



Canadian High Schools Model United Nations Conference

CAHSMUN

Vancouver, British Columbia | March 2nd to 4th, 2012

UNSC

Occupation of Golan Heights | Framework for intervention | Cote d'Ivoire

UNSC

Canadian High Schools Model United Nations 2012

Welcome from the Dais	1	The dais of UNSC for CAHSMUN 2012 welcomes you! Your UNSC staff for CAHSMUN 2012 are Geena lee and Yehan Yun.
Writing Position Papers	2	Geena is a senior student at Pinetree Secondary School. She was introduced to Model United Nations in grade 10. Ever since then, her love for debating and meeting new people has made every MUN moment a great one. She hopes to study law in the future and her passions include singing, playing the flute, as well as telling endless stories about her month long experience in South Africa where she helped build an elementary school in a rural community. Geena looks forward to serving as the Chair for the United Nations Security Council and is confident that CAHSMUN 2012 will be an amazing conference!
Committee Background	6	
Topic One: Israeli occupation of the Golan Heights	7	
Topic Two: Establishing a framework for intervention in the 21st century through redefining R2P	10	Yehan is a grade 12 student at Semiahmoo Secondary School. He attended his first Model United Nations conference in grade 10 at the CAHSMUN 2010, and has attended many other conferences in British Columbia as a delegate where he has expressed his love for debating. Other than MUN, Yehan spends his time playing his cello, volunteering in hospitals, practicing Tae Kwon Do, and obsessing over IB. Yehan is thrilled to be part of CAHSMUN 2012 staff and is looking forward to meeting you all as the director of United Nations Security Council.
Topic Three: Situation in Côte d'Ivoire	13	
Conference Rules	16	

Writing Position Papers

What are Position Papers?

Position papers are a reflection of the preparation that delegates put towards a Model UN conference. Each topic should be addressed briefly in a succinct policy statement representing the relevant views of your assigned country, NGO, or expert role. You should also include recommendations for action to be taken by your committee.

CAHSMUN will reward awards to delegation with the best position paper in each committee. In order for your position paper to be eligible for awards, please follow these guidelines:

- You must submit your position paper to your committee's email no later than February 24, 2012;
- Length cannot exceed two pages;
- The font must be Times New Roman, between 10 and 12 points;
- The margins must be one inch on all sides;
- The file format must be PDF or Word (.doc and .docx);
- Each topic is clearly segregated; and
- No national symbols (e.g. flag, coat of arms) can be displayed on the position paper.

Double Delegates will only need to submit one version of their position paper.

Committee Email Addresses

General Assembly First Committee ga1@cahsmun.org

Rio+20 Conference rio20@cahsmun.org

African Union au@cahsmun.org

UNESCO Executive Board unesco@cahsmun.org

United Nations Human Rights Council unhrc@cahsmun.org

Historical Crisis Committee historical@cahsmun.org

North Atlantic Treaty Organization nato@cahsmun.org

United Nations Security Council unsc@cahsmun.org

The following is a sample of an acceptable position paper.
(Courtesy of the National Model United Nations Conference)

Delegation from
The United Mexican States

Represented by
(Name of College)

Position Paper for the General Assembly Plenary

The issues before the General Assembly Plenary are: the Use of Economic Sanctions for Political and Economic Compulsion; Democracy and Human Rights in Post-Conflict Regions; as well as the Promotion of Durable Peace and Sustainable Development in Africa. The Mexican Delegation first would like to convey its gratitude being elected and pride to serve as vice-president of the current General Assembly Plenary session.

I. The Use of Economic Sanctions for Political and Economic Compulsion

The principles of equal sovereignty of states and non-interference, as laid down in the Charter of the United Nations, have always been cornerstones of Mexican foreign policy. The legitimate right to interfere by the use of coercive measures, such as economic sanctions, is laid down in Article 41 of the UN-charter and reserves the right to the Security Council.

Concerning the violation of this principle by the application of unilateral measures outside the framework of the United Nations, H.E. Ambassador to the United Nations Enrique Berruga Filloy underlined in 2005 that the Mexico strongly rejects “the application of unilateral laws and measures of economic blockade against any State, as well as the implementation of coercive measures without the authorization enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.” That is the reason, why the United Mexican States supported – for the 14th consecutive time – Resolution (A/RES/60/12) of 2006 regarding the Necessity of ending the economic, commercial and financial embargo imposed by the United States of America against Cuba.

