

The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)



Topic A: Improving Literacy Rates among Indigenous People

Topic B: The Bioethical Implications of Gene Editing

Director: Hazel Heo

POSITION PAPERS DUE on October 17th by 11:59 pm to Committee Email

October 24-25, 2020

To Delegates of CHSMUN Advanced 2020

Dear Delegates,
Welcome to CHSMUN Advanced 2020!

It is our highest honor and pleasure to welcome you all to our 2020 online advanced conference here at Cerritos High School. On behalf of the Cerritos High School Model United Nations program, we are proud to host our very first advanced conference, where you will become more knowledgeable on international issues, participate in intellectually stimulating discussions, and create new and everlasting friendships.

The CHSMUN program continues to compete around the world as a nationally ranked MUN program. Our delegates utilize diplomacy in order to create complex solutions towards multilateral issues in the global community. Our head chairs are selected from only the best seniors of our program, undergoing a rigorous training process to ensure the highest quality of moderating and grading of debate. Furthermore, all the topic synopses have been reviewed and edited numerous times. We strongly believe that by providing each and every delegate with the necessary tools and understanding, he or she will have everything they need to thrive in all aspects of the committee. We thoroughly encourage each delegate to engage in all of the facets of their topic, in order to grow in their skills as a delegate and develop a greater knowledge of the world around them.

Although this wasn't what we expected, our advisors and staff have put in countless hours to ensure delegates have an amazing experience at the online conference. Our greatest hope is that from attending CHSMUN 2020, students are encouraged to continue on in Model United Nations and nevertheless, inspired to spark change in their surrounding communities. With this strong circuit consisting of 6 schools and over 500 delegates, CHSMUN Advanced 2020 will provide a quality experience for intermediate delegates to enhance their speaking and delegating skills.

If you have any questions, comments, or concerns, please contact us! We look forward to seeing you at CHSMUN Advanced 2020!

Sincerely,

Anjali Mani and Karishma Patel

sg.cerritosmun@gmail.com

Secretary-Generals

A Note From The Director

Delegates,

My name is Hazel Heo, and I will be your head chair for the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization(UNESCO) committee. I am currently a senior at Cerritos High School, and I am more than pleased to be a part of the Model United Nations program. MUN has not only shaped me into a confident speaker but also has helped me form new relationships with people through mutual interactions. As of school, I am taking advanced STEM related courses to achieve my passion for math and physics(which is why I love space related committees), while I love sharing my knowledge and ideas to my peers through interactive teaching. Outside of school, I am partaking as a tutor for young youth having the opportunity to make an impact on different individuals, while I have some interesting hobbies as a owner of a study youtube channel and a Rubix Cube Nationals competition winner. Also, I'm a big fan of strawberry hibiscus flavored boba, and green tea macarons, as a person who loves visiting dessert cafes with friends and family. For this conference, I really hope everyone can freely share their ideas and leave with an unforgettable memory of brimful joy. We are the ones making this experience, and shaping the conference, so I hope it can be a momentous time for new chances and challenges for every delegate. Feel free to email me at any time if you have questions about the topic or the conference in general. I can't wait to see you guys!

Sincerely,

Hazel Heo

Unesco.CHSMUN@gmail.com

Director, UNESCO

Committee Introduction:

UNESCO, or United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, Is an organ member that is a part of the United Nations. Specializing in the achievements of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) outlined in Agenda 2030, UNESCO strives to allow for the preservation of educational standpoints and the rehabilitation of people and culture such as indigenous individuals. Originally founded on November 4th in 1945, UNESCO was created with the intention to ensure that cultures throughout the International Community would be able to be preserved and kept safe even in the midst of constant development. As of 2020, there are currently 195 member states within UNESCO, with Palestine being the most recent addition in 2011. With the main catalyst of the creation of UNESCO being the following aftermath of world war, countries realized that there must be a certain organizational body to ensure that communities that were at high risk of cultural Erasure would be kept safe. Since then, UNESCO

has strived to ensure that communities such as the indigenous, endangered, and minorities are able to remain constantly preserved and avoid risks of eradication. With UNESCO's main mission being the strengthening of the rule of law, respect for Human Rights, and freedom of expression, they continue to strive to allow for International cooperation for a wide variety of topics and concerns.

