Pusan perimeter. A rapid U.N. counter-offensive then drove the North Koreans past the 38th Parallel and almost to the Yalu River, when the People's Republic of China (PRC) entered the war on the side of North Korea.[13] Chinese intervention forced the Southern-allied forces to retreat behind the 38th Parallel. While not directly committing forces to the conflict, the Soviet Union provided material aid to both the North Korean and Chinese armies. The active stage of the war ended on 27 July 1953, when the armistice agreement was signed. The agreement restored the border between the Koreas near the 38th Parallel and created the Korean Demilitarized Zone (DMZ), a 2.5-mile (4.0 km)-wide fortified buffer zone between the two Korean nations. Minor outbreaks of fighting continue to the present day.

With both North Korea and South Korea sponsored by external powers, the Korean War was a proxy war. From a military science perspective, it combined strategies and tactics of World War I and World War II: it began with a mobile campaign of swift infantry attacks followed by air bombing raids, but became a static trench war by July 1951.

General Treaty

The **General Treaty** (German: Generalvertrag also Deutschlandvertrag - "Germany Treaty") is a treaty of international law which was signed by the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG or West Germany), and the Western Allies (France, Great Britain, and the USA) on May 26, 1952 but which took effect, with some slight changes, only in 1955. It ended formally Germany's status as an occupied territory and gives it the rights of a sovereign state, with certain restrictions that remained in place until German reunification.

Attaining sovereignty had become necessary in light of the rearmament efforts of the FRG. For this reason, it was agreed that the Treaty would only come to force when West Germany also joined the European Defense Community (EDC). Because the EDC Treaty was not approved by France's Parliament on August 30, 1954, the General Treaty could not come into effect. After this failure, the EDC Treaty had to be reworked and the nations at the London Nine-Power Conference decided to allow West Germany to join NATO and to create the Western European Union (not to be confused with the European Union). With this development, West Germany, under the leadership of Konrad Adenauer, in front of the backdrop of the Cold War became a fully trusted partner of the western allies and with the second draft of the General Treaty, West Germany largely regained its sovereignty. The Allies, however, retained some controls over Germany until 1991 (see further Two Plus Four Agreement).

After the ratification of the Paris Treaties on May 5, 1955 the General Treaty took full effect.

Treaty of Taipei

The **Sino-Japanese Peace Treaty** (Chinese: 中日和平條約, Japanese: 日華平和条約), commonly known as the **Treaty of Taipei** (Chinese: 台北和約), was a peace treaty between Japan and the Republic of China (ROC) signed in Taipei, Taiwan on April 28, 1952. This treaty was necessary, because neither the Republic of China nor the People's Republic of China was invited to sign the Treaty of San Francisco due to disagreements by other countries as to which government was the legitimate government of China during and after the Chinese Civil War. Under pressure from the United States, Japan signed a separate peace treaty with the Republic of China to bring the war between the two states to a formal end with the victory by the ROC. Although the ROC itself was not a participant of San Francisco Peace Treaty due to the resumption of Chinese Civil War after 1945, this treaty largely correlates itself to the San

Francisco Peace Treaty. In particular, ROC waived service compensation to Japan in this treaty with respect to Article 14 (a) 1 of the San Francisco Treaty.

The Treaty of Taipei was abrogated by the Japanese government on Sept. 29, 1972.[1]

Summary of Treaty

Treaty of Taipei largely correlates itself to the terms of the Treaty of San Francisco, recognizing that in the Treaty of San Francisco (which entered into force April 28, 1952) Japan renounced all right, title, and claim concerning Taiwan, the Pescadores, the Spratlys, and the Paracels.[2]

Key Articles

Article 2

> Reiterates the provision of the San Francisco Peace Treaty whereby Japan renounced all right, title, and claim to Taiwan and other associated islands.

Article 4

> All treaties, conventions and agreements concluded prior to August 9, 1941 were nullified.

Article 10

> Ethnic Chinese residents of the islands of Taiwan and Penghu and their descendants were regarded as having Chinese nationality.

Relationship with the San Francisco Treaty

Direct references

In two articles, the Treaty of Taipei makes direct references to the San Francisco Peace Treaty, which was the treaty signed and ratified by most Allies with the government of Japan in 1951 and 1952.

Article 2 is a confirmation of the renunciation of Japan's claims to Taiwan and the Pescadores as well as to the South China Sea island chains of the Paracels and Spratlys.

Dates

The San Francisco Peace Treaty was signed on September 8, 1951 and ratified on April 28, 1952. The date of the ratification of the San Francisco treaty is the same date that the Treaty of Taipei was signed, that being April 28, 1952. However, the Treaty of Taipei did not enter into force until August 5, 1952 with the exchange of instruments of ratification between the two governments in Taipei.[3] While there is no explicit provision for the transfer of sovereignty over Taiwan from Japan to the Republic of China, Article 10 is taken by many scholars as an implicit transfer. However, Ng Yuzin Chiautong, Chairman, World United Formosans for Independence (WUFI), writing in the 2nd edition (1972) of his book Historical and Legal Aspects of the International Status of Taiwan (Formosa) maintained that Article 10 is not an affirmative definition of the Chinese nationality of the Taiwanese people, but merely an agreement reached for the sake of convenience on the treatment of the Taiwanese as ROC nationals, because otherwise they would be considered stateless and be ineligible for documentation to enable them to travel to Japan. He further points out that the Treaty of Taipei does not call the Taiwanese "Chinese nationals" but instead employs the term "residents".[4]

Moreover, Japan formally surrendered its claim to sovereignty over Taiwan on April 28, 1952, thus calling into serious doubt the authority of Japan to formally make such an assignment regarding the status of Taiwan over three months later on August 5, 1952. Indeed, British and American officials did not recognize any transfer of Taiwan's sovereignty to "China" in either of the post-war treaties.

ANZUS

The **Australia, New Zealand, United States Security Treaty** (**ANZUS** or **ANZUS Treaty**) is the military alliance which binds Australia and New Zealand and, separately, Australia and the United States to cooperate on defence matters in the Pacific Ocean area, though today the treaty is understood to relate to attacks worldwide.

Treaty structure

The treaty was previously a full three-way defense pact, but following a dispute between New Zealand and the United States in 1984 over visiting rights for nuclear-armed or nuclear-powered ships of the US Navy to New Zealand ports, the treaty may have lapsed between the United States and New Zealand, although it remains separately in force between both those countries and Australia.[1]

The Australia–US alliance under the ANZUS Treaty remains in full force. Heads of defense of one or both nations often have joined the annual ministerial meetings, which are supplemented by consultations between the US Combatant Commander Pacific and the Australian Chief of Defence Force. There are also regular civilian and military consultations between the two governments at lower levels. Annual meetings to discuss ANZUS defense matters take place between the United States Secretary of State and the Australian Minister for Foreign Affairs (AUSMIN). The most recent AUSMIN meeting took place in San Francisco in September 2011.[2]

Unlike NATO, ANZUS has no integrated defense structure or dedicated forces. Nevertheless, Australia and the United States conduct a variety of joint activities. These include military exercises ranging from naval and landing exercises at the task-group level to battalion-level special forces training, assigning officers to each other's armed services, and standardising equipment and operational doctrine. The two countries also operate several joint defense facilities in Australia, mainly ground stations for early warning satellites, and signals intelligence gathering in South-East Asia and East Asia as part of the ECHELON network.

U.S. and Japan Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement

The **U.S. and Japan Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement** was signed on March 8, 1954 in Tokyo between John Moore Allison of the United States and Katsuo Okazaki of Japan. The accord contained eleven articles and seven amendments (or annexes). The agreement dictated that both the United States and Japan support each other militarily. Specifically, it permitted the United States to station its troops on Japanese soil in order to maintain security in the region. Moreover, Japan was obligated to take responsibility in protecting itself and was permitted to rearm for defensive purposes only. Ultimately, the agreement was ratified on May 1, 1954.[1]

Security Treaty Between the United States and Japan

The **Security Treaty Between the United States and Japan** was signed on 8 September 1951 in San Francisco, California between representatives of the United States and the State of Japan.

The agreement contained five articles, which dictated that Japan grant the United States the territorial means for it to establish a military presence in the

Far East. Moreover, the accord stated that Japan be prohibited from providing foreign powers any bases or any military-related rights without the consent of the United States. The accord was ratified by the United States Senate on 20 March 1952 and then it was ratified again by the President of the United States on 15 April 1952. Ultimately, the treaty went into effect on 28 April 1952.[1]

Text

Introduction

Japan has this day signed a Treaty of Peace with the Allied Powers. On the coming into force of that Treaty, Japan will not have the effective means to exercise its inherent right of self-defense because it has been disarmed.

There is danger to Japan in this situation because irresponsible militarism has not yet been driven from the world. Therefore Japan desires a Security Treaty with the United States of America to come into force simultaneously with the Treaty of Peace between the United States of America and Japan.

The Treaty of Peace recognizes that Japan as a sovereign nation has the right to enter into collective security arrangements, and further, the Charter of the United Nations recognizes that all nations possess an inherent right of individual and collective self-defense.

In exercise of these rights, Japan desires, as a provisional arrangement for its defense, that the United States of America should maintain armed forces of its own in and about Japan so as to deter armed attack upon Japan.

The United States of America, in the interest of peace and security, is presently willing to maintain certain of its armed forces in and about Japan, in the expectation, however, that Japan will itself increasingly assume responsibility for its own defense against direct and indirect aggression, always avoiding any armament which could be an offensive threat or serve other than to promote peace and security in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

Accordingly, the two countries have agreed as follows:

Article I

Japan grants, and the United States of America accepts, the right, upon the coming into force of the Treaty of Peace and of this Treaty, to dispose United States land, air and sea forces in and about Japan. Such forces may be utilized to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security in the Far East

and to the security of Japan against armed attack from without, including assistance given at the express request of the Japanese Government to put down largescale internal riots and disturbances in Japan, caused through instigation or intervention by an outside power or powers.

Article II

During the exercise of the right referred to in Article I, Japan will not grant, without the prior consent of the United States of America, any bases or any rights, powers or authority whatsoever, in or relating to bases or the right of garrison or of maneuver, or transit of ground, air or naval forces to any third power.

Article III

The conditions which shall govern the disposition of armed forces of the United States of America in and about Japan shall be determined by administrative agreements between the two Governments.