In the 1990s, comprehensive economic sanctions found several applications with very mixed results, which made a critical reassessment indispensable. The United Mexican States fully supported and actively participated in the “Stockholm Process” that focused on increasing the effectiveness in the implementation of targeted sanctions. As sanctions and especially economic sanctions, pose a tool for action “between words and war” they must be regarded as a mean of last resort before war and fulfill highest requirements for their legitimate use. The United Mexican States and their partners of the “Group of Friends of the U.N. Reform” have already addressed and formulated recommendations for that take former criticism into account. Regarding the design of economic sanctions it is indispensable for the success to have the constant support by all member states and public opinion, which is to a large degree dependent the humanitarian effects of economic sanctions. Sanctions must be tailor-made, designed to effectively target the government, while sparing to the largest degree possible the civil population. Sanction regimes must be constantly monitored and evaluated to enable the world-community to adjust their actions to the needs of the unforeseeably changing situation. Additionally, the United Mexican States propose to increase communication between the existing sanction committees and thus their effectiveness by convening regular meetings of the chairs of the sanction committees on questions of common interest. An example is the case of negative spill-over effects of economic sanctions on neighboring countries, in which affected countries additionally need to be enabled to voice their problems more effectively, as addressed in the resolution Implementation of the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations related to assistance to third States affected by the application of sanctions (A/RES/54/107). Non-state actors have in the last years tremendously grown in their political importance, especially with regard to the international fight against terrorism. Their position and the possibilities of the application of economic sanction on non-state actors is another topic that urgently needs to be considered.

II. Democracy and Human Rights in Post-Conflict Regions

As a founding member of the United Nations, Mexico is highly engaged in the Promotion of Democracy and Human Rights all over the world, as laid down in the Universal Declaration on Human Rights (UDHR) in 1948. Especially since the democratic transition of Mexico in 2000 it is one of the most urgent topics to stand for Democratization and Human Rights, and Mexico implements this vision on many different fronts.

In the Convoing Group of the intergovernmental Community of Democracies (GC), the United Mexican States uphold an approach that fosters international cooperation to promote democratic values and institution-building at the national and international level. To emphasize the strong interrelation between human rights and the building of democracy and to fortify democratic developments are further challenges Mexico deals with in this committee. A key-factor for the sustainable development of a post-conflict-region is to hold free and fair election and thus creating a democratic system. Being aware of the need of post-conflict countries for support in the preparation of democratic elections, the United Mexican States contribute since 2001 to the work of the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA), an intergovernmental organization operating at international, regional and national level in partnership with a range of institutions. Mexico's foreign policy regarding human rights is substantially based on cooperation with international organizations. The Inter American Commission of Human Rights is one of the bodies, Mexico is participating, working on the promotion of Human Rights in the Americas. Furthermore, the Inter-American Court of Human Rights is the regional judicial institution for the application and interpretation of the American Convention of Human Rights.

The objectives Mexico pursues are to improve human rights in the country through structural changes and to fortify the legal and institutional frame for the protection of human rights on the international level. Underlining the connection between democracy, development and Human Rights, stresses the importance of cooperation with and the role of the High Commissioner on Human Rights and the reform of the Human Rights Commission to a Human rights Council.

Having in mind the diversity of challenges in enforcing democracy and Human Rights, Mexico considers regional and national approaches vital for their endorsement, as Mexico exemplifies with its National Program for Human Rights or the Plan Puebla Panama. On the global level, Mexico is encouraged in working on a greater coordination and interoperability among the United Nations and regional organizations, as well as the development of common strategies and operational policies and the sharing of best practices in civilian crisis management should be encouraged, including clear frameworks for joint operations, when applicable.

III. The Promotion of Durable Peace and Sustainable Development in Africa

The United Mexican States welcome the leadership role the African Union has taken regarding the security problems of the continent. Our delegation is furthermore convinced that The New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) can become the foundation for Africa's economic, social and democratic development as the basis for sustainable peace. Therefore it deserves the full support of the international community.

Canadian High Schools Model United Nations 2012

The development of the United Mexican States in the last two decades is characterized by the transition to a full democracy, the national and regional promotion of human rights and sustainable, economic growth. Mexico's development is characterized by free trade and its regional integration in the North American Free Trade Agreement. Having in mind that sustainable development is based not only on economic, but as well on social and environmental development, President Vicente Fox has made sustainable development a guiding principle in the Mexican Development Plan that includes sustainability targets for all major policy areas.