Topic A: Improving Literacy Rates among Indigenous People

Background:

Following the rise of imperialism from the 1800s, indigenous peoples have always been cast aside and forced to adhere to the standards of the countries that conquered them. An example of a way that indigenous people had been affected includes through the eradication and loss of their own native languages due to constant linguistic discrimination. Linguistic discrimination is a term in which discrimination or unfair cruelty is given unto someone simply for the language that they speak. Due to the fact that it is fairly common for indigenous peoples to have their own traditional and sacred languages, the constant amount of forced language changes made by colonizers and imperialists alike has led to the constant eradication and the constant decline of indigenous languages. Even without the constant discrimination from colonization and imperialistic viewpoints, political, economic, and social discrimination still exist within many indigenous communities today. With one of the largest contributing factors being language barriers, indigenous individuals often find themselves having to conform to the new native languages that they have within their own countries or regions. Some countries have made significant efforts to ensure that Indigenous people and their languages are kept safe, such as in Norway within the Sami, or in New Zealand within the Maori. However, these are only a few examples within the entirety of the International Community, and many indigenous people have yet to find their own justice. Another contributing factor to the constant loss of indigenous language and decrease in literacy rates is the fact that indigenous people often have less access to proper education. With many countries completely abandoning indigenous rights and needs, financial and economic prosperity are often lacking within indigenous communities. Due to this, access to education is an extremely difficult task, and many within the young generations of indigenous tribes and communities do not have the proper access to education that they require. An example of this is within Nepal, where the Dalit indigenous group only had a 10% literacy rate in comparison of the 60% of the rest of the population. Within the 2001 census that took place in Australia, it was found that only 3% of indigenous people were able to ever attend school. This directly reflects into the statistic that only 0.9 percent of indigenous individuals were able to have a minimum literacy rate. This places indigenous people in a constant loop, due to the fact that economic stability is necessary in order to receive education. However, they are unable to obtain jobs or other means of obtaining monetary funds due to their own lack of

present education. Even though they do succeed in obtaining jobs, most are forced in harsh labor jobs without insurance or proper working conditions in most cases. With this constant cycle occurring, it is inevitable that indigenous people will only continue to fall deeper into illiteracy, with the chances of being able to rehabilitate any forms of indigenous life becoming slim. Even in the political sector, most indigenous people cannot vocally speak out considering the economic and political status of the indigenous people, and the low literacy rate also disables them from fully understanding different criterias between the actions they can take, misunderstanding what can benefit them in social, economic and political aspects.

United Nations Involvement:

In most cases, education systems do not respect indigenous people's diverse cultures that show their identity through different language, culture and habits. Educational materials and products that provide higher education to increase literacy rate is often not a case for indigenous people, where indigenous people can not fully enjoy their rights despite numerous international support that proclaim universal rights to education. Recognizing the ethnica and cultural discriminations at schools are major obstacles for indigenous people to access education, in 2018, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization(UNESCO) developed in cooperation with indigenous peoples, Member States, the permanent forum on indigenous issues, and the special rapporteur on the indigenous peoples for the action plan for the 2019 international year of indigenous languages. The right of indigenous people to education is mainly protected by the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, which in Article 14 states that "Indigenous peoples have the right to establish and control their educational systems and institutions providing education in their own languages, in a manner appropriate to their cultural methods of teaching and learning." Education of the indigenous people is also protected by a number of other international human rights initiatives, including the Universal Declaration of Human rights. Furthermore, the Goal 4 of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development Goals calls for ensuring equal acquaintances to all levels of education and vocational multidisciplinary training for the indigenous peoples and children in vulnerable situations. Despite these international initiatives, indigenous people's right for education and the chance for increase in literacy rate have not been fully realized for most of the people, where the critical gap still exists between the general public and the indigenous groups. There are about 370 million indigenous people living in the world, living in over 90 countries, and these people speak the majority of the world's languages with 7,000 languages and 5,000 different cultures. In the year 2000, the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues was created as the main United Nations body in order to look over the issues concerning the rights of the world's indigenous people. This was established during the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) in their resolution 2000/22. This started off with the World Conference on Indigenous Peoples, hosted by the General Assembly, on December 21, 2010. The purpose of this conference was for countries to share their perspective of the rights of indigenous people and was the start of creating objectives for the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People. Then followed with the World Conference on Indigenous People which was held from September

22-24 in 2014. This conference continued the agenda and plans that were set in the first conference. In the annex, they stressed the importance that “indigenous peoples are equal to all other peoples, while recognizing the right of all peoples to be different, to consider themselves different, and to be respected as such.”