Article IV

This Treaty shall expire whenever in the opinion of the Governments of the United States of America and Japan there shall have come into force such United Nations arrangements or such alternative individual or collective security dispositions as will satisfactorily provide for the maintenance by the United Nations or otherwise of international peace and security in the Japan Area.

Article V

This Treaty shall be ratified by the United States of America and Japan and will come into force when instruments of ratification thereof have been exchanged by them at Washington.

Signatories

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the undersigned Plenipotentiaries have signed this Treaty.

DONE in duplicate at the city of San Francisco, in the English and Japanese languages, this eighth day of September, 1951.

Treaty of San Francisco

The **Treaty of Peace with Japan** (commonly known as the **Treaty of San Francisco** or **San Francisco Peace Treaty**), between Japan and part of the Allied Powers, was officially signed by 48 nations on September 8, 1951, at the War Memorial Opera House in San Francisco, United States. It came into force on April 28, 1952.

This treaty served to end officially World War II, to end formally Japan's position as an imperial power, and to allocate compensation to Allied civilians and former prisoners of war who had suffered Japanese war crimes. This treaty made extensive use of the UN Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to enunciate the Allies' goals.

This treaty, along with the Security Treaty signed that same year, is said to mark the beginning of the "San Francisco System"; this term, coined by historian John W. Dower, signifies the effects of Japan's relationship with the United States and its role in the international arena as determined by these two treaties and is used to discuss the ways in which these effects have governed Japan's post-war history.

Genocide Convention

The **Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide** was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 9 December 1948 as **General Assembly Resolution 260**. The Convention entered into force on 12 January 1951.[1] It defines genocide in legal terms, and is the culmination of years of campaigning by lawyer Raphael Lemkin. Yaur Auron writes "When Raphael Lemkin coined the word genocide in 1944 he cited the 1915 annihilation of Armenians as a seminal example of genocide."[2] All participating countries are advised to prevent and punish actions of genocide in war and in peacetime. The number of states that have ratified the convention is currently 142.

Definition of genocide

Article 2 of the Convention defines genocide as

...any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such:

(a) Killing members of the group;

(b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;

(c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;

(d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;

(e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

— Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, Article 2[3]

Article 3 defines the crimes that can be punished under the convention:

(a) Genocide;

(b) Conspiracy to commit genocide;

(c) Direct and public incitement to commit genocide;

(d) Attempt to commit genocide;

(e) Complicity in genocide.

— Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, Article 3[3]

The convention was passed to outlaw actions similar to the Holocaust by Nazi Germany during World War II. The first draft of the Convention included political killings, but the USSR[4] along with some other nations would not accept that actions against groups identified as holding similar political opinions or social status would constitute genocide,[5] so these stipulations were subsequently removed in a political and diplomatic compromise.

Parties

Provisos granting immunity from prosecution for genocide without its consent were made by Bahrain, Bangladesh, India, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, the United States, Vietnam, Yemen, and Yugoslavia.[6][7] Prior to its ratification of the convention, the United States Senate was treated to a speech by Senator William Proxmire in favor of this treaty every day that the Senate was in session between 1967 and 1986.

Reservations

Immunity from prosecutions

Persons charged with genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in article III shall be tried by a competent tribunal of the State in the territory of which the act was committed, or by such international penal tribunal as may have jurisdiction with respect to those Contracting Parties which shall have accepted its jurisdiction.

— Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, Article 6[3]

Any Contracting Party may call upon the competent organs of the United Nations to take such action under the Charter of the United Nations as they consider appropriate for the prevention and suppression of acts of genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in article III.

— Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, Article 8[3]

Disputes between the Contracting Parties relating to the interpretation, application or fulfilment of the present Convention, including those relating to the responsibility of a State for genocide or for any of the other acts enumerated in article III, shall be submitted to the International Court of Justice at the request of any of the parties to the dispute.

— Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, Article 9[3]

- Bahrain
- Bangladesh
- China
- India
- Malaysia (reservation opposed by Netherlands, United Kingdom)
- Morocco
- Myanmar
- Philippines (reservation opposed by Norway)
- Rwanda (reservation opposed by United Kingdom)
- Singapore (reservation opposed by Netherlands, United Kingdom)
- United Arab Emirates
- United States of America (reservation opposed by Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom)

- Venezuela
- Vietnam (reservation opposed by United Kingdom)
- Yemen (reservation opposed by United Kingdom)
- Yugoslavia (Montenegro, Serbia, ...)

Application to Non-Self-Governing Territories

Any Contracting Party may at any time, by notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, extend the application of the present Convention to all or any of the territories for the conduct of whose foreign relations that Contracting Party is responsible

— Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, Article 12[3]

Several countries opposed this article, considering that the convention should apply to Non-Self-Governing Territories:

- Albania
- Belarus
- Bulgaria
- Hungary
- Mongolia
- Myanmar
- Poland
- Romania
- Russian Federation
- Ukraine

The opposition of those countries were in turn opposed by:

- Australia
- Belgium
- Brazil
- Ecuador
- China
- Netherlands
- Sri Lanka
- United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Breaches

Rwanda

The first time that the 1948 law was enforced occurred on 2 September 1998 when the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda found Jean-Paul Akayesu, the former mayor of a small town in Rwanda, guilty of nine counts of genocide. The lead prosecutor in this case was Pierre-Richard Prosper. Two days later, Jean Kambanda became the first head of government to be convicted of genocide.

Yugoslavia

The first state to be found in breach of the Genocide convention was Serbia. In the Bosnia and Herzegovina v. Serbia and Montenegro case the International Court of Justice presented its judgment on 26 February 2007. It cleared Serbia of direct involvement in genocide during the Bosnian war,[8] but ruled that Belgrade did breach international law by failing to prevent the 1995 Srebrenica genocide, and for failing to try or transfer the persons accused of genocide to the ICTY, in order to comply with its obligations under Articles I and VI of the Genocide Convention, in particular in respect of General Ratko Mladić.[9][10]

The ICD Initiative on the Genocide Convention

In 2010, Janez Janša, the former prime minister of Slovenia in collaboration with the Institute for Cultural Diplomacy, a non-governmental organisation based in Berlin, initiated “The Initiative on the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide". This initiative or "model convention" focuses on achieving a fast-track, concrete legal resolution to halting current instances of genocide taking place in conflict zones across the world. The dominant feature of this initiative is the incorporation of the "Responsibility to Protect" into the Convention, with the primary aim of preventing mass civilian casualties. This initiative has not yet been successful in amending the Genocide Convention.

Mutual Defense Treaty (U.S.–Philippines)

The **Mutual Defense Treaty Between the Republic of the Philippines and the United States of America** was signed on August 30, 1951 in Washington, D.C. between representatives of the Philippines and the United States. The overall accord contained eight articles and dictated that both nations would

support each other if either the Philippines or the United States were to be attacked by an external party.

Treaty Text

The Parties to this Treaty,

Reaffirming their faith in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all Governments, and desiring to strengthen the fabric of peace in the Pacific Area,

Recalling with mutual pride the historic relationship which brought their two peoples together in a common bond of sympathy and mutual ideals to fight side-by-side against imperialist aggression during the last war,

Desiring to declare publicly and formally their sense of unity and their common determination to defend themselves against external armed attack, so that no potential aggressor could be under the illusion that either of them stands alone in the Pacific Area,

Desiring further to strengthen their present efforts for collective defense for the preservation of peace and security pending the development of a more comprehensive system of regional security in the Pacific Area,

Agreeing that nothing in this present instrument shall be considered or interpreted as in any way or sense altering or diminishing any existing agreements or understandings between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines.[6]

Have agreed as follows:

Article I

The Parties undertake, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, to settle any international disputes in which they may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purpose of the United Nations.[6]

Article II

In order more effectively to achieve the objective of this Treaty, the Parties separately and jointly by self-help and mutual aid will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack.[6]

Article III

The Parties, through their Foreign Ministers or their deputies, will consult together from time to time regarding the implementation of this Treaty and whenever in the opinion of either of them the territorial integrity, political independence or security of either of the Parties is threatened by external armed attack in the Pacific.[6]

Article IV

Each Party recognizes that an armed attack in the Pacific Area on either of the Parties would be dangerous to its own peace and safety and declares that it would act to meet the common dangers in accordance with its constitutional processes. Any such armed attack and all measures taken as a result thereof shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations. Such measures shall be terminated when the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security.[6]

Article V

For the purpose of Article IV, an armed attack on either of the Parties is deemed to include an armed attack on the metropolitan territory of either of the Parties, or on the island territories under its jurisdiction in the Pacific or on its armed forces, public vessels or aircraft in the Pacific.[6]

Article VI

This Treaty does not affect and shall not be interpreted as affecting in any way the rights and obligations of the Parties under the Charter of the United Nations or the responsibility of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security.[6]

Article VII

This Treaty shall be ratified by the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines in accordance with their respective constitutional processes and will come into force when instruments of ratification thereof have been exchanged by them at Manila.[6]

Article VIII

This Treaty shall remain in force indefinitely. Either Party may terminate it one year after notice has been given to the other Party.[6]

Treaty of Zgorzelec

The **Treaty of Zgorzelec** (Full title The Agreement Concerning the Demarcation of the Established and the Existing Polish-German State Frontier, also known as the Treaty of Görlitz and Treaty of Zgorzelic) between the Republic of Poland and East Germany (GDR) was signed on 6 July 1950 in Polish Zgorzelec, since 1945 the eastern part of the divided city of Görlitz.

The agreement was signed under Soviet pressure by Otto Grotewohl, prime minister of the provisional government of the GDR (East Germany) and Polish premier Józef Cyrankiewicz. It recognized the Oder-Neisse line implemented by the 1945 Potsdam Agreement as the border between the two states.[1] The terms referred to the "defined and existing border" from the Baltic Sea west of Świnoujście - however without mentioning Szczecin - along the Oder and Lusatian Neisse rivers to the Czechoslovak border. Thereby the East German government also accepted the division of Küstrin, Frankfurt (Oder), Guben and Görlitz.

The treaty was worded as a declaration and was not recognised as a legitimate international treaty by West Germany insisting on its exclusive mandate and the members states of the NATO. Four years later when the Soviet Union granted East Germany independence,[2] the Soviet Union reserved rights over East Germany (similar to the rights reserved by the Western Allies over the West Germany under the Bonn–Paris conventions) pending a final peace treaty with Germany - the 1990 Treaty on the Final Settlement with Respect to Germany. So although the treaty was binding on the two states it was not seen by many western members of the international community as a definitive.[1] The West German government stressed the status of the territories east of the Oder-Neisse-line being "under Polish and Soviet administration" until in 1970 Chancellor Willy Brandt by signing the Treaty of Warsaw de facto acknowledged the border.