The United Nations Security Council has established not less than seven peace-keeping missions on the African continent, underlining the need for full support by the international community. In post-conflict situations, we regard national reconciliation as a precondition for a peaceful development, which is the reason why Mexico supported such committees, i.e. in the case of Sierra Leone. The United Mexican States are convinced that an institutional reform of the United Nations is crucial in enhancing durable peace in Africa. We therefore want to reaffirm our full support to both the establishment of the peace-building commission and the Human Rights Council. Both topics are highly interrelated and, having in mind that the breach of peace is most often linked with severest human rights' abuses, thus need to be seen as two sides of one problem and be approached in this understanding.

As most conflicts have their roots in conflicts about economic resources and development chances, human development and the eradication of poverty must be at the heart of a successful, preventive approach. Lifting people out of poverty must be seen as a precondition not only for peace, but for social development and environmental sustainability.

The United Mexican States want to express their esteem for the decision taken by the G-8 countries for a complete debt-relief for many African Highly-Indebted-Poor-Countries. Nevertheless, many commitments made by the international community that are crucial for Africa's sustainable development are unfulfilled. The developed countries agreed in the Monterrey Consensus of the International Conference on Financing for Development (A/CONF.198/11) to increase their Official Development Aid (ODA) "towards the target of 0,7 per cent of gross national product (GNP) as ODA to developing countries and 0,15 to 0,20 per cent of GNP of developed countries to least developed countries". Furthermore, the United Mexican States are disappointed by the result of the Hong Kong Ministerial conference of the World Trade Organization, which once more failed to meet the needs of those, to whom the round was devoted: developing countries and especially African countries, who today, more than ever, are cut off from global trade and prosperity by protectionism.

With regard to the African Peer Review Mechanism, the United Mexican States want to underline that good governance is an integral part of sustainable development. Therefore, we support all efforts by African countries to make the mechanism obligatory to increase transparency and accountability in all African countries.

Committee Background

The United Nations Security Council (UNSC) is an organ of the United Nations that has the primary purpose “to maintain international peace and security,” as stated in the UN Charter. Following the formation of the United Nations in response to World War II, member states convened at the first UNSC meeting at Church House, London in 1946. The Council has met at many different locations around the world since, but claims its permanent meeting rooms at the United Nations Headquarters in New York.

All members of the council must agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the UNSC. There are 15 member states, 5 of which are permanent members. The remaining 10 members are nonpermanent and are elected by the General Assembly for 2-year terms. The 5 permanent members, the United States, United Kingdom, China, France, and Russia hold veto power when voting on proposed resolutions. Currently, the elected members of the UNSC are Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Gabon, Lebanon, Nigeria, Columbia, Germany, India, Portugal, and South Africa.

The main factor that differentiates the UNSC from other committees of the UN is that they have the authority to act on decisions that concern the well-being of humanity, given that they follow the Charter. Member states work together to investigate conflicts and to create plans in order to combat any dangers that threaten world peace. As well as organizing United Nations peacekeeping troops for conflict resolution, when notified of a more serious threat to international peace, the UNSC may further decide upon economic sanctions, enforcement measures, or military action led by the United Nations. The UNSC’s main goal is to relieve the world from harm; it functions to reduce tensions and to promote and maintain peace in all nations.

Topic One: Israeli occupation of the Golan Heights

History

Ever since the inception of the state of Israel in May 14, 1948, Israel has been engulfed in constant turmoil amongst its neighbouring countries, including in the 1948 Arab-Israeli war, Suez crisis, Six-day war, etc. These skirmishes occurred because of Israel's Arab neighbours who opposed the independence of a Jewish state at the expense of Palestine.

After the 1948 Arab-Israeli war, which included Israel, Egypt, Lebanon, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Syria and more, the participating parties in the conflict signed what is known as 1949 Armistice Agreements, which created temporary boundaries between nations. However, numerous border clashes, especially between Israel and Syria, brought significant tensions in the region; Syria and Egypt mutually signed a defense agreement and the Palestine Liberation Organization launched guerrilla attacks in a vendetta against its neighbour.

In May of 1967, Egypt was falsely tipped off by the Soviet Union on concentration of Israel Defense Forces (IDF) troops near Syria. In response, Gamal Abdel Nasser, then the Egyptian president, began to place his troops in the Sinai Peninsula near the Israeli border and blocked the straits of Tiran. In retaliation, Israel, which has stated in the past that the blockade in the strait is an implicit declaration of war, launched Operation Focus on June 5th, and consequently finished the operation victorious on June 10th.

During the war, Israel captured the Golan Heights, which is located on the Israeli-Syrian border, from Syria, drawing the armistice line to put the Heights under its military administration. It's worthy to note that most Syrian Arab inhabitants fled the region during the conflict. In consequence, Syria joined other Arab nations in denouncing Israel by signing the Khartoum Resolution, which refused to recognize Israel, and quintessentially ruled out peaceful dialogue with Israel. Syria essentially reiterated that it would not participate in any talks with Israel before it withdraws from the occupied areas.