Case Study: Voting Rights in the U.S

In South Dakota, a Native American community of 1,200 people was provided with only a single voting site, and these groups of indigenous people weren't given the option of early voting nor early registration either. On the other hand, a non-indigenous community of just 12 people was provided with its own polling ballot location, with early voting and early registration chances fully given. According to Colorado-based Native American Rights Fund, indigenous people in about 17 states in the United States face an appalling array of challenges in exercising their right to vote. With the denial of requests to establish voting centers on reservations or refusing to adapt nontraditional residential addressing new language formats are how indigenous people are treated during the voting process. For instance, in Montana, Native Americans or the indigenous people are being adversely affected by a law proposed by conservatives as a protection against voters as the legislation is pointless, as it severely restricts who can collect the ballots and how many they can collect. This affects the Native Americans voters, who either doesn't live in remote locations or has language proficiency. Literacy rate dramatically affects the political status that the indigenous group can stand, considering that they also do have the voting rights. Increase in literacy rate can help them understand different political criterias and support the ones that can fully benefit the group, however without the education or the federal help that can fix the literacy accountability, indigenous people will never fully stand on the common ground with the public citizens. Recognizing that at least 40% and up to 85% of indigenous people aged 15 have low literacy, Literacy for Life Foundation that started in 2012 is now working to protect the rights of indigenous people, not only in the economy and labor sector but also in political aspects that would further provide them a promising future. Voting rights of indigenous people contributed to the healthy growth of political standards and knowledge that would give them the opportunity to change their environment with their own power.

Bloc Positions:

Western Bloc: Within the Western Bloc, indigenous groups have been very prevalent since the 1800s. Following the time period of expansion, as more and more territories were taken over and more and more indigenous populations were diminished. The constant erasure of culture has been the reality for over 5.2 million Native Americans within the US and for the Sámi, who are currently the only indigenous people living within Europe. Annually within North America, indigenous peoples are only given about 20 billion dollars in compensation, which is not nearly enough for a belt one sure that proper educational standards can be put in place. In Europe however, seeing as there is only a single remaining indigenous group, the amount of support that

they have been able to receive has been sufficient enough to ensure that the literacy rates of those within these indigenous communities are accessible.

Latin America and Caribbean Bloc: Although Indigenous peoples make up a small percentage within the populations of the countries within this bloc, discrimination against those who are indigenous is significantly less than those of other blocs. However, in highly developed areas, this is not the case. Access to proper funding and education has been difficult, as many individuals within Latin American countries already do not have stable access to steady economic inputs. According to the UNDP, there are currently over 590 ethnic groups within Latin America, and it has been reported that over 60% of them are unemployed, while as of 2018, over 75% have experienced some form of discrimination for their own native languages. With this, it showed that the constant need for access to better education and adequate funding for these educational institutes is needed.

African Bloc: Out of all blocs in the International Community, the African Bloc has the highest composition of Indigenous peoples. However, the amount of isolation they have to other individuals within the continent are also severely high. This means that the constant isolation politically, economically, and even geographically has led to the constant erasure of educational standpoints that specialize in teaching important aspects such as literacy in language. Furthermore, given the current economic state of the African Bloc, efforts for Indigenous funding and conservation are extremely limited.

Asian-Pacific Bloc: Within the Asian Pacific Bloc, there are high numbers of Indigenous groups, yet the isolation from higher states and cities is very high as well. Due to ethnic and cultural standards deeply rooted within the majority of tribes in the Asian Bloc, predominantly within the South Eastern Asian area, the ideals of mixing back in with society and becoming cohesive with their respective counties is very rare. This means that the opportunity for educational resources is scarce, and even with constant access, often these indigenous individuals would reject such integrations into society. According to the UNODC Indigenous Peoples Report of 2014, it was stated that 85% of indigenous peoples have refused to give into assimilation and preferred to be left alone by society. This further proves the difficulty of being able to preserve dictation access and reintegration into society.

