

COMMUNIQUE

Utopia Model United Nations 2017

Powered by





HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

Will The Young Minds Be Able To Compose Our Future?

Young delegates were enthusiastic about delivering a speech as soon as they settled in their committee on the first day of the conference. The United Nations Human Rights Council started its deliberation on LGBTQ rights. United Arab Emirates started the session by stating how the country is completely against same-sex marriages. The delegate then contradicted the previous statement, by stating how the country is not against the LGBT community. Republic of Tajikistan pointed out that UAE continues to have sodomy laws. The Executive Board at this point felt that even though the delegates are speaking confidently, the arguments are being repeated, indicating a lack of research.

The Pakistani delegation spoke in favour of the LGBTQ community, suggesting the use of the word 'questioning' instead of 'queer'. The delegate believes that 'queer' is discriminating. On the contrary, 'questioning' has less ranging interpretations and objections.

The committee soon got lost in its track to come to an actual conclusion. At the end of the first day,

the Executive Board was just as frustrated as the International Press, as the committee was stuck at one point.

The second day started with an un-moderated caucus. The delegate of the United States of America compared the earlier situation of women to the present situation of LGBTs, which is the denial of human rights. The delegate of the Togolese Republic mentioned that the country does not believe in reservation of seats in any institution for the LGBTQ community while stating that reservation should be given on the basis of the skill set of an individual. India, on the other hand, pointed out that the LGBTQ community does not face employment issues in the country.

The State of Israel mentioned that people have the right to do many things, but no one is allowed to take lives, as many countries do in the case of gays and bisexuals. The German delegate suggested that policies allowing the LGBT community to gain employment should be framed. The International Press is yet to see whether the government is ready to implement such laws.

When the direction of the committee drifted towards LGBT couples being fit to be parents, the delegates of El Salvador and Panama agreed that the kids of LGBT couples might end up being shunned at school since their parents are already being discriminated. The delegate of Ethiopia brought up that when there are single parents who are giving their children the best, same-sex parents would also be able to raise their kids just as well as them. The Executive Board appreciated this point. The delegate of the Republic of Botswana maintained that secularism was coming in the way of the country believing in the LGBTQ community and the country would never be able to give them their rights. The delegation of the Republic of Burundi pointed out that Indian mythology contains instances of support for the transgender community, yet the Indian government is not willing to give them rights. One of the members of the Executive Board delivered a speech as a delegate to make the committee understand what their speeches should actually include. Even after that, the EB could not decipher the track the committee was going on.

Suruchi Verma
UNHRC

A background image showing a group of students in a library or study hall. They are sitting at tables, looking at books or devices. The title 'SECURITY COUNCIL' is overlaid in large white letters.

SECURITY COUNCIL

SC: Security Council or Supreme Court

An emergency meet of the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) was called on the grim note of the assassination of the Pakistani Prime Minister, Nawaz Sharif, as he was being interviewed by CNN. A curfew had been imposed in Pakistan, and the delegates were called together to find ways to diffuse tensions.

The delegate of the Plurinational State of Bolivia started proceedings enthusiastically, however the delegate seemed more concerned with establishing the innocence of the Republic of India, than with the death of the leader of a nuclear power. The delegate of the Federal Republic of Germany followed with some explosive statements, suggesting that the Pakistani Army and Opposition party had worked together to assassinate the late Prime Minister. The delegate also urged a G-20 nation to send its army into Pakistan, to prevent martial rule.

The delegate of the United States of America drew parallels to the assassination of Benazir Bhutto, and laid out coincidental evidence that pointed towards Pervez

Musharraf.

The delegate also described the imposition of a curfew as the beginning of a coup, and said that such a move was in violation of the Pakistani Constitution. When the delegate of the United Kingdom suggested that Pakistan was faking the death of its own Prime Minister, the Executive Board intervened and an un-moderated caucus was declared to help the committee reach some consensus on what it wanted to debate, and to give it some uniform direction.

In the midst of this, the delegates of the People's Republic of China and the Republic of Kazakhstan questioned the possible involvement of the Taliban, which may have been aggravated by increasing American influence on Pakistan. The delegate of the United States of America decried these allegations, and called for NATO intervention, on the grounds of "human rights violations".

At this junction the committee was informed that members of the main Opposition party in Pakistan had been detained, and that the Army General Raheel Sharif had that stated that it

was necessary that the Army be allowed to detain people on the suspicion of being involved with the assassination.