Then, in the 1973's Yom Kippur War, Syria attempted to take back the Golan Heights unsuccessfully, and resulted in a 1974 Ceasefire agreement, which handed most of the region to Israel.

In 1981, Israel passed a law that essentially oversaw the annexation of Golan Heights by extending Israeli law to the territory. However, UNSC Resolution 497 condemned Israel's actions and continues to regard Golan Heights as Israeli-occupied territory.

Ever since the conflict, Israel's Land for Peace policy, grounded upon the UNSC Resolution 242 of 1967 and Syria's claim to the territory proved to be a major obstacle to the stability of the region.

Current Situation

The divergence of the two nations over Golan Heights is of major concern to the UNSC as it is aggravating the already volatile atmosphere in the Middle East. In 2010, it was estimated 20,000 Jewish and 20,000 Druze settlers reside in Golan Heights.

Canadian High Schools Model United Nations 2012

The reason why this seemingly barren plateau is so contested for is its strategic significances. When the Heights were under Syrian control, Syrian artilleries frequently shelled the Northern Israel. However, the Syrian capital, Damascus is only 40 miles from the top of the Heights, clearly observable from the vantage point. The Heights also holds important economic advantage, as the area supplies one third of Israel's water supply and provide vast fecund tracts of farming lands.

Even in present, Syria maintains it will not enter in a peace talk with Israel unless the Golan Heights is returned, and Israel maintains that it will only return for peace, in addition to the guarantee of Israel's access to the water source in the Golan Heights.

In 1999, the Israeli Prime Minister then offered to return most of the Heights, yet Syria wants the revival of the pre-1967 border, which would deprive Israel of the Eastern shore of the Sea of Galilee, a major source of fresh water for Israel. The peace talks eventually broke down in 2000. In addition, a poll taken in 2004 shows majority of Israelis disagree with handing back the Golan Heights back to Syria.

Israel and Syria had a bout of politics when in 2007, in the Operation Orchard, Israel launched an aerial attack on a nuclear reactor located in the middle of Syrian desert.

In 2008, Israeli Prime Minister Olmert began talks with Syria over the issue of Golan with Turkey as the talks' mediators. However, a corruption scandal and the public backlash coerced the prime minister to resign, ushering in the new Israeli government, led by Binyamin Netanyahu. The government stated it will take a tougher stance regarding the issue of Golan, and the conflict was yet again, exasperated. The change of government was followed by the Syrian leader stating that there was no partner for talks on the Israeli side, which was followed by a condemnation from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and a denial by the Syrian government of its alleged nuclear program.

In 2010, International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)'s head Yukiya Amano announced that the target of the operation was indeed a covert site for a future nuclear reactor, contrasting against the Syrian government's claims.

This event provides grave ramifications in the diplomacy of the two countries as Israel accuses Syria of blocking the international community from investigating its nuclear activities, while Syria censures Israel for its clandestine nuclear arsenal.

Within the Heights itself, the region had been begot with unrest as pro-Palestinian protesters have breached the Israel border on the anniversary of 1967 war, prompting the IDF to use force, resulting in many casualties. The situation became even more convoluted with the spark of revolutions in the region. With the United States declaring the fall of President Bashar al-Assad's regime an inevitable event, the committee needs to adeptly act upon this revolution to engender a positive compromise that will instill stability in the region. The United Nations Security Council is already considering to vote on a resolution that will call on Syria to immediately halt its gruesome crackdowns. The Syrian unrest is causing uncertainty in the area and may potentially engender an entirely altered political and diplomatic landscape in the region, making the situation even more mercurial and needing imperative resolution.

Questions to Consider

How will the prospect of the Syrian revolution movement affect peace talks between the two sovereign nations?

How can Israel's "Land for peace" policy and Khartoum Resolution be compromised?

Who will be the intermediary of the peace talk between the two nations should it occur?

How can Israel's longing for "peace" be sated were the land to return to Syria? How can the peace and guarantee of Israeli water source be upheld?

What is the extent of the United Nations Security Council's role to preserve the stability of the region?

Topic Two:

Establishing a framework for intervention in the 21st century through redefining R2P

History

In 2001, the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) drafted the dogma of “responsibility to protect” or R2P. It was aimed to mitigate the gross humanitarian crisis occurring around the globe and to guarantee the sovereignty of states. It was mainly in response to the genocide in Rwanda and the deliberate targeting of civilians in Kosovo and Srebrenica.