Basic Solutions:

With the constant cycle of having a lack of education, limited job opportunities and unemployment, the struggles that Indigenous people go through has worsened in the past decade. However, given the cultural and ethical beliefs of many indigenous groups, simply forcing reintegration into society is not plausible. Therefore, approaches such as economic stabilizers and stimulators should first be utilized in order to ensure that proper funding is given to Indigenous communities to prepare a baseline of educational approaches. By beginning a chain reaction of economic potential and stimulation to Indigenous peoples thrive additional funding, it can ensure that they are able to sustain themselves without having to depend on the constant flow of compensation money. Furthermore, allowing for economic stimulation will allow Indigenous

individuals to become self sufficient, which in turn gives them the opportunity to access basic educational needs. Another important aspect within allowing for the development of literacy rates within Indigenous peoples, is ensuring that educational institutes are able to overcome the language barriers that may come as time goes by. One of the largest issues with the education of Indigenous peoples is the fact that those who teach are unable to converse directly with students. However, this challenge can pose to be an opportunity. Indigenous peoples who are already fluent in both languages can become the teachers of these educational areas. This can make sure that Indigenous communities would be able to teach others, while still being able to earn a small amount of financial gain. UNESCO has been able to ensure that certain NGOs and Programs such as the Indigenous Skills and Employment Training (ISET) Program could be utilized to ensure that certain Indigenous groups had access to the necessary training, education, and compensation for being employees under sub-governments. This not only allows for the development of new education institutes that are accessible to Indigenous individuals, but also is able to ensure that Indigenous individuals who are uncomfortable with interactions with non-Indigenous could be much more comforted and comfortable with a one-on-one environment. Lastly, the importance of sustaining traditional Indigenous ideals is key. Although the improvement of literacy rates is substantially important, it is important to recognize that Indigenous peoples still have their own tradition, customs, and ethics. Teaching such languages should be for their advantage, whether it is for the benefit of employment or everyday life. Being able to come up with systems that adequately allow for the cooperation of Indigenous people and those living with them is crucial. Due to this, allowing for the development of certain guidelines is necessary to ensure that Indigenous people's rights are respected, all while being able to benefit them with the advantages of having the knowledge of dual languages.

Questions to Consider:

1. What are your countries' policies and stance towards the Indigenous people currently? How does this shape different Indigenous people's educational chances and experiences?
2. What educational policies are currently provided for the Indigenous people in your country?
3. Are there any initiatives or policies that prevent the literacy gap between the indigenous people and the normal population? If so, how has this been implemented in the past, and what results has it shown?
4. How can your country accommodate the indigenous group that is unwilling to accept educational, cultural and language "modernization"?
5. How has your country responded to the conflict between corporations and the indigenous people?

Sources:

1. IWGIA, “Indigenous People—Who are Indigenous Peoples?” available at <http://www.iwgia.org/culture-and-identity/identification-of-indigenous-peoples>, accessed 11 September 2017.
2. United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), 13 September 2007, available at <http://undesadspd.org/IndigenousPeoples/DeclarationontheRightsofIndigenousPeoples.aspx>.
3. United Nations, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 1966, available at <http://www.hrweb.org/legal/cpr.html>; United Nations, International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, 1966, available at <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/cescr.aspx>.
4. “Study Guide: The Rights of Indigenous Peoples,” University of Minnesota Human Rights Center, 2003, available at <http://www1.umn.edu/humanrts/edumat/studyguides/indigenous.html>.
5. Anup Shah, “Rights of Indigenous People,” *Global Issues*, October 16, 2010, available at <http://www.globalissues.org/article/693/rights-of-indigenous-people>.
6. Rory Carroll and Andres Schipani, “Bolivia set to adopt new constitution empowering indigenous majority,” *The Guardian*, 23 January 2009, available at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/jan/23/bolivia-indigenous-charter>.
7. Andrew Jacobs, “In China, Myths of Social Cohesion,” *New York Times*, 18 August 2014, <http://www.nytimes.com/2014/08/19/world/asia/in-china-myths-of-social-cohesion.html>; Chris Buckley, “China Says 8 Executed in Western Region; Charges Stem from Separatist Attacks,” 24 August 2014, *New York Times*, <http://www.nytimes.com/2014/08/25/world/asia/8-people-executed-in-xinjiang-on-terrorism-charges-china-says.html>.
8. Bruce Maddy-Weitzman, “Ethno-politics and globalization in North Africa: The Berber Culture Movement,” *The Journal of North African Studies* 11, no. 1, (2006), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13629380500409917>.
9. WIPO, “Intellectual Property and Traditional Medical Knowledge,” Background Brief No. 6, 2016 available at http://www.wipo.int/edocs/pubdocs/en/wipo_pub_tk_6.pdf.
10. UN Economic and Social Affairs, “State of the world’s Indigenous Peoples,” 2009, p. 69, available at <https://www.un.org/development/desa/indigenouspeoples/publications/state-of-the-world-s-indigenous-peoples.html>.
11. Siegfried Wiessner, “United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples: General Assembly Resolution 61/295,” 13 September 2013, UN Audiovisual Library of International Law, available at http://legal.un.org/avl/ha/ga_61-295/ga_61-295.html.
12. Simon Brascoupe and Karin Endemann, “Intellectual Property and Aboriginal People: A Working Paper,” Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, Fall