The community centre in which the treaty was signed is one of Zgorzelec's main sights and is found in a park beside the road bridge border crossing.

Liaquat–Nehru Pact

The **Liaquat–Nehru Pact** was signed by Pakistan's Prime Minister Liaquat Ali Khan and Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru in New Delhi on April 8, 1950. The pact was the outcome of six days of talks between the two Prime

Ministers in Delhi. It sought to guarantee the rights of minorities in both countries after the Partition of India and avert another war between them.

Treaty of London (1949)

The **Treaty of London** was signed on May 5, 1949, which created the Council of Europe. The original signatories were Belgium, Denmark, France, Republic of Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and United Kingdom. It is currently referred to as the Statute of the Council of Europe.

Treaty of The Hague (1949)

The **Treaty of Den Haag** (also known as the **Treaty of The Hague**) was signed on December 27, 1949 between representatives from Indonesia and the Netherlands. Based on the terms of the treaty, the Netherlands granted independence to Indonesia except for the South Molucca Islands and West Irian. The accord officially established the Netherlands-Indonesia Union whereby Indonesia was transformed into a federation.

Fourth Geneva Convention

The **Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War**, commonly referred to as the **Fourth Geneva Convention** and abbreviated as **GCIV**, is one of the four treaties of the Geneva Conventions. It was adopted in August 1949, and defines humanitarian protections for civilians in a war zone, and outlaws the practice of total war. There are currently 194 countries party to the 1949 Geneva Conventions, including this fourth treaty but also including the other three.[1]

In 1993, the United Nations Security Council adopted a report from the Secretary-General and a Commission of Experts which concluded that the Geneva Conventions had passed into the body of customary international law, thus making them binding on non-signatories to the Conventions whenever they engage in armed conflicts.[2]

Part I. General Provisions

This sets out the overall parameters for GCIV:

- Article 2 states that signatories are bound by the convention both in war, armed conflicts where war has not been declared and in an occupation of another country's territory.
- Article 3 states that even where there is not a conflict of international character the parties must as a minimum adhere to minimal protections described as: noncombatants, members of armed forces who have laid down their arms, and combatants who are hors de combat (out of the fight) due to wounds, detention, or any other cause shall in all circumstances be treated humanely, with the following prohibitions:

  (a) violence to life and person, in particular murder of all kinds, mutilation, cruel treatment and torture;
  (b) taking of hostages;

  (c) outrages upon personal dignity, in particular humiliating and degrading treatment

  (d) the passing of sentences and the carrying out of executions without previous judgment pronounced by a regularly constituted court, affording all the judicial guarantees which are recognized as indispensable by civilized peoples.

- Article 4 defines who is a **Protected person**: Persons protected by the Convention are those who, at a given moment and in any manner whatsoever, find themselves, in case of a conflict or occupation, in the hands of a Party to the conflict or Occupying Power of which they are not nationals. But it **explicitly excludes** Nationals of a State which is not bound by the Convention and the citizens of a neutral state or an allied state if that state has normal diplomatic relations within the State in whose hands they are.
- A number of articles specify how Protecting Powers, ICRC and other humanitarian organizations may aid **Protected persons**.

Protected person is the most important definition in this section because many of the articles in the rest of GCIV only apply to Protected persons.

Part II. General Protection of Populations Against Certain Consequences of War

Article 13. The provisions of Part II cover the whole of the populations of the countries in conflict, **without any adverse distinction** based, in particular, on **race**, **nationality**, **religion** or **political opinion**, and are intended to alleviate the sufferings caused by war.

Part III. Status and Treatment of Protected Persons

Section I. Provisions common to the territories of the parties to the conflict and to occupied territories

Article 32. A protected person/s shall not have anything done to them of such a character as to cause physical suffering or extermination ... the physical suffering or extermination of protected persons in their hands. This prohibition applies not only to murder, torture, corporal punishments, mutilation and medical or scientific experiments not necessitated by the medical treatment' While popular debate remains on what constitutes a legal definition of torture (see discussion on the Torture page), the ban on corporal punishment simplifies the matter; even the most mundane physical abuse is thereby forbidden by Article 32, as a precaution against alternate definitions of torture.

The prohibition on scientific experiments was added, in part, in response to experiments by German and Japanese doctors during World War II, of whom Josef Mengele was the most infamous.

Collective punishments

Article 33. No **protected person** may be punished for an offense he or she has not personally committed. Collective penalties and likewise all measures of intimidation or of terrorism are prohibited. Pillage is prohibited. Reprisals against **protected persons** and their property are prohibited.

Under the 1949 Geneva Conventions collective punishments are a war crime. By collective punishment, the drafters of the Geneva Conventions had in mind the reprisal killings of World Wars I and World War II. In the First World War, Germans executed Belgian villagers in mass retribution for resistance activity. In World War II, Nazis carried out a form of collective punishment to suppress resistance. Entire villages or towns or districts were held responsible for any resistance activity that took place there. Additional concern also addressed the United States' atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, which, in turn,

caused death and disease to hundreds of thousands of Japanese civilians.[3] The conventions, to counter this, reiterated the principle of individual responsibility. The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) Commentary to the conventions states that parties to a conflict often would resort to "intimidatory measures to terrorize the population" in hopes of preventing hostile acts, but such practices "strike at guilty and innocent alike. They are opposed to all principles based on humanity and justice."

Additional Protocol II of 1977 explicitly forbids collective punishment. But as fewer states have ratified this protocol than GCIV, GCIV Article 33 is the one more commonly quoted.

Section III. Occupied territories

Articles 47-78 impose substantial obligations on occupying powers. As well as numerous provisions for the general welfare of the inhabitants of an occupied territory, an occupier may not forcibly deport protected persons, or deport or transfer parts of its own civilian population into occupied territory (Art.49).

Article 49 - Population transfer [show]

Article 50 - Care and education of children [show]

Article 53 - Destruction of property [show]

Article 56 - Medical services [show]

Part IV. Execution of the Convention

This part contains "the formal or diplomatic provisions which it is customary to place at the end of an international Convention to settle the procedure for bringing it into effect are grouped together under this heading (1). They are similar in all four Geneva Conventions.[4]

Annexes

The ICRC commentary on the Fourth Geneva convention states that when the establishment of hospital and safety zones in occupied territories were discussed reference was made to a draft agreement and it was agreed to append it as an annex I to the Fourth Geneva Convention.[5]

The ICRC states that "the Draft Agreement has only been put forward to States as a model, but the fact that it as carefully drafted at the Diplomatic Conference,

which finally adopted it, gives it a very real value. It could usefully be taken as a working basis, therefore, whenever a hospital zone is to be established."[5]

The ICRC states that Annex II is a "...draft which, according to Article 109 (paragraph 1) of the Convention, will be applied in the absence of special agreements between the Parties, deals with the conditions for the receipt and distribution of collective relief shipments. It is based on the traditions of the International Committee of the Red Cross which submitted it, and on the experience the Committee gained during the Second World War."[6]

Annex III contains an example internment card, letter and correspondence card:[7]

1. An example internment card with dimensions of 10x15 cm.
2. An example letter with dimensions of 29x15 cm.
3. An example correspondence card with dimensions of 10x15 cm.

North Atlantic Treaty

The **North Atlantic Treaty**, signed in Washington, D.C. on 4 April 1949, is the treaty establishing the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

Background

The treaty was created with an armed attack by the Soviet Union against Western Europe in mind, but the mutual self-defense clause was never invoked during the Cold War. Rather, it was invoked for the first time in 2001 in response to the 11 September 2001 attacks against the World Trade Center and The Pentagon in Operation Eagle Assist.

When German reunification occurred in 1990, the country as a whole became a member of NATO.

During the April 2008 summit, Croatia and Albania were officially invited to join NATO. They both signed the treaty and officially joined NATO on April 1,2009.

Article Five

The key section of the treaty was Article V. This committed each member state to consider an armed attack against one state to be an armed attack against all states.

U.S. Ratification

In the United States, the treaty was ratified by the US Senate in a vote of 82 to 13 on July 21,1949.

Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance

The **Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance** (commonly known as the **Rio Treaty**, the **Rio Pact**, or by the Spanish-language acronym **TIAR** from **Tratado Interamericano de Asistencia Recíproca**) was an agreement signed on 1947 in Rio de Janeiro among many countries of the Americas.[1] The central principle contained in its articles is that an attack against one is to be considered an attack against them all; this was known as the "hemispheric defense" doctrine. The treaty was initially created in 1947 and came into force in 1948, in accordance with Article 22 of the treaty. The Bahamas was the most recent country to sign and ratify it in 1982.[2]

Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance

The **Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance** (commonly known as the **Rio Treaty**, the **Rio Pact**, or by the Spanish-language acronym **TIAR** from **Tratado Interamericano de Asistencia Recíproca**) was an agreement signed on 1947 in Rio de Janeiro among many countries of the Americas.[1] The central principle contained in its articles is that an attack against one is to be considered an attack against them all; this was known as the "hemispheric defense" doctrine. The treaty was initially created in 1947 and came into force in 1948, in accordance with Article 22 of the treaty. The Bahamas was the most recent country to sign and ratify it in 1982.[2]

Paris Peace Treaties, 1947

"Paris Peace Treaty" redirects here. For other uses, see Treaty of Paris.

The **Paris Peace Conference** (29 July to 15 October 1946) resulted in the **Paris Peace Treaties** signed on 10 February 1947. The victorious wartime Allied powers (principally the United States, Soviet Union, United Kingdom, and France) negotiated the details of treaties with Italy, Romania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Finland (see the List of countries involved in World War II).

The treaties allowed Italy, Romania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Finland to reassume their responsibilities as sovereign states in international affairs and to qualify for membership in the United Nations.

The settlement elaborated in the peace treaties included payment of war reparations, commitment to minority rights and territorial adjustments including the end of the Italian Colonial Empire in Africa and changes to the Italian–Yugoslav, Hungarian–Slovak, Romanian–Hungarian, Soviet–Romanian, Bulgarian–Romanian, French–Italian and Soviet–Finnish frontiers.

The political clauses stipulated that the signatory should "take all measures necessary to secure to all persons under (its) jurisdiction, without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion, the enjoyment of human rights and of the fundamental freedoms, including freedom of expression, of press and publication, of religious worship, of political opinion and of public meeting."

