

The Quidnunc



INTERNATIONAL PRESS, IIT GUWAHATI MODEL UNITED NATIONS

Issue 3

2nd February, 2014

The completeness of R2P

-Taha K. Barwahwala

The dramatic turn of events in the Middle East have brought the spotlight onto the 'Responsibility to Protect' - the 3 pillar doctrine adopted by the United Nations in the year 2005.

Revolutionary as it was - redefining one of the very basic concepts behind a nation - sovereignty; it was subjected to allegations of being a thin veil under which NATO carried out unduly interventions into interior matters of nations. Recent developments have again spurred the debate on whether or not the 'Responsibility to Protect' provides a framework complete enough to justify its compromise of the principle of sovereignty. As the current sitting of the United Nations General Assembly discusses R2P, the committee saw interesting developments

on the issue.

While most countries seemed to thoroughly back the idea that the primary responsibility of the UN is to prevent any grave situation in the first place, they failed to provide any sort of suggestions for any sort of guidelines or framework regarding the same.

A heated debate regarding critical analysis of the responsibility to prevent obligation under R2P saw Spain, Brazil, Ghana and Turkey among others showing their agreement to the school of thought that sovereignty should not be a hindrance when it comes to humanitarian crises and diplomatic measures must be used with full force.

Some ideas introduced to ensure the same advocating heightened surveil-

lance at all levels and maintaining a certain level of cooperation between them failed to address the fact that this involved an increased role of the international community in a country's internal matters. Brazil advocated responsibility while protecting and accountability of intervening parties like the NATO to the international community and the nation itself. Even the US was in fundamental agreement while advocating stringent measures.

Not surprisingly, the United States was leading the demand for a more stringent framework for interventions in light of the recent failures of isolation and embargoes on the perpetrators. It was trying to push the committee into discussing the

Must reads:

- A DISSECTION OF R2P
- WILL THEY INTERVENE?
- RESPONSIBILITY TO REBUILD
- DELEGATE INTERVIEWS

Inside this issue:

COMPLETENESS OF R2P	1
SHOULD THEY INTERVENE	2
CRISIS REPORT: THE SYRIAN JOB	3
POST INTERVENTION BUILDING	4
DELEGATE INTERVIEWS	6

The Quidnunc

difference between sovereignty and legitimacy so as to fundamentally support its demand. The ultimate agenda seemed to advocate higher levels of intervention in more states - with Syria being the priority - under the umbrella of R2P.

It also seemed eager to discuss the success of previous US-led interventions and thus silence all criticism surrounding them which resounded in the committee time and again.

Another school of thought was quite vocal about broadening the horizons of R2P to other forms of humanitarian crises and advocating a non-intervening role for the international community in them.

The committee was quite vocal about providing protection and aid to women and children in crisis affected territories and prevent their victimisation by foreign parties.

The delegate of Haiti advocated broadening the scope of R2P to include crises perpetrated by organised crime syndicates

which continue to be a major problem in some states; while Myanmar, a country frequented by natural disasters, expressed that such calamities be included in the scope of R2P.

A burning point of this debate was the formation of well-defined guidelines to ensure accountability - in case of a military intervention - of intervening parties, in post-intervention rebuilding.

While most nations agree to the fundamental responsibility, it is unclear as to whom the responsibility falls upon - whether it is the intervening party itself or the international community as a whole; and how must the reconstruction be carried about so as to not encroach upon the powers of the newly formed government which is fragile and susceptible to further conflict.

The forum was reluctant to discuss these subjects, particularly because the US-led NATO group seeks to avoid scrutiny which is

one of the central ideas behind accountability.

However, the United States of America is of the opinion that R2P is a thoroughly discussed and well-defined doctrine and is in no need of further refining on the fundamental level. Although the opposition to this school of thought was in majority in the conference they failed to counter this argument with a solid framework for extension of the doctrine.

The forum needs to discuss the implications of the suggestions on the exclusivity of a nation's powers over its internal affairs, or else it is a herculean task to implement the simplest of these suggestions in the real world.