- 1999, http://www.wipo.int/export/sites/www/tk/en/databases/creative_heritage/docs/ip_aboriginal_people.pdf.
13. UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, "Indigenous Languages Backgrounder," <http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/2016/Docs-updates/backgrounderL2.pdf>.
 14. Michael Walsh, "Will Indigenous Languages Survive?" *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 2005, p. 294, available at <http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev.anthro.34.081804.120629>.
 15. IWGIA, "Indigenous Peoples and Land Rights," available at <http://www.iwgia.org/sw231.asp>, accessed 25 May 2011.
 16. Max Bearak, "U.N. Officials Denounce 'Inhuman' Treatment of Native American Pipeline Protesters," *The Washington Post*, 15 November 2016, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2016/11/15/u-n-officials-denounce-inhuman-treatment-of-north-dakota-pipeline-protesters/?utm_term=.6a2749e55a69
 17. "Kenya: Landmark Ruling on Indigenous Land Rights," Human Rights Watch, February 4, 2010, available at <http://www.hrw.org/en/news/2010/02/04/kenya-landmark-ruling-indigenous-land-rights>.
 18. Nikolaj Petersen, "The Arctic as a New Arena for Danish Foreign Policy: The Ilulissat Initiative and its Implications," *Danish Foreign Policy Yearbook 2009*, 2009, p. 36, available at <http://www.arcticgovernance.org>.

Topic B: The Bioethical Implications of Gene Editing

Background:

Gene editing is the practice of changing an organism's genetic composition through the insertion, deletion or modification of DNA. While this replacement methods and the idea of gene editing has continued since 1979, the discovery of CRISPR Cas9(Clustered regularly interspaced short palindromic repeats) enzyme in 2013 foreshadowed a dramatic possibility of gene editing as well as genome modification. Prior to CRISPR technology, gene editing itself did not prove potential applications, especially on humans. Even though technologies that process CRISPR are relatively new, its prospects are very broad and can possibly pose serious biological damage whenever abused. Other than CRISPR Cas9, CAR T-Cell Therapy and Chimeric antigen receptor shows different forms of gene technology and how it has been implemented in public. To show the reality of the situation, United States intelligence official James Clapper stated genome modification as a potential weapon of mass annihilation and proliferation in a 2016 report, referring to the capacity of CRISPR technology within bioterrorism. While the future potential use of CRISPR technology has immense importance, the current bioethical concerns reveal the dreadful balance between life and science. Gene modification has practically boundless prospects, and the rapid development of gene editing in the technology sector has outpaced the international community's evaluations of ethical practices, where the change in international bioethical standard is necessary. The most common bioethical question coincides with the term "playing god", which defines exceeding boundaries of human role in life and nature, with extensive alteration of organisms that circulates in the natural process. Even though the CRISPR algorithm was discovered in early 1987, its simulation as a gene editing tool was found by Eugene Koonin in late 2008. With this research, CRISPR Cas9 was revealed to use in eukaryotic cells in 2013, and with this initial development and the expansion of the technology, it became inevitable to avoid international interest in the bioethical technology and the gene editing. Gene editing involving CRISPR is divided into two main categories: therapeutic, or the use of gene technology for health enhancement, and the use of gene editing to control the expression of favorable traits, especially in unborn children. With these new gene technologies that have the superficial potency of growth in biotechnology, global stances on the gene editing have been altered since the initial developments. "Arms race" to make new scientific discoveries and applications consistently involve gene editing, where it does pose the threat of serious genetic diseases with no reasonable alternative. Meanwhile, gene editing in tests has been proven to cure glioblastoma, muscular dystrophy, HIV/AIDS, and fibrosis, where it has the potential to cure external diseases prevalent. However, the hesitancy expressed by professionals question the danger and the moral ethics of gene editing, with many facets that cause concerns in the international community. For instance, most agree that the genome editing process should not be