No penalties were to be visited on nationals because of wartime partisanship for the Allies. Each government undertook measures to prevent the resurgence of fascist organizations or any others "whether political, military or semi-military, whose purpose it is to deprive the people of their democratic rights".

Particularly in Finland, the reparations and the dictated border adjustment were perceived as a major injustice and a betrayal by the Western Powers, after the sympathy Finland had received from the West during the Soviet-initiated Winter War of 1939–1940. However, this sympathy had been eroded by Finland's cooperation with Nazi Germany during the Continuation War. During this time Finland not only recaptured territory lost in 1940, but continued its offensive deeper into the Soviet Union, occupying a broad strip of Soviet territory. This prompted the United Kingdom to declare war on Finland in November 1941, further weakening political support in the West for the country. The Soviet Union's accessions of Finnish territory were based on the Moscow Armistice signed in Moscow on 19 September 1944 and resulted in an extension of the accessions in the Moscow Peace Treaty (1940) that ended the Winter War.

General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade

The **General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade** (**GATT**) is a multilateral agreement regulating international trade. According to its preamble, its purpose is the "substantial reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers and the elimination of preferences, on a reciprocal and mutually advantageous basis."

It was negotiated during the UN Conference on Trade and Employment and was the outcome of the failure of negotiating governments to create the International Trade Organization (ITO). GATT was signed in 1947 and lasted until 1993, when it was replaced by the World Trade Organization in 1995. The original GATT text (GATT 1947) is still in effect under the WTO framework, subject to the modifications of GATT 1994.[1]

Annecy Round - 1949

The second round took place in 1949 in Annecy, France. 13 countries took part in the round. The main focus of the talks was more tariff reductions, around 5000 in total.

Torquay Round - 1951

The third round occurred in Torquay, England in 1950. Thirty-eight countries took part in the round. 8,700 tariff concessions were made totaling the remaining amount of tariffs to ¾ of the tariffs which were in effect in 1948. The contemporaneous rejection by the U.S. of the Havana Charter signified the establishment of the GATT as a governing world body.[3]

Geneva Round - 1955-1956

The fourth round returned to Geneva in 1955 and lasted until May 1956. Twenty-six countries took part in the round. $2.5 billion in tariffs were eliminated or reduced.

Dillon Round - 1960-1962

The fifth round occurred once more in Geneva and lasted from 1960-1962. The talks were named after U.S. Treasury Secretary and former Under Secretary of State, Douglas Dillon, who first proposed the talks. Twenty-six countries took part in the round. Along with reducing over $4.9 billion in tariffs, it also yielded discussion relating to the creation of the European Economic Community (EEC).

Kennedy Round - 1962-1967

Kennedy Round took place from 1962-1967. $40 billion in tariffs were eliminated or reduced.

Tokyo Round - 1973-1979

Reduced tariffs and established new regulations aimed at controlling the proliferation of non-tariff barriers and voluntary export restrictions. 102 countries took part in the round. Concessions were made on $190 billion worth.

Uruguay Round - 1986-1994

The Uruguay Round began in 1986. It was the most ambitious round to date, hoping to expand the competence of the GATT to important new areas such as services, capital, intellectual property, textiles, and agriculture. 123 countries took part in the round. The Uruguay Round was also the first set of multilateral trade negotiations in which developing countries had played an active role.[4]

Agriculture was essentially exempted from previous agreements as it was given special status in the areas of import quotas and export subsidies, with only mild caveats. However, by the time of the Uruguay round, many countries considered the exception of agriculture to be sufficiently glaring that they refused to sign a new deal without some movement on agricultural products. These fourteen countries came to be known as the "Cairns Group", and included mostly small and medium sized agricultural exporters such as Australia, Brazil, Canada, Indonesia, and New Zealand.

The Agreement on Agriculture of the Uruguay Round continues to be the most substantial trade liberalization agreement in agricultural products in the history of trade negotiations. The goals of the agreement were to improve market access for agricultural products, reduce domestic support of agriculture in the form of price-distorting subsidies and quotas, eliminate over time export subsidies on agricultural products and to harmonize to the extent possible sanitary and phytosanitary measures between member countries.

GATT and the World Trade Organization

Main article: Uruguay Round

In 1993, the GATT was updated (GATT 1994) to include new obligations upon its signatories. One of the most significant changes was the creation of the World Trade Organization (WTO). The 75 existing GATT members and the European Communities became the founding members of the WTO on 1

January 1995. The other 52 GATT members rejoined the WTO in the following two years (the last being Congo in 1997). Since the founding of the WTO, 21 new non-GATT members have joined and 29 are currently negotiating membership. There are a total of 153 member countries in the WTO.

Of the original GATT members, Syria[5][6] and the SFR Yugoslavia has not rejoined the WTO. Since FR Yugoslavia, (renamed to Serbia and Montenegro and with membership negotiations later split in two), is not recognised as a direct SFRY successor state; therefore, its application is considered a new (non-GATT) one. The General Council of WTO, on 4 May 2010, agreed to establish a working party to examine the request of Syria for WTO membership.[7][8] The contracting parties who founded the WTO ended official agreement of the "GATT 1947" terms on 31 December 1995. Serbia and Montenegro are in the decision stage of the negotiations and are expected to become the newest members of the WTO in 2012 or in near future.

Whilst GATT was a set of rules agreed upon by nations, the WTO is an institutional body. The WTO expanded its scope from traded goods to include trade within the service sector and intellectual property rights. Although it was designed to serve multilateral agreements, during several rounds of GATT negotiations (particularly the Tokyo Round) plurilateral agreements created selective trading and caused fragmentation among members. WTO arrangements are generally a multilateral agreement settlement mechanism of GATT.[9]

Treaty of London (1946)

The **Treaty of London** was signed between the United Kingdom and Transjordan on March 22, 1946 and came into force on June 17, 1946.[1]

The treaty concerned the sovereignty and independence of the Arab state of Transjordan, which would now be known as the Hashemite Kingdom of Transjordan with Emir Abdullah I as its king. However, Britain would still maintain military bases within the country and continue to subsidize and support the Arab Legion.

The Treaty of London superseded the former Anglo-Transjordan mandate known as the **Organic Law of 1928**. This former mandate liberalized several restrictions on Transjordan, however Great Britain still controlled financial matters and most foreign policy issues. It was then considered a step towards future independence.

Transjordan's independence was recognized on April 18, 1946 by the League of Nations during the last meeting of that organization on April 18, 1946. When King Abdullah applied for membership in the newly formed United Nations, his request was vetoed by the Soviet Union, citing that the nation was not "fully independent" of British control. This resulted in another treaty in March 1948 with Britain in which all restrictions on sovereignty were removed. Despite this, Jordan was not a full member of the United Nations until December 14, 1955.

Treaty of Manila (1946)

The **Treaty of Manila (1946)** is a treaty of general relations signed on July 4, 1946 in Manila, capital of the Philippines. Parties to the treaty were the governments of the United States and the Republic of the Philippines. The treaty provided for the recognition of the independence of the Republic of the Philippines and the relinquishment of American sovereignty over the Philippine Islands. The treaty was signed by President Manuel Roxas representing the Philippines and Ambassador Paul V. McNutt as a representative of the United States.

1946 Lake Success Protocol

The **Protocol Amending the Agreements, Conventions and Protocols on Narcotic Drugs concluded at The Hague on 23 January 1912, at Geneva on 11 February 1925 and 19 February 1925, and 13 July 1931, at Bangkok on 27 November 1931 and at Geneva on 26 June 1936** was a treaty, signed on December 11, 1946 at Lake Success, that shifted the drug control functions previously assigned to the League of Nations to the United Nations. As the Protocol's official title suggests, it modifies the provisions of the:

- 1912 and 1925 International Opium Conventions,
- 1931 Convention for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, and the
- 1936 Convention for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs.

Under this Protocol, the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, appointed by the UN Economic and Social Council, took over drug policymaking from the League of Nations' Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium and Other Dangerous Drugs.

In an important precedent, the Supervisory Body that was created to administer the estimate system (which required nations to keep within their predetermined estimates of necessary narcotics production, imports, exports, etc.) was appointed by:

- The World Health Organization (two members)
- The Commission on Narcotic Drugs (one member)
- The Permanent Central Board (one member).

The Supervisory Body's successor, the International Narcotics Control Board, also had 3 of its 13 members nominated by the World Health Organization, with the rest nominated by UN members, with nominations subject to approval by the UN Economic and Social Council. No doubt in both cases, lobbying by the pharmaceutical industries influenced the inclusion of a requirement to place some scientific and medical experts on the board. However, the influence of Harry J. Anslinger and his Canadian counterpart Charles Henry Ludovic Sharman, both narcotics control officials, could be seen in the decision to allow the Commission to select somemembers (thus allowing law enforcement officials to be appointed to the Supervisory Body).

In accordance with the provisions of the drug control treaties, the revisions instituted by the Protocol did not require ratification to enter into force. For each Party, the treaty entered into force immediately upon their (a) signature without reservation as to approval, (b) signature subject to approval followed by acceptance or (c) acceptance. Since there were far fewer independent nations in the 1940s than there are today, the Protocol's 40 Parties – including populous empires and unions such as the United Kingdom and Soviet Union – encompassed the vast majority of the world's population.

The Protocol was terminated by the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, except as it affected the 1936 Convention for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs. However, the Protocol's influence can be plainly seen in the power structure established by the Single Convention, which remains in force.

International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling

The **International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling** is an international environmental agreement signed in 1946 in order to "provide for the proper conservation of whale stocks and thus make possible the orderly development of the whaling industry".[1] It governs the commercial, scientific, and aboriginal subsistence whaling practices of fifty-nine member nations.

It was signed by 15 nations in Washington, D.C. on December 2, 1946[2] and took effect on November 10, 1948. Its protocol (which represented the first substantial revision of the convention and extended the definition of a "whale-catcher" to include helicopters as well as ships) was signed in Washington on November 19, 1956. The convention is a successor to the **International Agreement for the Regulation of Whaling**, signed in London on June 8, 1937, and the protocols for that agreement signed in London on June 24, 1938, and November 26, 1945.

The objectives of the agreement are the protection of all whale species from overhunting, the establishment of a system of international regulation for the whale fisheries to ensure proper conservation and development of whale stocks, and safeguarding for future generations the great natural resources represented by whale stocks. The primary instrument for the realization of these aims is the International Whaling Commission which was established pursuant to this convention. The commission has made many revisions to the schedule that makes up the bulk of the convention. The Commission process has also reserved for governments the right to carry out scientific research which involves killing of whales.