“...WHILE MOST NATIONS AGREE TO THE FUNDAMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY, IT IS UNCLEAR AS TO WHOM THE RESPONSIBILITY FALLS UPON...”

Should they intervene?

-Amlan Das

It took quite some time for the international community to establish a proper definition of the Right to Protect (R2P). After the

first round of deliberation, a fact became very clear that almost all the major countries do stay in favour of military intervention, if

and when required. Countries however who were previously invaded by super power countries are still haunted by nightmares

Issue 3

and were pretty much clear with their view that they did not want a repeat of the same.

The big question today is Syria. Countries, especially the ones who dictate the functioning of the United Nations (UN) seem particularly in favour of intervening into Syria. They feel that the situation today is as such that it has become necessary for the international community, in the name of international peace to help the country out of such trouble.

The United States of America (USA) believes in the fact that it is the role of the UN to move into a member nation and help them out in the time of the crisis. Help can be humanitarian, military and even economic. And one being asked about their multiple interventions

overtime, the representative of the States made it pretty clear that it is the Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) charter that makes them do so. The article says that an attack on any member nation of the NATO would be considered an attack over all member countries. Hence, in lieu of international peace and security, every intervention of them is justified.

There was so as such direct opposition to the view put forward by the delegation of the United States (US). But many countries like Spain and a few others were of the view that if everything else fails, military invasion should remain as the last resort. An interesting fact brought into light by the representative of UAE said that R2P doesn't necessarily

mean military intervention, and there is a just more to it. Ghana further expressed that state should be determined by severity not by proximity and particularly focussed more on the need for humanitarian intervention.

As they debate again came revolving around the topic of Syria, the state of Brazil made it very clear that there should be economic and arms embargo in Syria and if that fails, then there should be thoughts on military intervention.

The situation as now seems that there has been a major consensus amongst the council members that a military intervention is very much required in Syria. USA is all set, and so are its allies and soon enough a bold decision would be taken.

Crisis report: The Syrian Job

- **Mangesh Joshi**

The news report of life threatening attack on Syrian President General Bashar Al Assad and fears of nationwide unrest provided an impetus to the call of United States of America for immediate intervention in Syrian Arab Republic (SAR). The republic of Palau speculated that the possibility of ambiguous reporting by SAR.

Repeated reports from SAR including missing report and

then the later death of Hilal Hilal the Assistant Region secretary of regional command caused the discussion to take a turn and the agenda shifted from Responsibility to Rebuild to immediate intervention. The driver of Assad was declared missing with his last phone call being ascribed to a chemical scientist from Israel.

The mention of Israel led the delegates from Poland and

United States (US) to suspect the veracity of reports by SAR. US criticized the Russian Federation and People's Republic of China (PRC) for refusing to allow previous interventions and they feared that non-state actors may cause turmoil across the Middle East.

The US criticism was given a fitting reply by PRC that any intervention in SAR will be properly dealt with. Although supporting the intervention the Republic of Po-

“...THE US
CRITICISM WAS
GIVEN A FITTING
REPLY BY PRC
THAT ANY
INTERVENTION IN
SAR WILL BE
PROPERLY DEALT
WITH...”

The Quidnunc

land brought back the attention of member nations to Responsibility to Rebuild calling for simultaneous rebuilding while intervening. They also said that they believe the breach from outside was highly improbable and report should be critically analysed..

The contradictory reports from the SAR made many nations believe the view of Palau's suspicion of possibility of false reporting by SAR.US claimed considering the time frame of events and reports the SAR is trying to sway the international opinion by playing a victim card and trying to absolve

itself from the crimes committed against their people .The US condemned China for creating confusion and called for the recommendation of the issue to security council. The decision of PRC was condemned by Poland , US, Brazil and UAE with fervent support for intervention in SAR.

Post Intervention Rebuilding

-Pallavi Benawri

Reconstituting legitimacy re-establishing security and rebuilding effectiveness-these are some of the basic issues that require immediate attention following an intervention.

