



SAMONU
MODELO DE NACIONES UNIDAS



JULIO ESTEBAN / JERÓNIMO OVIEDO

SAMONU 2025

COLEGIO LOS SAMANES

Ministerio del Entorno (Polonia)



Ministerstwo
Klimatu i Środowiska

Ficha de Competencias *Procesofolio* SAMONU

Comisión			
Nombre			Delegación
Áreas	Asignaturas	Competencias	
Ciencias Sociales	Filosofía	Analizar problemas éticos y políticos	Pensamiento Crítico
	Políticas y Eco	Pensamiento Reflexivo y sistémico	Interpretación y Análisis de Perspectivas
Humanidades	English	Comunicativa	Funcional
	Lenguaje	Comprensión e interpretación textual	Lectura crítica
Matemáticas	Estadística	Interpretación y representación	Razonamiento y argumentación
	Cálculo	Formulación y ejecución	
Ciencias Naturales	Biología	Observar y obtener información	Analizar problemas
	Química	Desarrollar la capacidad crítica, reflexiva y analítica	
	Física	Indagación	Uso del conocimiento científico

Tabla de observaciones

Áreas	Asignaturas	Observaciones
Ciencias Sociales	Filosofía	excelente análisis de los problemas éticos que puede conllevar la modificación genética, vas por muy buen camino.
	Políticas y Eco	Están muy bien implementadas las políticas y las soluciones dadas a la problemática, también relacionas de manera excelente el ámbito económico con el ambiental y social, muy buen trabajo.
Humanidades	English	excelente uso del inglés, acataste todas las recomendaciones dadas anteriormente y le diste una profundidad y vista al futuro excelentes al texto, forma y estructura también aplicadas de muy buena manera.
	Lenguaje	
Matemáticas	Estadística	No presentaste gráficas ni estadísticas, algo de suma importancia para respaldar tus argumentos y soluciones.
	Cálculo	las cifras son pertinentes con lo que se menciona y apoyan las ideas y argumentos propuestos de muy buena manera, serían mucho mejores si agregaras las gráficas correspondientes.
Ciencias Naturales	Biología	muy buen análisis del problema y aportas muy buenas soluciones que van en pro de una solución justa y equitativa al problema, si sigues ahondando así vas a dar una de las mejores soluciones a la problemática.
	Química	Excelente análisis y reflexiones en base del problema, das soluciones pertinentes al problema y genera bastantes reflexiones en cuanto a este, guiando a soluciones pertinentes tomando en cuenta la problemática expuesta.
	Física	Se evidencia una gran investigación e indagación tanto del problema como de la delegación, haciendo de este un ejercicio muy completo y elaborado.

CARTA DE POSICIÓN

Delegation of Poland

Poland is in Central and Eastern Europe, bordered by the Baltic Sea to the north and the Carpathian Mountain range to the south. It is located near the city of Warsaw. Poland is approximately at the geographical center of Europe. Poland shares borders with Germany (467 km) to the west, and the south borders with the Czech Republic (790 km).

Introductory Notes of the themes

Poland's considerations on the international community's adoption of Infinita Genetics' experiences in cloning and genome editing technologies are framed by the ethical, legal, and scientific values advocated by Poland at international forums, including the Committee on Ethics and Environment of the Gene Manipulation. +Infinita Lessons for Safe Development of Biotechnology +Perspectives in Health, Ethical, Legal, Common Good +Poland's position as a member of the international community From a legal and ethical perspective, the use of cloning and genome editing techniques by entities such as Infinita Genetics must be guided and limited to balance advances in science with human dignity, safeguarding human rights, protecting public health, and the environment/sustainability. The following limitations are presented as well as the relevant monitoring mechanisms:

From a law and ethics perspective, the use of cloning and genome editing techniques by entities such as Infinita Genetics must be guided and limited to balance advances in science with human dignity, safeguarding human rights, protecting public health, and the environment/sustainability.

1. Respect for Human Dignity

Any regulatory framework for cloning and genetic interventions must concern itself with respect for human dignity. Whenever life-altering technologies are at the forefront, it is imperative to draw inviolable borders.

Prohibition of human reproductive cloning. Cloning of human reproductive cells is a phenomenon that does not deserve ethical, psychosocial, or biological weighing-in. While there may be some biological purposes to meaningfully clone an individual, reproductive cloning is a characteristics-averse, individuality-infringing, autocratic project that raises grave ethical considerations about individuality, non-interference, non-consumerism, exploitation, commercialization, commercialization of the gift of life, and objectification. Prohibition must also extend to the cloning of human beings under the aegis of an uncertain enterprise that is particularly care-averse, respect-oblivious, over-commercialized, reliant on hopeless opportunism, and highly consumptive.