Gruber–De Gasperi Agreement

The **Gruber-De Gasperi Agreement**, named after the foreign minister of Austria (Karl Gruber) and the prime minister of Italy (Alcide De Gasperi), of September 1946, allowed Trentino-Alto Adige/Südtirol to remain part of Italy, but ensured its autonomy

European Union - United States air agreement

The Bermuda agreements were replaced in two stages on March 30, 2008, and June 24, 2010, by an Air Transport Agreement between the European Union (representing 25 European countries) and the United States. This provides for an Open Skies regime, which is more liberal even than Bermuda I.

Bermuda Agreement

The **Bermuda Agreement**, reached in 1946 by American and British negotiators in Bermuda, was an early bilateral air transport agreement

regulating civil air transport. It established a precedent for the signing of approximately 3,000 other such agreements between countries.

The Agreement was expanded in 1977.

Full titles:

Bermuda I

Agreement between the government of the United Kingdom and the government of the United States relating to Air Services between their respective Territories, Bermuda, 11 February 1946

Bermuda II

Agreement between the government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the government of the United States concerning Air Services, Bermuda, 23 July 1977

Wanfried agreement

The **Wanfried Agreement** (German: Wanfrieder Abkommen) concerned a transfer of territory between the U.S. and Soviet occupation zones after World War II in Hesse, Germany, which took place after the determination of the main inner German border at the end of July 1945.

In the U.S. zone the Bebra–Göttingen railway line, which linked with lines to the cities of Bremen, Hannover and Bebra cut across a small (~ 3 km / 2 mi) portion of the Soviet zone near Neuseesen and Werleshausen (Thuringia). This situation caused disruptions of traffic on the line, which was important to the U.S. as a link between its occupation zone in southern Germany and a small U.S.-controlled exclave at the port of Bremerhaven on the North Sea.

On September 17, 1945, an agreement was signed in the town of Wanfried between the American and Soviet authorities moving the border to resolve the problem. After the agreement was concluded, the participating officers exchanged flasks of whisky and vodka, and from then on the railway line was known jokingly in German as the Whisky-Wodka-Linie.

Brigadier General W.T. Sexton, U.S. Army, signed the Wanfried agreement for the United States, while Major General V.S. Askepalov signed for the Soviet Union.

The Hessian villages of Asbach-Sickenberg, Vatterode, and Weidenbach/Hennigerode (Kreis Witzenhausen) with 429 inhabitants and 7.61 square kilometres of land fell in Soviet territory. The Eichsfeld villages of Neuseesen and Werleshausen with 560 people and 8.45 square kilometres were transferred to the U.S. zone.

Although other such small exchanges took place afterwards on the inner-German border, only the Wanfried Agreement had the status of a treaty between the occupying Powers, and is considered to have been on an equal footing with the Potsdam Agreement.

United Nations Charter

The **Charter of the United Nations** is the foundational treaty of the international organization called the United Nations.[1] It was signed at the San Francisco War Memorial and Performing Arts Center in San Francisco, United States, on 26 June 1945, by 50 of the 51 original member countries (Poland, the other original member, which was not represented at the conference, signed it 2 months later). It entered into force on 24 October 1945, after being ratified by the five permanent members of the Security Council—the Republic of China (later replaced by the People's Republic of China), France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (later replaced by the Russian Federation), the United Kingdom, and the United States—and a majority of the other signatories. Today, 193 countries are the members of the United Nations.

As a charter, it is a constituent treaty, and all members are bound by its articles. Furthermore, the Charter states that obligations to the United Nations prevail over all other treaty obligations.[1] Most countries in the world have now ratified the Charter. One notable exception is the Vatican City State, which has chosen to remain a permanent observer state and therefore is not a full signatory to the Charter.[2]

Summary

The Charter consists of a preamble and a series of articles grouped into chapters.[1]

The **preamble** consists of two principal parts. The first part containing a general call for the maintenance of peace and international security and respect for human rights. The second part of the preamble is a declaration in a contractual style that the governments of the peoples of the United Nations have agreed to the Charter.

- **Chapter I** sets forth the purposes of the United Nations, including the important provisions of the maintenance of international peace and security.
- **Chapter II** defines the criteria for membership in the United Nations.
- **Chapters III-XV**, the bulk of the document, describe the organs and institutions of the UN and their respective powers.
- **Chapters XVI and Chapter XVII** describe arrangements for integrating the UN with established international law.
- **Chapters XVIII and Chapter XIX** provide for amendment and ratification of the Charter.

The following chapters deal with the enforcement powers of UN bodies:

- **Chapter VI** describes the Security Council's power to investigate and mediate disputes;
- **Chapter VII** describes the Security Council's power to authorize economic, diplomatic, and military sanctions, as well as the use of military force, to resolve disputes;
- **Chapter VIII** makes it possible for regional arrangements to maintain peace and security within their own region;
- **Chapters IX and Chapter X** describe the UN's powers for economic and social cooperation, and the Economic and Social Council that oversees these powers;
- **Chapters XII and Chapter XIII** describe the Trusteeship Council, which oversaw decolonization;
- **Chapters XIV and Chapter XV** establish the powers of, respectively, the International Court of Justice and the United Nations Secretariat.
- **Chapters XVI through Chapter XIX** deal respectively with XVI: miscellaneous provisions, XVII: transitional security arrangements related to World War II, XVIII: the charter amendment process, and XIX: ratification of the charter.

Treaty of Varkiza

The **Treaty of Varkiza** (also known as the **Varkiza Pact** or the **Varkiza Peace Agreement**) was signed in Varkiza (near Athens) on February 12, 1945

between the Greek Minister of Foreign Affairs (supported by the British) and the Secretary of the Communist Party of Greece (KKE) for EAM-ELAS. One of the aspects of the accord (Article IX) called for a plebiscite to be held within the year in order to resolve any problems with the Greek Constitution. This plebiscite would help establish elections and thus create a constituent assembly that would draft a new organic law. In another aspect of the treaty, both signatories agreed that the Allies send overseers in order to verify the validity of the elections.[1] The accord also promised that members of EAM-ELAS would be permitted to participate in political activities if they surrendered their weapons. Moreover, all civil and political liberties would be guaranteed along with the undertaking by the Greek government towards establishing a nonpolitical national army.

The Treaty specified that EAM-ELAS in particular should disarm. ELAS are recorded to have surrendered, within the next few days or weeks, the following:

a) artillery of various types 100 b) heavy mortars 81 c) light mortars 138 d) machine-guns 419 e) submachine guns 1,412 f) automatic rifles 713 g) rifles and pistols 48,973 h) anti-tank rifles 57 i) radios 17[2]

However the data is not complete, as some refused to accept receipts for their weapons. Panagiotis Koumoukelis relates in 'All That Grief' that he refused a receipt for his gun, and was subsequently tortured by members of the Security Battalions, as he could not produce his receipt.[3]

Ultimately, the promises enshrined in the Treaty of Varkiza were not upheld. The main problem is that the treaty was giving amnesty only for political reasons, while many actions by communists during the Dekemvriana was viewed as common crimes. The events that followed entailed widespread right-wing persecution of leftist elements (White Terror).[4] Even though the Treaty of Varkiza was not enforced, it was nevertheless a diplomatic attempt towards officially ending the civil war. Due to the treaty, the Communist Party of Greece remained legal during the Greek Civil War until 27 December 1947.

London Protocol

London Protocol is a name used to describe several different documents.

1814

Main article: Eight Articles of London

On June 21, 1814, a secret convention between the Great Powers: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Prussia, Austria, and Russia awarded the territory of current Belgium and the Netherlands to William I of the Netherlands, then "Sovereign Prince" of the United Netherlands. He accepted this award on July 21, 1814.

1829

On 22 March 1829, a conference of ambassadors of the three protecting powers (Britain, France and Russia) established the borders of Greece, which was to encompass all lands south of the line running from the Ambracian Gulf to the Pagasetic Gulf, including Negroponte (Euboea) and the Cyclades but not Crete. Greece was, however, to remain an autonomous tributary state under a prince that would explicitly not belong to the ruling families of the three powers. A further conference in London on 30 November of the same year decided that Greece should instead be given full independence, but its borders were moved back to the Aspropotamos River-Maliac Gulf line.[1]

1830

On February 3, 1830, the sovereignty of Greece was confirmed in a London Protocol.[2]

1832

On August 30, 1832, a London Protocol was signed to ratify and reiterate the terms of the Treaty of Constantinople. The 1830 London Protocol affirmed the rights of Christians in the Ottoman Empire and the rights of Muslims in Greece

1852

On May 8, 1852, after the First War of Schleswig, another London Protocol was signed. The international treaty that became known as the "London Protocol" was the revision of an earlier protocol, which had been ratified on August 2, 1850, by the major Germanic powers of Austria and Prussia. The second, actual London Protocol was recognized by the five major European powers (Austria, France, Prussia, Russia, and the United Kingdom), as well as the two major Baltic Sea powers of Denmark and Sweden.

The Protocol affirmed the integrity of the Danish federation as a "European necessity and standing principle". Accordingly, the duchies of Schleswig (a Danish fief), and Holstein and Lauenburg (German fiefs) were joined by personal union with the Kingdom of Denmark. However, Frederick VII of

Denmark was childless, so a change in dynasty was imminent and the lines of succession for the duchies and Denmark conflicted. That meant that, contrary to the Protocol, the new King of Denmark would not also be the new duke of Holstein and duke of Lauenburg. So for this purpose, the line of succession to the duchies was modified. Further, it was affirmed that the duchies were to remain as independent entities, and that Schleswig would have no greater constitutional affinity to Denmark than Holstein.

The major powers primarily wanted to ensure, by guaranteeing Denmark's territorial integrity, that the strategically significant port of Kiel would not fall into Prussian hands.[3] Eleven years later, this treaty became the trigger for the German–Danish war of 1864. Prussia and Austria declared Denmark in violation of the Protocol, by the November Constitution, which Christian IX of Denmark signed on November 18, 1863.[4] After an initial period of joint Austro-Prussian administration, Kiel was ultimately delivered to Prussia in 1867.