Establishment of an interim Government should be given prime importance because it plays an indispensable role in establishing peace, pursuing state reconstruction and preventing further conflict.

When it comes to meddling in the undertakings of another state, for whatever noble reason the meddler claims to have, someone must be held accountable for the consequences of that decision and the ones

that follow.

Furthermore, if a nation decides to intervene in another nation's affairs, it only seems fair that the intervening state takes on the responsibility to rebuild, or in the least, assist the concerned state in the process of rebuilding.

Though armed external intervention may sometimes be required to halt attacks on the vulnerable, rebuilding political, economic and social order in the aftermath of an intervention is fraught with difficulty.

Post-intervention problems may include managing complex processes of change, addressing fundamental questions of political philosophy, coping with trust issues, and avoiding inadvertent

damage to the intervention's beneficiaries - all in situations where resources may be scarce and intervening powers at odds with each other.

Interveners should strive to absorb the lessons of past interventions and master the complexities of the territory on which they propose to act. Only through carefully calculated decisions and coordinated, pre-planned damage control,

Can the doctrine of Responsibility to Protect serve the purpose it was established for-protecting citizens from any atrocities that may have been inflicted on them by the state.

“...SOMEONE
MUST BE HELD
ACCOUNTABLE
FOR THE
CONSEQUENCES
OF THAT
DECISION AND
THE ONES THAT
FOLLOW...”

The “Responsibility to Rebuild:” Inputs from the delegates of USA and South Africa

- *Mangesh Joshi and Rajat Saha*

DELEGATE OF SOUTH AFRICA:

Q. During the proceedings, you have constantly pushed for more discussion on the “Responsibility to Rebuild.” Do you think it is an ignored aspect of interventions?

A. I could not agree more. Through the course of history we have seen military intervention, which have left devastated cities, chaotic regimes and horrible living conditions in their wake. Iraq and Afghanistan are some infamous examples where the intervention failed to execute the obligation of rebuilding.

Q. What pointers do you think should be considered during such interventions to make sure that the state is able to get back on its feet when the conflict is over?

A. As we have seen in Afghanistan and Iraq, a military intervention has a devastating effect on a

country. The living conditions, especially for woman and children deteriorate heavily, not to mention the economic growth of the country gets stunted. A war leaves many dead and homeless. There is a strong need for a codified procedure for rebuilding and it's the international community's responsibility to share this burden together.

DELEGATE OF USA:

Q. What would you comment upon your post intervention building measures in a country which has been invaded militarily? Particularly in Iraq and Afghanistan?

A. When it comes to intervention, US have always followed a fixed policy to ensure political stability in the region. We take care of the transitional security arrangements and contributed economically towards

development. There has been technological sharing with the local authorities and a proper judicial system is also aimed to be established.

Apart from this, we also take care of social well being of the civilians; provide humanitarian assistance, encourage prove investments, ensure education and also promote economic development.

“...THERE IS A STRONG NEED FOR A CODIFIED PROCEDURE FOR REBUILDING AND IT'S THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY'S RESPONSIBILITY TO SHARE THIS BURDEN TOGETHER...”



“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 K.
Barwahwala
- ◇ Vishal Kumar

Finally, after all the sleepless nights, the apprehensiveness, and all that followed, the organizing committee was able to pull off what one would call ‘a spectacular show’. From arranging bottled water to preparing the conference hall, every task provided us with a new learning opportunity, and with it, a new story to share. If you were of the opinion that a conference hall was supposed to be filled with dull, boring introverts arguing pointlessly over issues that nobody really cared about, you were mistaken. Because this was one conference where the mere number of un-moderated caucuses re-

Find us on the web at:

www.iitgmun.wordpress.com

CREDITS:

◆ **Writers:**

- ◇ *Amlan Das*
- ◇ *Mangesh Joshi*
- ◇ *Nakul Yadav*
- ◇ *Pallavi Benawri*
- ◇ *Taha K. Barwahwala*

◆ **Interviewers:**

- ◇ *Mangesh Joshi*
- ◇ *Rajat Saha*

