

The Quidnunc



INTERNATIONAL PRESS, IIT GUWAHATI MODEL UNITED NATIONS

Issue 2

2nd February 2014

“The committee is in session...”



Special points of interest:

- WORD-TO-WORD
COVERAGE OF THE FIRST
DAY OF DEBATE
- USA UNDER FIRE
- INSIGHT INTO
INTERVENTIONS
- PICS FROM FIRST DAY

Inside this issue:

AND THE DEBATE BEGINS	2
DAY 1: ITS USA AGAINST THE WORLD	3
ALL ABOUT INTERVENTIONS	4
PHOTO GALLERY	5

*“Diplomacy is the velvet glove that cloaks the fist of
power...”*

The Quidnunc

“...And the debate begins”

-Nakul Yadav and Pallavi Benawri



“...INTERVENTION

BECOMES A
NECESSITY
WHEN THE
STATE PROVES
TO BE
INCAPABLE OF
PROTECTING ITS
CITIZENS OR IS
COMMITTING...”

As the sitting of the United Nations General Assembly commenced to deliberate upon the agenda of Right to Protect (R2P), the opinions of different countries became very much clear.

While Kenya and Turkey were in strong support of the notion of R2P, Iran's views were that of dissent. Iran believed national sovereignty to be of supreme importance but the delegate advocated the idea against the concept of Responsibility to Protect on the ground of its direct contradiction of Article II of United Nations Charter, as well as the weak foundation on which the present R2P documents are based.

Again, USA alleged Russia and China of abusing their right to veto in the Security

Council for deploying troops to Syria which led to the question of whether human rights were of greater importance than sovereignty. UAE intervened by claiming that intervention becomes a necessity when the state proves to be incapable of protecting its citizens or is committing the atrocities.

There were numerous attempts to introduce the topic of The Syrian Republic into the debate, most of which failed miserably owing to the disagreement among the committee members.

Spain was of the view that Responsibility to Protect and sovereignty are conflicting notions, however, one has to deeply understand the importance of

R2P Doctrine, and its relevance in the present day scenario.

Finally after a lot of efforts the community here decided to deliberate upon “Military intervention as a last resort and formation of separate body with equal representation of armies of all nations”. While Spain raised concerns on the legitimacy of this body with reference to those nations where military coups prevail, Ireland strongly condemned the notion of military intervention. Israel failed to provide a substantial back up of their testimony, instead got carried away with the sentiments attached to the agenda.

Day 1: Its USA against the world

-Vishal Kumar

The first sitting of the United Nations General Assembly saw USA at the centre of the battle, as it faced flak from all directions for its more 'aggressive' policies regarding interventions. However, US faced the swarm of dissent quite bravely, and took on the accusations of World domination just the way the country took on its last invasion. Although the question of whether US will get away with its agenda, which primarily focuses on another intervention in Syria, remains to be seen; it certainly held doggedly to its foothold today.

Although the debate started on a general note about "Responsibility to Protect (R2P)," it was soon clear what the delegates had in mind when it came to discussing this doctrine. The Syrian issue was a hot topic at the conference, with especially US asserting that diplomatic negotiations with the Assad Government had come to a standstill, and pushing very hard for stronger measures, including use of force. However the US policy encountered a lot of resistance, which ranged from mild references from

Spain to R2P procedure, to the passionate outburst by the Bosnian delegate, who condemned the killing of Bin Laden as a breach of Pak sovereignty, but also went on to say that the US doesn't understand the meaning of the word itself

However, US came back with a strong reply at the very beginning of the second session. Not only the delegate asserted that the killing of Bin Laden was US observance of the Responsibility to Prevent principle, but also went on to contradict the Spanish stance on diplomatic and economic

sanctions, saying that these steps don't always work, and brute force is the only option in many desperate struggles, such as the ones US has participated in over the years. Later in the debate we even got to see the age-old US-Russia rivalry. USA criticised the Sino-Russian stance of holding

sovereignty as the ultimate word on governance. Russia came up with a pointy retort describing the apparent failure of NATO invasions, such as in Afghanistan.