When debate resumed, there was a growing sentiment in favor of a military intervention, as suggested by the delegate of the USA. Several nations also submitted Directives to the same effect.

At this juncture, a Special Rapporteur from the UN addressed the SC, to remind the delegates that they could not violate the sovereignty of Pakistan, unless the conditions set for such action were expressly met. The committee was told that such action was far beyond the mandate of a neutral international body.

Before breaking for lunch, the committee was informed that the Terek-e-Taliban had in their protection the missing former Commander-in-Chief, Qamar Javed Bajwa. The delegates were also told that the Foreign Ministry of India had issued an advisory, asking all Indian citizens in Pakistan to return to their motherland.

This led to an odd turn of debate, with the French Republic cancelling all flights from Pakistan and Afghanistan. The delegate of Japan declared that Japan was planning an evacuation of all Japanese citizens in Pakistan, to Amritsar. The delegate of Senegal also shared plans to rescue all Senegalese students. The Executive Board had to step in and remind the committee that such extreme action was offensive and insensitive.

The committee seemed a bit drained, as the day ended and debate began to circle the same points.

The delegates returned to committee on the second day, with fresh energy

and renewed enthusiasm.

However, this energy was directionless and the Executive Board had to remind delegates of the limits that international law placed on them. Some very important new points regarding the tension prevalent in Kashmir were raised. The significance of a former Commander-in-Chief, with sensitive information about the Pakistani army, being held by a terrorist group was also debated. The threat of nuclear secrets being in the possession of terrorists was also discussed.

However, the committee as a whole was stuck on the idea of Raheel Sharif collaborating with terrorist organizations, to assassinate the late Prime Minister. Debate was centered around the effects of a military coup on the borders it shares, and few solutions to the tension came forth. At this point, the Security Council was informed of a series of bombings in Balochistan, which claimed 268 lives. Brahmdagarh Bhugti, the leader of a pro-India movement, was also amongst the victims.

These bombings came right after a national address by Raheel Sharif, who spoke of restoring Pakistan's greatness.

When debate resumed, the committee seemed to have lost direction. Debate centered on the issue of Kashmir and a potential Indo-Pak nuclear confrontation. The International Press was appalled to note that only three delegates expressed grief on the death of over 250 civilians. Debate rapidly petered out into nothing more than countries declaring which side they would support, in case of conflict between India and Pakistan.

A rather stunning revelation came to the fore, when the SC was told of a CIA dossier that contained details of a yearlong plan by the USA, to install Raheel Sharif as Head of State of Pakistan and therefore assume “complete control” over it. The Chinese Premier also announced an end to all diplomatic relations with Pakistan. This update was followed by equally explosive declarations by the delegates. The delegate of China accused the USA of trying to exert a monopolistic rule over the Asian continent, followed by the Russian delegation lambasting the USA for the same.

Rather stunningly, the delegate of India tried to impose economic sanctions on China, a country with which it shares trade of up to 150 billion USD, risking an economic breakdown just to prove a point.

The committee has debated relevant aspects in flashes, but has been unable to sustain the level of debate required for solution delivery. Individuals have made very important points, but an equal number of entirely laughable statements have been made. The International Press hopes that this committee can fulfill its responsibilities to the world by consistently performing at the level required to reach concrete solutions.

Vaibhav Gupta
UNSC



EUROPEAN UNION

CEASING THE FIRE OF CATASTROPHE

Europe is in turmoil. Along with the exit of Britain, there have been innumerable hate crimes, terrorist attacks and the constant influx of refugees continues to oil the fire. Fear, dread and uncertainty have gripped the residents of the continent. To deliberate upon these grave socioeconomic issues, forty delegates, eager to make a difference were proud to be a part of the European Union.

The three day conference commenced with warm greetings and a will to extinguish the fire of upheaval. The General Speakers List was established by the delegate of Germany. The first to express his concerns about economic depression was the delegate of the World Bank. In his blazing speech, the delegate enunciated that Europe had failed to prepare for the worst while preparing for the best. The delegate of France questioned the inception of funds following the departure of the Great Britain from the EU. Delegates of several countries put forth the lessons of European history which emphasised on the attempts of European Unity in the past. However its results did not exactly fit the plethora of contentment.