1877

The London Protocol was signed on March 21, 1877 between Russia and the United Kingdom. The Russians agreed not to establish any client states in case they attained victory in the looming Russo–Turkish War. In return, the British agreed to remain neutral in any conflict between the Ottoman Empire and Russia. The agreement was an effort to maintain a balance of power in the Balkans and to avoid intervention by the other Great Powers. Russian attempts to create a large Bulgaria in the Treaty of San Stefano led to the British withdrawal from the Protocol and threatened military intervention, quieted only by the Congress of Berlin.

1944

In the London Protocol signed on September 12, 1944, the Allies of World War II (then without France) agreed on dividing Germany into four occupation zones after the war. A more detailed account is available on the German-language article → http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zonenprotokoll

1977

International Maritime Organisation, Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes and Other Matter 1972, also known as the London Convention/Protocol [5]

2000

The London Protocol is also an alternative name for the London Agreement (2000) between certain contracting States to the European Patent Convention, aiming to reduce the number of translations required of granted European patents.[6]

2004

The London Protocol is the revised and updated version of the original 'Protocol for the Investigation and Analysis of Clinical Incidents' first published in 1999 (Vincent et al., BMJ 1998; Vincent et al., BMJ 2000; Vincent, NEJM 2003).

The protocol outlined a process of incident investigation and analysis for use by clinicians, risk and patient safety managers, researchers and others wishing to reflect and learn from clinical incidents. This approach has now been refined and developed in the light of experience and research into incident investigation both within and outside healthcare. It is designed to be a structured process of reflection on incidents providing a 'window on the healthcare system' (Vincent, QSHC 2004) which can be adapted for use in many contexts and used either quickly for education and training or in substantial investigations of serious incidents. The London protocol is free to download and available in a number of languages.

Convention on International Civil Aviation

The **Convention on International Civil Aviation**, also known as the **Chicago Convention**, established the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), a specialized agency of the United Nations charged with coordinating and regulating international air travel. The Convention establishes rules of airspace, aircraft registration and safety, and details the rights of the signatories in relation to air travel. The Convention also exempts air fuels from tax.

The document was signed on December 7, 1944 in Chicago, U.S., by 52 signatory states. It received the requisite 26th ratification on March 5, 1947 and went into effect on April 4, 1947, the same date that ICAO came into being. In October of the same year, ICAO became a specialized agency of the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC). The Convention has since been revised eight times (in 1959, 1963, 1969, 1975, 1980, 1997, 2000 and 2006).

Main Articles

Some important articles are:

Article 1: Every state has complete and exclusive sovereignty over airspace above its territory.

Article 5: (Non-scheduled flights over State's Territory): The aircraft of states, other than scheduled international air services, have the right to make flights across state's territories and to make stops without obtaining prior permission. However, the state may require the aircraft to make a landing.

Article 6: (Scheduled air services) No scheduled international air service may be operated over or into the territory of a contracting State, except with the special permission or other authorization of that State.

Article 10: (Landing at customs airports): The state can require that landing to be at a designated customs airport and similarly departure from the territory can be required to be from a designated customs airport.

Article 12: Each state shall keep its own rules of the air as uniform as possible with those established under the convention, the duty to ensure compliance with these rules rests with the contracting state.

Article 13: (Entry and Clearance Regulations) A state's laws and regulations regarding the admission and departure of passengers, crew or cargo from aircraft shall be complied with on arrival, upon departure and whilst within the territory of that state.

Article 16: The authorities of each state shall have the right to search the aircraft of other states on landing or departure, without unreasonable delay...

Article 24: Aircraft flying to, from or across, the territory of a state shall be admitted temporarily free of duty. Fuel, Oil, spare parts, regular equipment and aircraft stores retained on board are also exempt custom duty, inspection fees or similar charges.

Article 29: Before an international flight, the pilot in command must ensure that the aircraft is airworthy, duly registered and that the relevant certificates are on board the aircraft. The required documents are:

Certificate of Registration

Certificate of Airworthiness

Passenger names, place of boarding and destination

Crew licences

Journey Logbook

Radio Licence

Cargo manifest

Article 30: The aircraft of a state flying in or over the territory of another state shall only carry radios licensed and used in accordance with the regulations of the state in which the aircraft is registered. The radios may only be used by members of the flight crew suitably licenced by the state in which the aircraft is registered.

Article 32: the pilot and crew of every aircraft engaged in international aviation must have certificates of competency and licences issued or validated by the state in which the aircraft is registered.

Article 33: (Recognition of Certificates and Licences) Certificates of Airworthiness, certificates of competency and licences issued or validated by the state in which the aircraft is registered, shall be recognised as valid by other states. The requirements for issue of those Certificates or Airworthiness, certificates of competency or licences must be equal to or above the minimum standards established by the Convention.

Article 40: No aircraft or personnel with endorsed licenses or certificate will engage in international navigation except with the permission of the state or states whose territory is entered. Any license holder who does not satisfy international standard relating to that license or certificate shall have attached to or endorsed on that license information regarding the particulars in which he does not satisfy those standards".

Annexes

The Convention is supported by eighteen annexes containing standards and recommended practices (SARPs). The annexes are amended regularly by ICAO and are as follows:

- Annex 1 – Personnel Licensing
- Annex 2 – Rules of the Air
- Annex 3 – Meteorological Service for International Air Navigation

  Vol I – Core SARPs

Vol II – Appendices and Attachments

- Annex 4 – Aeronautical Charts
- Annex 5 – Units of Measurement to be used in Air and Ground Operations
- Annex 6 – Operation of Aircraft

  Part I – International Commercial Air Transport – Aeroplanes

  Part II – International General Aviation – Aeroplanes

  Part III – International Operations – Helicopters

- Annex 7 – Aircraft Nationality and Registration Marks
- Annex 8 – Airworthiness of Aircraft
- Annex 9 – Facilitation
- Annex 10 – Aeronautical Telecommunications

  Vol I – Radio Navigation Aids

  Vol II – Communication Procedures including those with PANS status

  Vol III – Communication Systems

  Part I – Digital Data Communication Systems

  Part II – Voice Communication Systems

  Vol IV – Surveillance Radar and Collision Avoidance Systems

  Vol V – Aeronautical Radio Frequency Spectrum Utilization

- Annex 11 – Air Traffic Services – Air Traffic Control Service, Flight Information Service and Alerting Service
- Annex 12 – Search and Rescue
- Annex 13 – Aircraft Accident and Incident Investigation
- Annex 14 – Aerodromes

  Vol I – Aerodrome Design and Operations

  Vol II – Heliports

- Annex 15 – Aeronautical Information Services
- Annex 16 – Environmental Protection

  Vol I – Aircraft Noise

  Vol II – Aircraft Engine Emissions

- Annex 17 – Security: Safeguarding International Civil Aviation Against Acts of Unlawful Interference
- Annex 18 – The Safe Transport of Dangerous Goods by Air

Annex 5, Units of Measurement to be Used in Air and Ground Operations, named in its Table 3-3 three "non-SI alternative units permitted for temporary use with the SI": the foot (for vertical distance = altitude), the knot (for speed), and the nautical mile (for long distance).

Treaty of Vis

The **Treaty of Vis** (Serbo-Croatian and Slovene: Viški sporazum), also known as the **Tito-Šubašić Agreement**, was an attempt by the Western Powers to merge the royal Yugoslav government in exile with the Communist-led Partisans who were fighting the Axis occupation of Yugoslavia in the Second World War and were de facto rulers on the liberated territories.

It was signed on the Dalmatian island of Vis (in Croatia) on June 16, 1944.[1] by Josip Broz Tito, the leader of the Partisans, and Ivan Šubašić, Prime Minister of the Royal Government in exile and previous ban (governor) of autonomuos Croatia in the pre-war Kingdom of Yugoslavia. The actual formation of a new government was postponed until November 1, 1944, when the Belgrade Agreement was signed. According to its provision, an interim government was to be formed until the people would decide the form of government in democratic elections. Šubašić became the foreign minister in a coalition government led by Tito. The real power remained however in the Communist-led Anti-Fascist Liberation Council of Yugoslavia.

The agreement also included a specific mention that Yugoslavia would be transformed into a democratic and federal country after the end of the war. Since the issue on its form of government (monarchy or republic) was postponed to after the war, the official name of the country in the meantime was "Democratic Federal Yugoslavia" (Serbian: Demokratska Federativna Jugoslavija, DFJ).

The signature of the agreement was pushed by Winston Churchill, who had his people watching over the negotiations, on hand but hands off, as described in Eastern Approaches: Ralph Stevenson, ambassador to the government in exile, and Fitzroy MacLean, the soldier-ambassador liaison to Tito. Britain thought the agreement would bring a democratic post-war system in Yugoslavia, but it granted full legitimacy and international recognition to Tito's government. Furthermore, the Chetniks, who had previously fought in the King's name, were

left without a legitimate covering for their existence, since King Peter recognized Tito's insurgent army as the only legal force fighting the Nazi occupation in Yugoslavia and dismissed Draža Mihailović because of collaboration with the Axis.

The Treaty became obsolete after the elections (conducted with British oversight) in autumn 1945, which confirmed the absolute Communist supremacy in the country. Šubašić and other officials appointed by the King resigned in October 1945. On November 29, 1945, the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia was declared.

Bretton Woods system

The **Bretton Woods system** of monetary management established the rules for commercial and financial relations among the world's major industrial states in the mid-20th century. The Bretton Woods system was the first example of a fully negotiated monetary order intended to govern monetary relations among independent nation-states.

Preparing to rebuild the international economic system as World War II was still raging, 730 delegates from all 44 Allied nations gathered at the Mount Washington Hotel in Bretton Woods, New Hampshire, United States, for the United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference. The delegates deliberated upon and signed the Bretton Woods Agreements during the first three weeks of July 1944.

Setting up a system of rules, institutions, and procedures to regulate the international monetary system, the planners at Bretton Woods established the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), which today is part of the World Bank Group. These organizations became operational in 1945 after a sufficient number of countries had ratified the agreement.

The chief features of the Bretton Woods system were an obligation for each country to adopt a monetary policy that maintained the exchange rate by tying its currency to the U.S. dollar and the ability of the IMF to bridge temporary imbalances of payments.

On August 15, 1971, the United States unilaterally terminated convertibility of the dollar to gold. As a result, "[t]he Bretton Woods system officially ended and the dollar became fully 'fiat currency,' backed by nothing but the promise of the federal government."[1] This action, referred to as the Nixon shock, created the

situation in which the United States dollar became a reserve currency used by many states. At the same time, many fixed currencies (such as GBP, for example), also became free floating.