Although USA has fought valiantly today, it may find itself with few allies as the debate progresses. USA's strong stance regarding R2P and eagerness to bring Syrian invasion to the table might alienate it to the moderate countries. What USA needs right now is a common ground; a thread to bind its allies together. Otherwise, even for its entire prowess, it can still be outvoiced and outvoted when the time comes.



“...ALTHOUGH USA HAS FOUGHT VALIANTLY TODAY, IT MAY FIND ITSELF WITH FEW ALLIES AS THE DEBATE PROGRESSES...”

All about interventions

- *Amlan Das*

The issue of military intervention has always been a topic of heated debate for the international community, particularly amongst the scavenger nations. In the play of power many countries in the likes of Afghanistan, Iraq and others have actually been intervened by the powers dictating the world.

What happened in

military action. This clearly indicates the need for a frame work that is to be laid down before such a severe action is taken again.

The representative from Spain was quite vocal about it as she said that United Nations should analyze the prevailing situation before an invasion, there has to be diplomatic analysis and then an intervention.

Brazil too went on the same lines suggesting strict

Libya and Iraq. Indeed an indirect attempt to question the dictatorship of USA inside the council.

But what happened after that is something that has been happening ever since the rise of USA as a superpower. It justified all its action in the name of world peace and security and even alleged that it was because of a few countries inside the committee that obstructed a peaceful solution and hence they stepped in.

As a whole, a lot needs to be talked and discussed about when consider Right to Protect as an agenda. A lot has already been talked about and a lot still needs to be done.

amendments relating to Right to Protection doctrine. It talked about a strict line of action and suggested the abolition of veto powers when it came to instances involving cases of genocide and mass killings.

Countries like Turkey suggested time



“...COUNTRIES

LIKE TURKEY
SUGGESTED
TIME AND AGAIN
THAT MILITARY
INTERVENTION
CANNOT SOLVE
HUMANITARIAN
CRISIS IN
COUNTRIES...”

Afghanistan in 1979 and what happened in Iraq lately was all consequential, but what followed after that was completely undesirable. Yes, to save the civilians from the mass atrocities created, a military intervention was definitely called for, but what was not called for was the sufferings of the civilians post the

and again that military intervention cannot solve humanitarian crisis in countries. And as for countries like Afghanistan, some old wounds seemed to have refreshed as it went to question about the very existence of the United Nations. The Asian nation pointed fingers asking about the Vietnam War,



“The first day of the General Assembly saw an eclectic mix of passion and logic, with the International Press covering each moment with rapt attention. Here are a few highlights...”



“THE NEWS IS MIGHTIER THAN THE NEWSMAKERS”

INTERNATIONAL PRESS, IIT GUWAHATI MODEL UNITED NATIONS

- ◆ IP Members:
- ◇ Amlan Das
(Editor-in-Chief)
- ◇ Mangesh Joshi
- ◇ Nakul Yadav
- ◇ Pallavi
- ◇ Benawri
- ◇ Rajat Saha
- ◇ Taha
- ◇ Barwawala
- ◇ Vishal Kumar

It is befittingly said, “The sword is always beaten by the spirit.” And so it shall, with delegates striving to provide solutions to global issues while adopting a peaceful approach, and ardently contested debates ensuring that all point of views are heard and all opinions aired before arriving at a mutually agreeable consensus. In the words of Hubert Humphrey- “Freedom is hammered out on the anvil of discussion, dissent and debate.” So brace yourselves for discussion, learn to tolerate dissent, and roll up your sleeves for debate, for a man reveals nothing unless you contradict him.



Find us on the web at:

www.iitgmun.wordpress.com



CREDITS:

- ◆ **Writers:**
- ◇ *Amlan Das*
- ◇ *Nakul Yadav*
- ◇ *Pallavi*
- ◇ *Benawri*
- ◇ *Vishal Kumar*