Poorly regulated germline gene editing. The editing of the germline brachial apparatus of human beings is a currently inadvisable use of gene editing technologies due to its grave risk to future generations. Appropriate inadvisability overrides potentially meaningful somatic-only uses of gene editing technologies, unintended consequentialism and river-crossing consequentialism. The misuse of germline gene editing technologies-desired or undesired-for the transmittance of polygenetically influenced heritable traits, relies on the probable significant ability of phenomena that are, thus far, beyond full comprehension and knowability-desired, unintended risks or consequences. Additive chemicals like toy genes and polygenetical influencers of playing or overtaud are two such uses.

Expansion of societal well-being

Within an examination of the potential for societal well-being to be used and manipulated marks by cloning and gene editing technologies is the compelling need to address risks to the public. Advances in cloning and gene editing technologies raise uncertainties for the greater good of all time tied to the future, near and distant, which make them desirable of adverse consequences.

Pre-market proofs of concept. Organizations such as Infinita Genetics, Inc., must conduct meaningful and thorough investigatory phases of one or more preclinical and clinical prototypes of their proposals for cloning or gene editing at a particularly high biological and psychological risk before the application of human somatic or human adjunct tuft germline targeting intervention procedures may be commercially and/or noncommercially attempted and/or transitioned to the actual or projected parents or gametes of the future persons involved. The preclinical investigations must include investigatory phases of at least meaningful prototypes of the entities and procedures and systems or systems and procedures that conceptualize, construct, and/or deploy all components of the entities and procedures. The investigatory phases of prototypes and the investigations must be pre-market, prior to extended essential use and include meaningful and thorough investigations of the adverse biological and psychological consequences and risks that may be posed, and may be posed first and/or primarily, precede or take place alongside the exposures of real individuals to components and/or instantiations of the targeting intervention entity or procedure.

Environmental Conservation Cloning and genetic modification do not pertain to humans alone but are highly significant in terms of ecosystems. When Genetically Modified Organisms (GMO) are released to the environment, there may be disruption of ecological balances in most cases beyond our comprehension.

Companies involved in the cloning or genetic modification of animals, plants, or microorganisms must conduct comprehensive environmental risk assessments. This is essential in determining the possible ways through which these modified organisms may interact with indigenous species or ecosystems.

Tight GMO control. If we're going to put genetically modified organisms into the environment—like in agriculture or wildlife management—then, yes, there should be strict laws controlling their development, testing, and distribution. The regulations should emphasize control of biodiversity loss, invasive species spread, and genetic contamination.

Transparency and accountability are essential to the responsible use of cloning and gene-editing technologies. Private firms must be accountable not only to regulatory bodies but also to the general public.

Research methodology, clinical trial results, and possible risks as well as benefits of technology should be disclosed. Free flow of information will enable the public to have an informed discussion and enhance Community Trust.

Ethical review boards, external audits, and citizen participation oversight should be standard corporate activities in genetic engineering and cloning. Those groups must have the power and authority to halt any project if it poses an unacceptably high ethical or environmental risk.

5. Global Rules

Because genetics impacts everyone, countries need to work together to make similar rules. If they don't, businesses might go to countries with weak rules to take advantage of them.

Global agreements: Groups like the UN, WHO, and UNESCO should create official agreements on cloning and gene editing. These agreements should include ways to share info, check if people are following the rules, and punish those who don't follow ethical practices.

Cloning and gene editing could be great for science, medicine, and farming, but they also bring up big ethical, legal, and environmental questions. To make sure these changes help people, we need strong rules that focus on human dignity, public safety, and protecting the environment. We also need to be open, responsible, and work together globally. Only then can we enjoy the good things these technologies offer without hurting our values or future.

A. Ethical and Legal Limits on Genetic Manipulation

A ban on human cloning for reproductive purposes should be instituted, based on ethical dimensions concerning the sanctity of human life and the right to an unmanipulated existence. Above all, this prohibition should allow room for therapeutic cloning (regeneration of organs or treatment of genetic disorders) under very stringent ethical requirements. However, creating genetically modified humans outside the medical field is not a mere practice that falls within stringencies; it should simply be illegal.

Identity and autonomy. Suppose a person decides to clone her dead child; the clone will most probably be regarded as a substitute rather than an individual in its own right. This is likely to precipitate mounting unfulfilled expectations, thus creating tremendous psychological conflict within the clone who might feel compelled to live a life it never chose.