Anglo-Soviet Treaty of 1942

The **Twenty-Year Mutual Assistance Agreement Between the United Kingdom and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics** or **Anglo-Soviet Treaty** established military and political alliance between the USSR and the British Empire during World War II, and for 20 years after it. The treaty was signed in London on 26 May 1942 by British Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden and by Soviet foreign minister Vyacheslav Molotov.

Treaty of Craiova

The **Treaty of Craiova** (Bulgarian: Крайовска спогодба; Romanian: Tratatul de la Craiova) was signed on 7 September 1940 between the Kingdom of Bulgaria and the Kingdom of Romania. Under the terms of this treaty, Romania returned the southern part of Dobruja (the Cadrilater or "Quadrilateral" in Romanian) to Bulgaria and agreed to participate in organizing a population exchange. The treaty was approved by Germany, the United Kingdom,[1] the Soviet Union, Italy, USA,[2] and France.[citation needed]

Terms of the Treaty provide for the mandatory resettlement of Romanian citizens of Bulgarian ethnicity living in Northern Dobruja to Bulgaria, and the resettlement of ethnic Romanians living in Southern Dobruja to Romania. 110,000 Romanians (80,000 of them from South Dobruja) were forced to leave their homes in Southern Dobruja and other parts of Bulgaria. Most of these Romanians were colonists who had settled there after the Second Balkan War in 1913, when the territory was annexed by Romania (see Treaty of Bucharest (1913)). 65,000 Bulgarians left their homes in Northern Dobrudja and resettled in Bulgaria.

Treaty of Commerce and Navigation

The **Treaty of Commerce and Navigation** was signed on March 25, 1940 between representatives of Iran and the Soviet Union. This accord helped to reinforce the tenets of the Treaty of Establishment, Commerce and Navigation. Based on the terms of the treaty, both signatories agreed to reinforce the 10-mile fishing limit for all commercial vessels in the Caspian Sea. Moreover, both signatories agreed that only Iranian and Russian commercial vessels were permitted to fish beyond the 10-mile nautical limit. The treaty did not include any clauses regarding the issue of seabed mining.[1]

Moscow Peace Treaty

The **Moscow Peace Treaty** was signed by Finland and the Soviet Union on 12 March 1940, and the ratifications were exchanged on 21 March.[1] It marked the end of the 105-day Winter War. The treaty ceded parts of Finland to the Soviet Union. However, it preserved Finland's independence, ending the Soviet attempt to annex the country. The treaty was signed by Vyacheslav Molotov, Andrey Zhdanov and Aleksandr Vasilevsky for Soviet Union, and Risto Ryti, Juho Kusti Paasikivi, Rudolf Walden and Väinö Voionmaa for Finland.

Pact of Steel

The **Pact of Steel** (German: Stahlpakt; Italian: Patto d'Acciaio), known formally as the **Pact of Friendship and Alliance between Germany and Italy**, was an agreement between Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany signed on May 22, 1939, by the foreign ministers of each country and witnessed by Count Galeazzo Ciano for Italy and Joachim von Ribbentrop for Germany.

The Pact consisted of two parts: the first section was an open declaration of continuing trust and cooperation between Germany and Italy while the second, a "Secret Supplementary Protocol"[1] encouraged a union of policies concerning the military and economy. However, certain members of the Italian government, including the signatory Ciano, were opposed to the Pact.[citation needed]

It was Italian leader Benito Mussolini who dubbed the agreement "the Pact of Steel", after being told that its original name, "the Pact of Blood", would likely be received poorly in Italy.

Non-aggression pact

A **non-aggression pact** is a national treaty between two or more states/countries agreeing to avoid war or armed conflict between them and resolve their disputes through peaceful negotiations. Sometimes such a pact may include a pledge of avoiding armed conflict even if participants find themselves fighting third countries, including allies of one of the participants.

It was a popular form of international agreement in the 1920s and 1930s, but has largely fallen out of use after the Second World War. Since the implementation of a non-aggression pact depends on the good faith of the parties, the international community following the Second World War adopted the norm of multilateral collective security agreements, such as the treaties establishing NATO, ANZUS, SEATO and Warsaw Pact.

The most famous non-aggression pact is the 1939 Molotov–Ribbentrop Pact between the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany, which lasted until the 1941 German invasion of the Soviet Union in Operation Barbarossa. Its fame partly derives from the fact of being labelled as an military alliance by anti-communists.

Examples of such pacts in history:

- Peace of Callias (449-450 BC)
- Treaty of London (1518)
- Soviet–Lithuanian Non-Aggression Pact (September 28, 1926)
- Greek-Romanian Non-Aggression and Arbitration Pact (March 21, 1928)[1]
- Soviet-Afghan Non-Aggression Pact (June 24, 1931)[2]
- Soviet–Finnish Non-Aggression Pact (January 21, 1932)
- Soviet-Latvian Non-Aggression Pact (February 5, 1932)[3]
- Soviet-Estonian Non-Aggression Pact (May 4, 1932)[4]
- Soviet–Polish Non-Aggression Pact (July 25, 1932)
- Soviet-Italian Non-Aggression Pact (September 2, 1933)[5]
- Romanian-Turkish Non-Aggression Pact (October 17, 1933)[6]
- Turkish-Yugoslav Non-Aggression Pact (November 27, 1933)[7]
- German–Polish Non-Aggression Pact (January 26, 1934)
- Franco-Soviet Treaty of Mutual Assistance (May 2, 1935)
- German-British Non-Aggression Pact (September 30, 1938)
- German-Danish Non-Aggression Pact (May 31, 1939)[8]
- German–Estonian Non-Aggression Pact (June 7, 1939)
- German–Latvian Non-Aggression Pact (June 7, 1939)
- Molotov–Ribbentrop Pact (23 August 1939)
- British-Thai Non-Aggression Pact (June 12, 1940)[9]

- Soviet–Japanese Neutrality Pact (April 13, 1941)
- German–Turkish Non-Aggression Pact (June 18, 1941)

During negotiations between the United States and North Korea in 2003, North Korea offered to eventually eliminate its nuclear weapons program if both sides signed a non-aggression treaty (along with multiple other conditions). As of this date, however, a nonaggression treaty between the two has yet to be formulated.

Treaty of Non-Aggression between Germany and the Soviet Union

The **Treaty of Non-Aggression between Germany and the Soviet Union**[1], also known as the **Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact** (after its chief architects, Soviet foreign minister Vyacheslav Molotov and German foreign minister Joachim von Ribbentrop) was a non-aggression pact, signed in Moscow in the late hours of 23 August 1939, under which the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany each pledged to remain neutral in the event that either nation were attacked by a third party.[2] It remained in effect until 22 June 1941, when Germany invaded the Soviet Union.

In addition to stipulations of non-aggression, the treaty included a secret protocol dividing Romania, Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia and Finland into German and Soviet spheres of influence, anticipating potential "territorial and political rearrangements" of these countries. Thereafter, Germany and the Soviet Union invaded, on September 1 and 17 respectively, their respective sides of Poland, dividing the country between them. Part of eastern Finland was annexed by the Soviet Union after the Winter War. This was followed by Soviet annexations of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Bessarabia, Northern Bukovina and the Hertza region.

Munich Agreement

The **Munich Agreement** was an agreement permitting Nazi Germany's annexation of Czechoslovakia's Sudetenland. The Sudetenland were areas along Czech borders, mainly inhabited by ethnic Germans. The agreement was negotiated at a conference held in Munich, Germany, among the major powers of Europe without the presence of Czechoslovakia. Today, it is widely regarded as a failed act of appeasement toward Germany. The agreement was signed in the early hours of 30 September 1938 (but dated 29 September). The purpose of the conference was to discuss the future of the Sudetenland in the face of territorial demands made by Adolf Hitler. The agreement was signed by

Germany, France, the United Kingdom, and Italy. The Sudetenland was of immense strategic importance to Czechoslovakia, as most of its border defenses were situated there, and many of its banks were located there as well.

Because the state of Czechoslovakia was not invited to the conference, it felt betrayed by United Kingdom and France, so Czechs and Slovaks call the Munich Agreement the **Munich Dictate** (Czech: Mnichovský diktát; Slovak: Mníchovský diktát). The phrase **Munich Betrayal** (Czech: Mnichovská zrada; Slovak: Mníchovská zrada) is also used because the military alliance Czechoslovakia had with France and United Kingdom was not honoured. Today the document is typically referred to simply as the Munich Pact (Mnichovská dohoda).

Treaty of Saadabad

The **Treaty of Saadabad** (or the **Saadabad Pact**) was a non-aggression pact signed by Turkey, Iran, Iraq and Afghanistan on July 8, 1937. This treaty lasted for five years. The treaty was signed in Tehran's Saadabad Palace and was part of an initiative for greater Middle Eastern-Oriental relations spearheaded by King Mohammed Zahir Shah of Afghanistan. Ratifications were exchanged in Tehran on June 25, 1938 and it became effective on the same day. It was registered in League of Nations Treaty Series on July 19, 1938.[1]

In Iraq, the left-leaning Bakr Sidqi military government of 1936-1937 was less Arab nationalist than other Iraqi governments. Sidqi was a Kurd and his prime minister, Hikmat Sulayman, was a Turkmen. They were therefore interested in diplomacy with Iraq's eastern, non-Arab neighbours. Turkey sought friendly relations with its neighbours and was still recovering from its defeat in World War I.

In 1943 the Treaty was automatically extended for a further five years because none of the signatories had denounced it.

International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling

The **International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling** is an international environmental agreement signed in 1946 in order to "provide for the proper conservation of whale stocks and thus make possible the orderly development of the whaling industry".[1] It governs the commercial, scientific, and aboriginal subsistence whaling practices of fifty-nine member nations.

It was signed by 15 nations in Washington, D.C. on December 2, 1946[2] and took effect on November 10, 1948. Its protocol (which represented the first substantial revision of the convention and extended the definition of a "whale-catcher" to include helicopters as well as ships) was signed in Washington on November 19, 1956. The convention is a successor to the **International Agreement for the Regulation of Whaling**, signed in London on June 8, 1937, and the protocols for that agreement signed in London on June 24, 1938, and November 26, 1945.