used for clinical reproductive purposes as the risk cannot be justified by the potential benefit, even with technologies such as preimplantation genetic diagnosis(PDG) and in vitro fertilization(IVF).⁴ Furthermore, there is concern upon the gap the technology would widen, as genome editing will only be accessible to the wealthy and will increase existing disparities in access to health and other interventions. Even though the genome editing promises for a safe and effective use of curing genetic diseases, most researchers agree on the slippery slope of using it for non-therapeutic and enhancement purposes.

UN Involvement:

The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Committee has met to address the bioethical implications of gene editing technology aiming to form the international boundaries regarding its usage. While CRISPR gene editing technology does have a wide efficacy and applicability, the specific use of this technology has to be rigidly regulated, in which the UNESCO prioritizes the directive of the committee to prevent potential arms race upon bio technology specifically in the gene implication. Recently at the UNESCO meeting in Paris, the International Bioethics Committee(IBC) has reported the concern upon finding the appropriate balance between incentivizing advances in genetic technologies and managing their intended and unintended consequences. They divided the balance between three pillars: (1) consent and privacy; (2) information sharing and intellectual property rights; and, (3) ethical boundaries. Since the immortal HeLa cells of Henrietta lacks, and African American cancer patient who died in 1951, scientists have grown 50 million metric tons of her cells, and there are almost 11,000 patents involving this mechanism. Nonetheless, neither Henrietta nor her family members ever consented to the experimentation, where UNESCO has found the need for the implication of privacy after the publication of HeLa genome in 2013. The future of genomic research and gene editing hinge on the international standard that can regulate the gene technology and distribution. The earliest patents were issued in 1982, which opened the debate upon DNA's discovery in the United Nations. Earlier in 2019, the Director-General of the WHO established a new advisory committee on developing global standards for governance and oversight of human genome editing. The committee highlighted the irresponsibility of the current clinical application where WHO immediately began working on a central registry on human genome editing research. The standards of the guiding principle is based on the UN charter's Universal Declaration of Human rights, given that the gene editing will affect not only this current generation but also our future generations.

Case Study: China

In 2019 November, the world was diminished with the disturbing announcement during the Second International Summit on Human Genome Editing held in Hong Kong. Jiankui, a

Chinese researcher claimed to the world that he had edited the genes of two human embryos and that they had been brought to the term. This immediately led to an outrage of scientists across the world, where the world questioned vigorously upon the ethical norms of gene editing and this patient's safety. The germline editing this scientist carried out showed a slight difference than the somatic gene therapies that were currently leading the gene technology, as the germline editing he proceeded effects all cells in an organism including eggs and sperms which eventually leads on the future generations. Somatic gene therapies modify the DNA to treat a disease caused by genetic mutation using the CRISPR techniques changing the 'part' of the patient's gene order. However, the germline editing alters the fundamental genome of a human embryo at its early stage which impacts not only the patients but possibly their descendants, which is why substantial ethical restriction needs to be made. The FDA(Food and Drug Administration) states rigid policy on germline gene editing, following the COnsolidated Appropriations Act of 2016, blocking same clinical application of human germline editing Jiankui has announced, where the world view upon this reveal saw him as someone who broke the national law and scientific conventions, in a scientific community that uses peer review, public censure, and promotions. Through this case, it showed that "Public policy or ethical discussion that's divorced from how science is progressing is problematic, and it is very hard to deal with a transnational problem with national legislation, but it would be once regulated through international consensus on the subject." Ethical intervention upon gene editing might be hard to regulate, but it is the human ethics that protect the future generation that the world pursues.