The members decided to focus their discussion on the exit of Britain from the EU. The delegate of Croatia exclaimed that the committee should broaden the bounds of debate and extend it to refugee crisis, which is spiralling out of control. The committee was finally enlightened by the delegate of the United Kingdom. It expressed that leaving the European Union, allowed their Parliament to break free from the shackles of the aristocratic constraints, put forth by Brussels. The delegate stated that they had reclaimed their democracy. However the Executive board intervened and brought to their attention that the United Kingdom was still a part of a constitutional monarchy.

The committee continued to deliberate upon the elephant in the room-Brexit, its implications and restricted their powwow to the economic sphere of the agenda. The delegate of United States of America warned the EU that France may follow the footsteps of United Kingdom and depart from the Union, further raging the storm.

A proposal was introduced by the delegates, which consisted of irrational points such as distributing

40 billion USD to education. The only achievement of the proposal was its success in infuriating the Executive Board. The committee further tested the patience of the Board by reducing the pace of the proceedings. It consisted of five fifteen minute un-moderated caucuses, none of which provided a fruitful outcome. The most astounding suggestion of the session was proposed by the delegate of Afghanistan, as he recommended the Executive Board to kindly introduce a crisis. The Board in awe of his request, offered to drop a bomb in his country to satisfy his thirst for jeopardy. Although the discussion primarily focussed on Brexit, the Board appreciated the improvement in the debate and dismissed the committee on a positive note, expecting more from the days to come.

The second day, continued on the lines of the previous day and delegates returned rejuvenated with fresh ideas. A new proposal was introduced by the delegate of Hellenic Republic of Greece. The highlights of the proposal included preferential tariff rates and laws on trade routes. It proposed that if the United Kingdom still wanted to be a part of the European economic sphere, it would have to comply with the laws of the Union.

The committee felt energized. Delegates not only enthusiastically debated and negotiated, but also presented amendments with vigour. It finally seemed like the committee was beginning to unite and reach a consensus. Just as the smiles of the Executive Board widened, the zeal of the committee, abruptly vacuumed. The proposal, fully amended and passed by the committee was brutally vetoed by the delegate of the United States.

The disappointed delegates and the exhausted executive board still didn't lose might and proceeded with a second proposal.

Another proposal was introduced by the delegates of Libya and the United Kingdom and was extensively debated upon. It recommended that pre and post Brexit committees be built. It also guided the Multinational companies of the European Union to continue investing in the United Kingdom and vice versa.

It was beyond unfortunate that the committee met with the same fate of a scrapped proposal. The executive board with a bin full of shreds from two proposals and sinking hopes, took the time to informally address the committee. The Board rebuked the delegates for their vague and irrational points. Moreover the EB could not comprehend the lack of prudence which prevented the delegates from gaining basic knowledge of the committee and the agenda as a whole. Delegates blamed lack of communication between the blocks for the failure.

The session culminated with nations eager to work in harmony and mend what still was fragmentary. As the session culminated, the impassioned delegates were certain of two beliefs. The former was to douse the fire that had yet not been extinguished. The latter was to oath to never let the fire within themselves, shrivel to ashes.

Anushka Ghosh
Manasi Gupta
EU



ALL INDIA POLITICAL PARTIES MEET

ALL SUBTLETIES EXCUSED

Nervous chit-chat, scattered research papers, and the birth of new alliances marked the commencement of the first day of the All India Political Parties Meet. The resonance of the gavel commemorated the round robin for the committee which proceeded to discuss the Ayodhya Dispute.

The dialogue was initiated by Arvind Kejriwal, who strongly proposed the dismissal of those who create fear on the lines of communalism. E.K. Palaniswami added to the discussion and suggested that a committee of twelve people should be formed to address the dispute. The general mood of the committee grew tense as time passed. Sides were taken, threats were made, and a series of aggressive comments were exchanged. Garnering everyone's attention, Amit Shah was intrepid in proclaiming that the Ram Temple will be built over the ruins of the demolished mosque; irrespective of what the Muslim community stated. Asaduddin Owaisi, fuelling the already engaging fiery debate, was fearless in replying with a claim that the Mosque would be the only thing built on that land, and nothing would hold the

Muslims back.

Many leaders contested that India's political standards should not be limited to contesting baseless fights on communalism. They proposed the construction of a school on the land, in place of a temple or a mosque, to entirely culminate the issue. However, the blatant shortfalls of this proposal led to its dismissal.

An update in the committee shifted everyone's attention to the draughts in Tamil Nadu, and the violent protests by the farmers in Delhi. A similar protest in Madhya Pradesh soon followed, and unfortunately resulted in the death of two people.