Impact: The right of an autonomous existence gets violated. The clone may suffer from identity crises, low self-esteem, or emotional disorders. It will always remain in the shadows of its "original" counterpart.

Commercialization of human life. Companies may provide cloning services, paid by the wealthy who wish to "reproduce" themselves or their progeny of certain favored characteristics, thereby creating a market for an essentially boutique offering. Human life is a consumable commodity that throws right out of the window all aspects of human dignity and equality; this is in addition to widening existing social inequalities when only the rich can access genetic enhancements.

Designer Babies: Selection of Traits for Non-Medical Reasons

For example, a couple chooses to genetically modify their baby by specific physical traits such as blue eyes, blonde hair, and tall. If not that, then choose for "desired" intellectual abilities or athletic skills.

It builds a society that begins to see children more as products than as individuals of great intrinsic value. It breeds a culture of perfectionism and conformity, not merely theoretically but practically because the financially empowered class can afford to choose positive attributes that eventually select the "genetic elite," deepening the wedge regarding socioeconomic classes. Besides, this will create immense psychological pressure on children to live up to these preselected traits, leading an individual into identity crises and autonomy.

2. Genetic Alteration for Enhanced Intelligence or Physical Traits

For example, parents may wish to genetically modify their children to be more intelligent or physically superior-including cognitive enhancements, muscle mass, or endurance-based on the presumption that such enhancements will place their child at a competitive advantage in life.

Resulting will be a future where people are designed to match the standards of society in terms of intelligence or physical ability. Competition on who has better genetically engineered is enabled and facilitated even though nobody had a choice in the matter; this intensifies existing forms of inequality. The wealthier families will just have access to better genetic enhancements, leaving the poor unenhanced. That would diminish much human abilities and experiences which diversity brings and makes innovation and societal advance possible.

3. Genetic editing for cosmetic purposes. A person could choose genetic modification related to their looks, like changing the color of their skin, facial characteristics, or body form to fit beauty standards of culture or individual preference.

Cosmetic genetic enhancements may make individuals feel like products of their environment or societal expectations, thus undermining personal identity and autonomy. Should cosmetic alterations become commonplace, this will make society even more pressure people to meet certain ideals of beauty to look a particular way-consider how much more severe body image issues, low self-esteem, and discrimination based on looks could be when these are all based on genetics. This too would be tantamount to other extremes wherein children or future generations are modified based on superficial aesthetic standards.

4. Genetic Selection for Disease Resistance or Longevity

5. Discrimination and the Creation of Genetic "Haves" and "Have-Nots"

6. Genetic Modification for Specific Gender or Sexual Orientation

7. Long-Term Environmental and Ecological Risks

Why Global Guidelines Are Essential:

- *Preventing Inequality: By setting clear global standards, we can ensure that these powerful technologies do not become tools of inequality, where only the rich or powerful can afford genetic enhancements.*
- *Protecting Autonomy: Clear guidelines will safeguard the rights of individuals, ensuring that decisions made about gene editing are not imposed by external pressures or societal expectations.*
- *Minimizing Risks: It is crucial to have ethical guidelines that help minimize the risks of unforeseen consequences, such as unintended health problems or societal*

disruptions.

- *Promoting Equity: Global guidelines should emphasize the equitable access to gene editing technology, ensuring that it is not used solely for cosmetic or non-therapeutic purposes but primarily for addressing health issues that would benefit humanity as a whole.*
- *Human Dignity: Ethical guidelines should reinforce the idea that human beings, whether modified or not, are inherently valuable and not subject to manipulation for superficial or unnecessary reasons.*

Without comprehensive, global guidelines, gene editing technologies could easily be misused, leading to unintended societal, ethical, and environmental consequences. The examples provided above highlight why it is essential to regulate and set clear ethical standards to prevent the commodification of life, uphold human dignity, and ensure that these technologies are used for the collective good, not for individual gain or exploitation.

Sandel, M. J. (2007). The Case Against Perfection: Ethics in the Age of Genetic Engineering.

Pursell, A. (2018). Ethics of Human Germline Editing: Challenges and Opportunities.

Kitcher, P. (2001). Science, Truth, and Democracy.

3.Environmental Protection

Thorough environmental risk assessments must be performed before genetically modified organisms (GMOs) are released into the environment, whether in agriculture or another industry. Local ecosystems and biodiversity shouldn't be harmed by transgenic organisms.

Unless gene drives are shown to be safe, reversible, and advantageous to both the environment and human health, they must be prohibited from being used in environmental applications such as eliminating pests.

4. Limiting Commercialization and Exploitation

It is not right to use genetic technologies solely for profit, particularly when doing so entails biopiracy (the illegal use of genetic materials from indigenous peoples or nations) or the exploitation of genetic resources. Profits should not take precedence over the moral advantages for society in corporate use.

