

Resolution LEGAL/6/1.1

General Assembly Sixth Committee

Co-sponsors: Republic of Albania, Commonwealth of Australia, Kingdom of Belgium, Canada, Central African Republic, Republic of Chad, Republic of Chile, People's Republic of China, Republic of Croatia, Kingdom of Denmark, Republic of Ecuador, Republic of Finland, Republic of France, Federal Republic of Germany, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Hellenic Republic, Hungary, Republic of India, Japan, Republic of Kazakhstan, State of Kuwait, Republic of Latvia, Kingdom of Netherlands, Republic of Palau, Russian Federation, Republic of Senegal, Republic of Singapore, Kingdom of Thailand, Republic of Togo, United States of America, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Socialist Republic of Vietnam

Topic: "Diplomatic Protection"

Remembering that Diplomatic Protection was founded on the idea that citizens should be provided with safety abroad,

Knowing that there is not yet an official United Nations convention on the subject of Diplomatic Protection,

Fully aware that citizens' rights are being ignored, abused, and violated,

Noting with regret that Diplomatic Protection has been used to justify wars and invasions,

Reinforcing the belief that Diplomatic Protection, when used correctly, is important in order to uphold human rights,

Remembering its resolution 62/67,

Concerned about the lack of citizens' education pertaining to this issue,

Understanding the need for strict international regulations on Diplomatic Protection in order to prevent the abuse of less developed countries,

Understanding also the need for these rights to be extended to refugees and stateless people,

1. Heavily encourages the forming of a convention that will solidify the laws pertaining to Diplomatic Protection with the following points:
 - a. Expresses hope that states educate their citizens on their rights provided by Diplomatic Protection, through state-sponsored courses, verbal listing of citizens' rights on state borders and airplanes, or the listing of rights on signs and passports,
 - b. Reaffirms that The International Court of Justice has the right to intervene when it believes that Diplomatic Protection is being used irresponsibly,
 - c. Proclaims that Diplomatic Protection is not a valid reason for an invasion for another sovereign state,

- d. Reminds member states that Diplomatic Protection should be extended to aid refugees and stateless persons,
2. Supports member states that use other tools besides Diplomatic Protection;
3. Strongly affirms the right of the member states to choose when to use Diplomatic Protection; and
4. Trusts that member states will use Diplomatic Protection responsibly.