Day One culminated with leaders deliberated in the hopes of discovering a viable solution to the plight of the farmers.

Day 2 began with the committee finally arriving at a consensus and proposing one working paper. The Executive Board wasn't satisfied with the working paper and struck off one clause and edited others. The apprehensions of the Executive Board were also shared by the honourable Prime Minister.

Meanwhile, Dushyant Chauttala released a memorandum saying that

he would donate INR 85 lakhs for the farmer's aid.

His efforts ultimately lead to his own downfall, and he went on to claim that the funds were sourced from reserves collected during the corrupt term of his grandfather. Predictably, the CBI officials soon came to arrest him. Upon his release he issued a statement, where he claimed that he acknowledged the graveness of the crime. On his return to the committee, he vowed to cooperate with the CBI in their investigation.

The issue was side-lined as soon as the committee received the next update. The Executive Board informed the committee that protests for the abolition of the 'Triple Talaq' policy were being held in front of the office of All India Muslim Personal Law Board.

The leaders presented their views on this incident. Mayavati questioned why dowry and safety of women wasn't a bigger issue. Nitish Kumar, on the other hand, stated that 'Triple Talaq' is an important custom for Muslims by taking references from the past. He strengthened his claim by stating that the internal matters of the Muslim community shouldn't be interfered by the Supreme Court. The representative of the Indian Union Muslim League stated that the original form of 'Triple Talaq' should be restored. He was supported by the representative of the All India Muslim Personal Law Board as the committee moved closer to the end of the day. The International Press would like to highlight that the committee has made great progress in these two days. Just like a caterpillar that feeds on leaves and ultimately transforms into a beautiful butterfly, the

committee also fed on information and eventually turned their energies towards transforming their nation. To conclude, the International Press believes that the motivation of the leaders will lead bring a positive change in the future state of affairs of the country.

Arsh Gupta and Jasmine Kaur
AIPPM



DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

Viva La Uganda

The delegate of the Republic of Korea argued that the first SDG would lay the basis for discussing other SDGs while the delegate of Denmark suggested that the fifth SDG is crucial to be discussed. A majority of the committee came to the conclusion that discussing the indicators of poverty and their solutions would help in taking the first step towards sustainable development. In the following discussions, the delegates asserted their stance on this issue, coming up with very few solutions in the process.

The delegate of the Republic of Korea, however, ingeniously mentioned that monitoring micro-finance to ensure that impoverished people can obtain self-sustaining business opportunities and increasing international partnerships. It is important to note that the SDGs go beyond targeting poverty and its symptoms. Concerns like increasing participatory and representative decision-making, improving access to justice and strengthening the participation of the developing countries on a global platform in general, were not mentioned in detail in the committee. The committee witnessed a gripping

crisis towards the end of the day, which according to the Executive Board, attracted immediate attention from all the delegates. As per the first update, 34,000 beggars on the streets in Kampala, Uganda were evicted when the visiting International Olympic Commission officials observed their severe conditions. The question, "How could they have money for unwanted games and not for their own people?" sent the delegates spiraling into redundant debates. When the update of the beggars protesting and breaking windows and violently demanding compensation

was given by the Executive Board, the committee echoed of equivocal opinions on the same.

Realizing the intensity of the situation, the delegate of the Republic of Uganda, who was still in a state of shock, was asked if he was an imposter for not coming up with an explanation immediately. However, his ability to tackle this issue was expertly displayed as he gave solutions for a situation that was worsening as every minute passed.

An unmoderated caucus which was decided with consent from all countries, ended up yielding fruitful results. The Executive Board was impressed to see the formation of two blocks, one headed by The Russian Federation and the Republic of Uganda and the other, by the United States and the Republic of Korea. The first Action Plan had several intriguing solutions to the impending crisis situation in Kampala. Several of the solutions that were proposed included increasing security around the hotel in which the athletes were staying in, creation of job opportunities, increasing employment and building shelter camps for the beggars. The second one, in the opinion of the Executive Board, seemed to have a more concrete, but were filled with a few inaccuracies. It consisted of solutions including providing adequate security measures for the athletes, rehabilitating the beggars in refugee camps in Uganda, shutting down public transport systems to prevent civil unrest, loaning some money to Republic of Uganda by the UNDP and negotiating with the leaders of the rebel groups to pacify the group and convince them of a solution to their problems.

Ankita N.
Abhinav
UNDP

.