Bloc Positions:

Western Bloc: Western bloc has become one of the strongest participants in gene technology since the development of CRISPR Cas9 in 1979. The United States has been the leading gene editing developer, with initial developments invested in the country, notably that of gene modification. The United States National Academy of Sciences in 2015 imposed the responsibility of the current bioethical regulations, where the United State posed for a 'reasonable alternative' in the bioethical sector. The United States has embraced technology and public-private partnerships for gene development objectives, where private American companies have procedures to provide aid for the germediting operations. The general public of the western bloc supports the idea of genome technology in which they desire the use of PGD and IVF 7,8 that would allow them to obtain decided future of their childrens through gene editing process.

Middle Eastern Bloc: The Middle East has been a center of human migration and population admixture, where the Gulf region, North Africa and Central Asia has suffered from recessive diseases. With this experience, Middle Eastern Bloc has managed to generate GME Variome Consortium collecting the data of 1,794 self-reported nationals from GME regions participating in on-going genetics studies. Applying the database to unsolved GME recessive conditions, it successfully reduced the number of potential disease causing variants by 4-7 fold.

Latin America and Caribbean Bloc: Even though Latin American Bloc comparably lack technological resources in gene editing and genome intervention, latin American bloc has continuously issued proposed gene therapy and experiments. This area of research is in the

biotechnology industry whereas the procedures and therapeutic gene therapy was estimated to represent an 800 million dollar market by 2017. The Science and technology in Latin America highlights a number of singularities that are now apparent as a newly developing field. For instance, the Brazilian constitution guarantees universal access to health care, federal expenses after legal decisions to provide treatments in gene technology sectors. However, gene therapy products and procedures are likely to be very expensive in the current inaugural period of new technologies, and there are concerns on how Latin American bloc will reinforce the lack of research and development in this field.

African Bloc: In African bloc, due to environmental and economical reasons, CRISPR-Cas9 technology is rather used in plant science than humanitarian gene editing. CRISPR-Cas9 is already being used in Africa, such as wheat, cassava and banana in terms of agricultural prosperity and development. The Kenya Agricultural and Livestock Research Organization(KALRO) and other international organizations are using CRISPR-Cas9 technology to improve maize germplasm so that it becomes resistant to maize lethal necrosis(MLN). Gene editing has provided an opportunity to capture the tremendous potential for African scientist to develop homegrown solutions to food security and climate change by producing high-yielding seeds that are disease/pest resistant with diverse nutritional base. In the recent Africa Biennial Biosciences Communication(ABBC), Africa opened a new paradigm upon using the gene editing in health and agricultural research, in coordination with the International Institute of Tropical Agriculture(IITA), with Kenya leading the African countries who begun drafting the guidelines to regulate gene-edited products(CRISPR Cas9).

Asian-Pacific Bloc: Asian Pacific bloc has a big genome market that is expected to grow with the investment on the development of genome editing technology. In April 2016, Japan invested approximately US \$76 million for Japanese owned genome editing technologies. In 2017, the CRISPR segment held a largest market share of 53.6% of the genome editing market, where Asia Pacific genome editing market is based on application which is segmented into genetic engineering, cell line engineering and others. China also has very applicable gene editing technology, while their bioethical laws surrounding gene editing are very ambiguous, which many argue regardless of bioethical boundaries this has greatly contributed to the rapid scientific development and some potential ethical branches.

Basic Solutions:

While CRISPR does have a wide variety of applications, the specific uses of this technology should not be the focus of debate as it does not fall under UNESCO's jurisdiction. The bioethical implication does involve massive amounts of medical context and ideology, however the delegates in this committee should rather prioritize research and discussion upon moral implications and regulation for the international community in order to fit the directive of the committee and to prevent any infringement upon other committee's jurisdiction. For example, the committee will discuss the viability and the efficacy of therapeutic germline and somatic cell technology while avoiding the discussion of specific medical applications and

ideology of these types of editing as this falls into the jurisdiction of WHO(World Health Organization). CRISPR-Cas9 impose a high threat of being a bioterrorist weapon, and the delegates in the committee should find a logical intervention as part of the international community to prevent further action of a specific group. For example, Direct-to-Consumer(DTC) kits that allow any consumer to test their own DNA without any medical counselling posed a danger in the bioethical area as it made available for the consumers to carry out medical as well as non-medical tests. UNESCO called for a regulation for these testings that are easily accessible when adopting the Universal Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights dealing with ethical issues raised by rapid change in medicine, life-sciences and technology. There are many ethical facets of this new technology that need to be addressed and as the international community, it is our responsibility to regulate them to properly circumvent future ethical breaches.