A balanced, open, and responsible approach is necessary to effectively inform the public and citizens about cloning and genetic modification technologies. The use of clear communication techniques that foster public trust, promote educated discourse, and prevent needless panic or fear is crucial given the possible hazards, the contentious character of these technologies, and the possibility of disinformation.

Of course! Fostering understanding requires effectively educating the public and citizens about cloning and genetic modification technologies.

1. Transparent Communication and Fact-Based Information

Government health agencies or research institutions could create easily accessible online platforms that provide accurate, evidence-based information on the current state of genetic technologies, their benefits, risks, and ethical considerations. These platforms should address common misconceptions, such as the difference between therapeutic cloning (used to treat diseases or regenerate tissues) and reproductive cloning (which involves creating an identical human being).

Why it works:

Transparency helps reduce confusion and builds trust with the public. By addressing misconceptions head-on and explaining the science in simple, understandable terms, people are less likely to fall prey to sensationalized media or misinformation.

2. Public Consultations and Open Forums

Example:

Public consultations or town hall meetings can be organized by governments, universities, or independent organizations where experts, ethicists, and scientists provide clear explanations of the risks and benefits of cloning and genetic editing. Citizens could ask questions, express concerns, and have their voices heard.

Why it works:

Engaging in direct dialogue with the public allows for the clearing up of misconceptions, fosters transparency, and lets people feel more involved in the decision-making process. It also humanizes the scientific community by showing that they are approachable and responsive to public concerns.

3. Educational Campaigns Using Real-Life Stories

Example:

Using real-life stories of individuals or families who have benefited from genetic

modification technologies (such as gene therapy for hereditary diseases like sickle cell anemia) can help the public understand the positive potential of these technologies. Conversely, stories that explain the ethical dilemmas or failures (such as problematic cases in animal cloning) can help illustrate the risks.

Why it works:

Personal stories make complex scientific topics more relatable and tangible. When people see how new technologies can improve lives or when they witness the consequences of misuse, they are more likely to engage in the conversation with empathy and a clearer understanding of both the potential and the risks.

When speaking with the general public, refrain from using technical jargon. Everyone should be able to understand the main concerns and ramifications of cloning and genetic modification, regardless of their level of scientific training, thanks to the use of straightforward, understandable language.

Give a brief explanation of the following important ideas: what genetic modification and cloning mean, what technologies are used, how they differ from natural processes, and the possible risks and benefits.

Pay attention to common examples: Show how genetic technologies already impact daily life with analogies or real-world examples (e.g., GMOs in food, gene therapy for inherited diseases).

1.2. Public Consultations and Open Discussions

Involve the public in town halls, online forums, and open forums where they can voice concerns, ask questions, and get frank answers from professionals. This can guarantee that people feel included in the decision-making process and demystify genetic technologies.

1. In-person Town Halls with Policymakers and Scientists

For instance, scientists, bioethicists, and public health representatives are invited to a town hall on gene editing (CRISPR) at a nearby university. People from the community come to inquire, "Could this be used to eliminate hereditary diseases?"

"What are the risks of editing embryos?"

Professionals respond in straightforward terms and hand out educational pamphlets.

It is from this perspective that we, as the Delegation of Poland, propose the following considerations to guide the responsible development of biotechnology:

Health: ensuring safety and settling the matter of transparency

The Republic of Poland recognizes the potential use of gene technologies for the improvement of human health and sustainable agricultural development. However, we believe that technical/political debates should first determine the conditions for ensuring safety standards in human and environmental health. We propose the establishment of the global governance body regulating work with gene technologies, including organically binding peer review principles and guidelines for assessing long-term consequences. The Republic of Poland emphasizes the need to create regulations and binding provisions concerning biosafety as part of the agricultural biotechnology biosafety convention. This body shall empower relevant state bodies to ensure consistency with biosafety regulations under national law before authorizing international trade or introduction.

Ethics: respect for the dignity of human beings and the moral imperative to protect the environment

The Republic of Poland believes that the application of gene technologies should respect human dignity and human rights, and the regulation concerning gene technologies shall rule out conducting activities that would lead to the commercialization of human life or the violation of the sustainable development of biodiversity. We support the development of a global bioethical framework to meet the challenges of the 21st century, including the prohibition of eugenics-based gene editing and gene editing of the human genome for non-therapeutic purposes. We support the establishment of legal norms concerning discrimination based on genetic characteristics or taking actions that deepen social inequalities or divisions

based on real or perceived genetic differences, including the regulation of genetic determinism.