The objectives of the agreement are the protection of all whale species from overhunting, the establishment of a system of international regulation for the whale fisheries to ensure proper conservation and development of whale stocks, and safeguarding for future generations the great natural resources represented by whale stocks. The primary instrument for the realization of these aims is the International Whaling Commission which was established pursuant to this convention. The commission has made many revisions to the schedule that makes up the bulk of the convention. The Commission process has also reserved for governments the right to carry out scientific research which involves killing of whales.

Montreux Convention Regarding the Regime of the Turkish Straits

The **Montreux Convention Regarding the Regime of the Straits** was a 1936 agreement that gives Turkey control over the Bosporus Straits and the Dardanelles and regulates the transit of naval warships. The Convention gives Turkey full control over the Straits and guarantees the free passage of civilian vessels in peacetime. It restricts the passage of naval ships not belonging to Black Sea states. The terms of the convention have been the source of controversy over the years, most notably concerning the Soviet Union's military access to the Mediterranean Sea.

Signed on 20 July 1936, it permitted Turkey to remilitarise the Straits. It went into effect on November 9, 1936 and was registered in League of Nations Treaty Series on December 11, 1936.[1] It is still in force today, with some amendments.

Terms and consequences of the Convention

The Convention consists of 29 Articles, four annexes and one protocol. Articles 2-7 consider the passage of merchant ships. Articles 8-22 consider the passage of war vessels. The key principle of freedom of passage and navigation is stated in articles 1 and 2. Article 1 provides that "The High Contracting Parties

recognise and affirm the principle of freedom of passage and navigation by sea in the Straits". Article 2 states that "In time of peace, merchant vessels shall enjoy complete freedom of passage and navigation in the Straits, by day and by night, under any flag with any kind of cargo."

The International Straits Commission was abolished, authorising the full resumption of Turkish military control over the Straits and the refortification of the Dardanelles. Turkey was authorised to close the Straits to all foreign warships in wartime or when it was threatened by aggression; additionally, it was authorised to refuse transit from merchant ships belonging to countries at war with Turkey. A number of highly specific restrictions were imposed on what type of warships are allowed passage. Non-Black Sea state warships in the Straits must be under 15,000 tons. No more than nine non-Black Sea state warships, with a total aggregate tonnage of no more than 30,000 tons, may pass at any one time, and they are permitted to stay in the Black Sea for no longer than twenty-one days.

Although the treaty is often cited as prohibiting aircraft carriers in the straits[9], there is no explicit prohibition on aircraft carriers in the treaty. However, the tonnage limits in Article 14, which apply to all non-Black Sea powers, would preclude the transit of modern aircraft carrying ships. In the case of non-Black Sea powers, these terms make it impossible for transit any modern ships carrying aircraft through the straits without violating the terms of the convention.

By contrast, Black Sea powers such as the USSR were able to transit aircraft carrying cruisers through the straits under other terms of the convention. As with non-Black Seas powers, the Montreux convention does not explicitly forbid a Black Sea power from transiting aircraft carriers through the straits, and the tonnage limits in Article 14 also apply to Black Sea powers as well as non-Black Sea powers. However, under Article 11, Black Sea states are permitted to transit capital ships of any tonnage through the straits. Annex II specifically excludes aircraft carriers from the definition of capital ships, but limits the definition of carriers to ships that are designed primarily for carrying and operating aircraft at sea and specifically excludes other ships that merely are able to operate aircraft. [10]

The result of this is that by designing its aircraft carrying ships such as the Kiev and the Admiral Kuznetsov to have roles other than aircraft operation and by designating those ships as "aircraft carrying cruisers" rather than "aircraft carriers" the Soviet Union was able to transit its aircraft carrying ships through the straits in compliance with the convention, while at the same time the

Convention denied access to NATO aircraft carriers, which are not covered by the exemption in Article 11.[11][12][13]

Under Article 12, Black Sea states are also allowed to send submarines through the Straits, with prior notice, as long as the vessels have been constructed, purchased or sent for repair outside the Black Sea. The less restrictive rules applicable to Black Sea states were agreed as, effectively, a concession to the Soviet Union, the only Black Sea state other than Turkey with any significant number of capital ships or submarines.[8][14] The passage of civil aircraft between the Mediterranean and Black Seas is permitted, but only along routes authorised by the Turkish government.[15]

The terms of the Convention were largely a reflection of the international situation in the mid-1930s. They largely served Turkish and Soviet interests, enabling Turkey to regain military control of the Straits and assuring Soviet dominance of the Black Sea.[15] Although the Convention restricted the Soviets' ability to send naval forces into the Mediterranean sea - thereby satisfying British concerns about Soviet intrusion into what was considered a British sphere of influence - it also ensured that outside powers could not exploit the Straits to threaten the Soviet Union. This was to have significant repercussions during World War II when the Montreux regime prevented the Axis powers from sending naval forces through the Straits to attack the Soviet Union[citation needed]. The Axis powers were thus severely limited in naval capability in their Black Sea campaigns, relying principally on small vessels that had been transported overland by rail and canal networks. Auxiliary vessels and armed merchant ships occupied a grey area, however, and the transit of such vessels through the straits led to friction between the Allies and Turkey. Repeated protests from Moscow and London led to the Turkish government banning the movements of "suspicious" Axis ships with effect from June 1944 after a number of German auxiliary ships were permitted to transit the Straits.

Franco–Syrian Treaty of Independence (1936)

The **Franco-Syrian Treaty of Independence** was a treaty negotiated between France and Syria to provide for Syrian independence from French authority, which had been imposed under a League of Nations Mandate.

Explanation

The agreement was negotiated over a six-month period from March to September 1936. The Syrian government ratified the treaty before the end of the year. France signed but never ratified the document. The treaty was the first

formal compact between France and a recognized nationalist movement in Syria, comprising several elected officials of the parliament in Damascus.

History

In 1934, France attempted to impose a treaty of independence heavily prejudiced in favor of France. It promised gradual independence but kept the Syrian Mountains under French control. The Syrian head of state at the time was a French puppet, Muhammad 'Ali Bay al-'Abid. Fierce opposition to this treaty was spearheaded by senior nationalist and parliamentarian Hashim al-Atassi, who called for a sixty day strike in protest. Atassi's political coalition, the National Bloc, mobilized massive popular support for his call. Riots and demonstrations raged, and the economy came to a standstill.

The new Popular Front-led French government then agreed to recognize the National Bloc as the sole legitimate representatives of the Syrian people and invited Hashim al-Atassi to independence negotiations in Paris. He traveled there on March 22, 1936, heading a senior Bloc delegation. The resulting treaty called for immediate recognition of Syrian independence as a sovereign republic, with full emancipation granted gradually over a 25 year period.

The treaty guaranteed incorporation of previously autonomous Druze and Alawite regions into Greater Syria, but not Lebanon, with which France signed a similar treaty in November. The treaty also promised curtailment of French intervention in Syrian domestic affairs as well as a reduction of French troops, personnel and military bases in Syria. In return, Syria pledged to support France in times of war, including the use of its air space, and to allow France to maintain two military bases on Syrian territory. Other political, economic and cultural provisions were included.

Atassi returned to Syria in triumph on September 27, 1936 and was elected President of the Republic in November.

The emerging threat of Adolf Hitler induced a fear of being outflanked by Nazi Germany if France relinquished its colonies in the Middle East. That, coupled with lingering imperialist inclinations in some levels of the French government, led France to reconsider its promises and refuse to ratify the treaty. Also, France ceded the province of Alexandretta, whose territory was guaranteed as part of Syria in the treaty, to Turkey. Riots again broke out, Atassi resigned, and Syrian independence was deferred until after World War II.

Anglo-Egyptian treaty of 1936

The **Anglo-Egyptian Treaty of 1936** was a treaty signed between the United Kingdom and the Kingdom of Egypt; it is officially (but seldom) known as The Treaty of Alliance Between His Majesty, in Respect of the United Kingdom, and His Majesty, the King of Egypt. Under the terms of the treaty, the United Kingdom was required to withdraw all its troops from Egypt, except those necessary to protect the Suez Canal and its surroundings, numbering 10,000 troops plus auxiliary personnel. Additionally, the United Kingdom would supply and train Egypt's army and assist in its defence in case of war. The treaty was to last for 20 years; it was signed on August 26 in Zaafarana palace, and ratified on 22 December. It was registered in League of Nations Treaty Series on 6 January, 1937.[1]

Among the pretexts for the treaty was the Second Italo-Abyssinian War, which had started in 1935. King Farouk feared that the Italians might invade Egypt or drag it into the fighting. The 1936 treaty did not resolve the question of Sudan which, under the terms of the existing Anglo-Egyptian Condominium Agreement of 1899, stated that Sudan should be jointly governed by Egypt and Britain, but with real power remaining in British hands.[2] With rising tension in Europe, the treaty expressively favoured maintaining the status quo. The treaty however, was not welcomed by Egyptian nationalists like the Arab Socialist Party, who wanted full independence from Britain. It ignited a wave of demonstrations against the British and the Wafd Party, which had supported the treaty.

Following World War II, and the Wafd Party's victory in the boycotted 1950 election, the new Wafd government unilaterally abrogated the treaty in October 1951. Three years later, and with new government leadership under the popular Gamal Abdel Nasser, the UK agreed to withdraw its troops; the British withdrawal was completed in July 1956. This date is seen as when Egypt gained full independence, but Nasser had already established an independent policy that caused tension with several Western powers.

Following the abrupt withdrawal of an offer by Britain and the United States to fund the building of the Aswan Dam, Egypt nationalised the Suez Canal on 26 July, 1956,[3] ostensibly to pay for the dam, and established compensation for the former owners. Nonetheless, some months later, France, Israel and Britain colluded to overthrow Nasser,[4] and the Suez Crisis ensued.

The Suez Crisis brought the western alliance to a disastrous juncture where the United States became distrusted by Britain and France. The Soviet Union threatened Britain and France with nuclear bombardment if they did not

withdraw from Suez. The United States did not side with its Anglo-French allies and instead supported the Soviet Union's demand for Anglo-French withdrawal.

Treaty of Establishment, Commerce and Navigation

The **Treaty of Establishment, Commerce and Navigation** (or the **Treaty of Establishment, Commerce and Navigation with Full Protocols and Annex**) was signed on August 25, 1935 between representatives of Iran and the Soviet Union. This accord helped to reinforce the tenets of the Russo-Persian Treaty of Friendship. Based on the terms of the treaty, both signatories reinforced their respective rights to fly their national flags on their respective commercial vessels. Moreover, both signatories were allowed to fish in the Caspian Sea within ten nautical miles (19 km) of the coastline.