Questions to Consider:

1. What branches of biotechnology have been proved successful in your country, and how has it affected the bioethical terms and regulations?
2. Is a religion a prominent factor in your country and your government? If so, how does this affect the bioethical interventions, and what relationship does it have with UNESCO's objective?
3. Has your country ever commented on relatively similar bioethical issues? How has your country reacted to it, and how was it prevented?
4. Does your country have the capacity to fund and develop biotechnology? What is the future estimate of biotechnology in your country, and what does it impose?
5. What precautions would be taken to lessen potential effects of bioethical risk factor? How will the aftermath impacts of biotechnology be regulated?

Sources:

1. Fyodor Urnov, "Genome Editing B.C. (Before CRISPR)," Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology News, March 13, 2018, <https://www.genengnews.com/insights/genome-editing-b-c-before-crispr/>
2. James Clapper, "Statement for the Record Worldwide Threat Assessment of the Us Intelligence Community," Office of the Director of National Intelligence, February 13, 2018
3. "Crispr-Cas9," What is biotechnology? accessed February 1, 2019, <http://www.whatisbiotechnology.org/index.php/science/summary/crispr>.
4. *Human Genome Editing* (Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press, 2017), 1, <http://dx.doi.org/10.17226/24623>.

5. U.S. National Library of Medicine, "What Are Genome Editing and Crispr-cas9?," Genetics Home Reference, accessed February 1, 2019, <https://ghr.nlm.nih.gov/primer/genomicresearch/genomeediting>.
6. National Institute of Health, "Genome Editing," National Human Genome Research Institute, August 3, 2017, <https://www.genome.gov/27569225/what-are-the-ethical-concerns-about-genome-editing/#13>.
7. Christopher Gyngell, Thomas Douglas, and Julian Savulescu, "The Ethics of Germline Gene Editing," *Journal of Applied Philosophy* 34, no. 4 (December): 498-513, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/japp.12249>.
8. Eliot Marshall, "Company's 'designer baby' Patent Divides Bioethicists," *Science Magazine*, October 3, 2013, https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2013/10/companys-designer-baby-patent-divides-bioethicists?r3f_986=https://www.google.com/.
9. Erik Sherman, "Genetic Engineering Will Make Income Inequality Much Worse," *Forbes*, August 20, 2017, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/eriksherman/2017/08/20/genetic-engineering-will-make-income-inequality-much-worse/#57046d8d3d75>.
10. "Science: It's a Geep," *Time*, February 27, 1984, <http://content.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,921546,00.html>.
11. Bob Yirka, "Second Successful Human-Animal Hybrid: Sheep Embryo with Human Cells," *Phys.org*, February 20, 2018, <https://phys.org/news/2018-02-successful-human-animal-hybrid-sheep-embryo.html>.
12. Rodolphe Bourret et al., "Human-animal chimeras: ethical issues about farming chimeric animals bearing human organs," *Stem Cell Research & Therapy* 7, no. 1 (June), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s13287-016-0345-9>.
13. United Nations, "Universal Declaration On Bioethics and Human Rights," UNESCO, October 19, 2005, http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=31058&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html.
14. United Nations, "Unesco Panel of Experts Calls for Ban On "editing" of Human Dna to Avoid Unethical Tampering with Hereditary Traits," UNESCO, accessed February 1, 2019, <https://en.unesco.org/news/unesco-panel-experts-calls-ban-editing-human-dna-avoid-unethical-tampering-hereditary-traits>.
15. United Nations, "Unesco Panel of Experts Calls for Ban On "editing" of Human Dna to Avoid Unethical Tampering with Hereditary Traits," UNESCO, accessed February 1, 2019, <https://en.unesco.org/news/unesco-panel-experts-calls-ban-editing-human-dna-avoid-unethical-tampering-hereditary-traits>.
16. Sy Mukherjee, "Goldman Sachs: China Is Beating the U.S. In the Gene Editing Arms Race," *Fortune*, April 13, 2018, <http://fortune.com/2018/04/13/goldman-sachs-china-gene-editing-race/>.
17. Jocelyn Kaiser, "U.s. Panel Gives Yellow Light to Human Embryo Editing," *Science Magazine*, February 14, 2017,

<https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2017/02/us-panel-gives-yellow-light-human-embryo-editing>