Legal Framework: Global Governance of Biotechnology

The Infinita case demonstrates the existing gaps in the legal and institutional framework over cross-border gene technologies, and thus, the need for international cooperation and accountability. The Republic of Poland believes that the global regulation of gene technologies requires the adoption of new legally binding regulations. We propose establishing an international legally binding convention within the framework of the United Nations on gene technologies regulated by the United Nations. The Republic of Poland supports appointing an oversight body to monitor unintended consequential effects and adherence to the provisions of the convention. We propose the establishment of an international, permanently(ly) available system to ensure accountability through remedial actions for unauthorized actions to intervene in biological processes by means of gene technologies.

DISCURSO DE APERTURA

Ethics and Environment in Genetic Manipulation Comittee (EEGMC)

Honorable Chairs, Distinguished Delegates,

As Poland Delegation, we reaffirm our unwavering commitment to making sure genetic manipulation techniques -- including cloning and gene editing -- are used responsibly for human dignity, the common good and the environment. So, although we acknowledge the promising possibilities with such technologies, we believe that ethical-legal-social issues should not be overlooked, which is demonstrated by what Infinita do.

Opportunities and challenges Infinita's work in genetic cloning and editing offers opportunities but also huge challenges. Though it has demonstrated the ability to cure genetic diseases and increase crop productivity it also raises questions about the boundaries of scientific intervention, the risk of exploitation, and the equity of access.

INVESTIGACIÓN DE SU DELEGACIÓN

1. Bioethics Committees in Poland

Poland operates on regional bioethics committees that are usually part of a university or medical entity, with no centralized committee at the national level. These committees conduct multi-faceted reviews for research on:

Human Derived Materials

Animal Research

Organisms

Genetically Modified Organisms

Genetically Modified Microorganisms

The University of Gdańsk has a regulation concerning the use of research on GMOs, which provides specific ethical guidelines for these research projects.

Additionally, under the Ministry of Health exists a Bioethics Appeals Committee, which is in place to overrule decisions made by the Committees when ethical disputes arise.

2. Legislation and Regulation

Poland holds to the EU legislation and regulations on Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology translations. Included among these are:

The Helsinki Declaration

Good Clinical Practice

Good Clinical Practice EU GMO Directive

Legislation directly pertaining to the legal status of GMOs in the Republic of Poland includes:

Legal to import and trade GMO seeds and products.

Legal to consume GMO(products and by-products).

Prohibition of GMO cultivation.

Prohibition of GMO fodder use. Though previously binding legislation included a full ban of GMO use in feed products, this has been delayed on several occasions. The most recent deadline has been set for 2025.

3. Public Opinion and Social Concerns

Research conducted by CBOS showcases the public's perspective on genetic manipulation.

Polacy są sceptyczni: wynika z tego, że większość respondentów oferuje odpowiedzi z negatywnymi konotacjami, takimi jak "nużnia" i "disavows." Almost the entire business of creating new species enjoys the approval of only a small percentage of the population. Resentment is usually explained by:

Fear of health and environmental dangers.

Concern for nature.

Mistrust of scientific bodies and power entities.

Genetic manipulation considered dangerous, high percentage of negative answers is only an exception for:

Vaccines.

Treatment of diseases.

Purification of the environment.

Concerns over the development of biotechnology for commercial gain and the narcissistic attitudes prevalent in today's world were often mentioned. It was also highlighted that legal and ethical constraints on biotechnological research are necessary and should be overseen and co-ordinated centrally by the government.

4. Recent Developments and Initiatives Popular Press and Current Research Trends in Biotechnology and Life Sciences Ge Longer Abstract Presentations Introduction Overview of recent developments in Biotechnology and Life Sciences in Poland Drew Basiaga Zhen Quang Wang Biolife Company, Piony, Miejsce Rusinow Ambiguity Biotechnologys Economic Forum 1. Historical and Political Context Development encouraged by important scientific publications earlier in our decade. No further indications of scientific work meeting are important.

BIBLIOGRAFÍA

Statista. (s. f.). Statista - El portal de estadísticas.

<https://es.statista.com/buscar/?q=Economia+de+Polonia+&p=1>

Search | Britannica. (s. f.). Encyclopedia Britannica.

<https://www.britannica.com/search?query=Poland>

USDA Agricultural Biotechnology Report – Poland

Sandel, M. J. (2007). The Case Against Perfection: Ethics in the Age of Genetic Engineering.

Pursell, A. (2018). Ethics of Human Germline Editing: Challenges and Opportunities.

Kitcher, P. (2001). Science, Truth, and Democracy.