It was presented in the same year by Gareth Evans, former Foreign Minister of Australia, and Mohamed Sahnoun, Special Advisor to the UN Secretary-General, with the main concept of states intervening to help an afflicted population out of their own moral duty.

The doctrine was once more in the limelight in 2004, when Kofi Annan created the High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges, and Changes. The purpose of the panel was to discern the threats to the peace and security of the international community. Later, the panel published a report in which it tried to enforce “emerging norm”, where if a humanitarian crisis were to occur and the primary sovereignty is incapable or disinclined to mitigate the issue, the international community will have an obligation to help.

In 2005, 191 heads of states present in the U.N. General Assembly endorsed the R2P unanimously; the R2P was then included in the World Summit Outcome Document. In 2006, the UNSC formalized the R2P by including it in the Resolution 1674. This is the first global consensus on the accountability of each individual nation in protecting groups of people from genocide, ethnic cleansing, war crimes, and crimes against humanity.

Also, in the same year when Resolution 1674 passed, Resolution 1706, which provided a peacekeeping mission in Darfur, where a civil war and a genocide was taking place, asserted and acknowledged the Responsibility to Protect’s significance. The resolution also confirmed the UNSC’s commitment to adhering to the doctrine of Responsibility to Protect.

In 2009, the Secretary General Ban Ki Moon released a report named “Implementing the Responsibility to Protect”. In this report, three principles of the R2P were accentuated; states have primary accountability to protect its own citizens from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity, the international community needs to commit to aid the nations to help them be able to help its own citizens, and international community needs to act promptly and timely when a nation fails to protect its own people.

Current Situation

Although the doctrine itself has passed through United Nations with unrelenting acclamation, the application of such doctrine remains to be seen as dubious by many skeptics. If the R2P was to be held true, then many atrocities since the adaptation in 2005 should have been prevented.

Canadian High Schools Model United Nations 2012

During the year 2007 – 2008, the Republic of Kenya was overwhelmed by a political, economical, and humanitarian crisis that evolved from the 2007 Kenyan presidential election where an incumbent president was declared the winner. Violence erupted from the supporters of the opposition and ethnic violence against Kikuyu people, who are largely affiliated with the incumbent leader, swept the country. It is estimated approximately 800 people, including Olympic athletes and politicians have been killed during this crisis, with up to 600,000 people displaced. Yet, no action from the United Nations was taken except a calling for a peace resolution by the UNSC.

In 2008, South Ossetia War, a conflict among Georgia, Russia and the separatist governments of South Ossetia and Abkhazia, is another instance of failure to upkeep the R2P. The war was waged by Georgia who wanted to reconquer its lost territories. During this conflict, many impeachments of war crimes have been made. Georgian army used indiscriminate force “with blatant disregard for the safety of civilians.” Russia also committed grave crimes such as targeting a civilian convoy and bombing civilian population centers in Georgia. 365 civilians in South Ossetia have been killed according to South Ossetia, and 224 civilians have been killed in Georgia. During the conflict, no major contribution from the UN was made to alleviate the fight other than providing limited supplies of food in cities.

The two instances accentuate the instances of major failings of the R2P. Both conflicts violated what R2P seemingly considered sacrilegious to violate; yet was met with little intervention from the UN. These instances portray lack of efficacy in the doctrine and show the imperative need to revise the said policy.

Many criticisms surround the R2P despite its ideology of collective security – the doctrine goes against the self-determination of states and ultimately violates the sovereignties of the nations; the United Nations charter signed and ratified in 1945 had placed self-determination as part of the framework of international law and diplomacy.

However, some argue that it can be said one is justified in intervening when a nation fails to fulfill the first principle – to protect its own people – since that’s when the nation is no longer fulfilling its duties as a nation and does not deserve the right to self-determination at that point. However, it is ambiguous as to who or what standardized rubric can determine the appropriateness of the intervention.

There are also discussions on the extent of the application of R2P. Currently, it only guarantees that intervention will be made in case of genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity. General consensus among the leaders is that a focused, well-defined range of R2P is favored, as it will maintain the efficacy of the doctrine. Some however, argue that the doctrine should be extended to include natural calamities, and other possible disastrous events. Whether this doctrine should be extended to include other calamities, and if so, what kind of calamities, should be discussed.

A major consideration for UNSC is how to discern when R2P should be applied. The members of UNSC, especially the permanent five members, hold an increased influence over the implementation of the doctrine, since as it stands, intervention under R2P needs to be carried out multilaterally, and needs an approval by the UNSC. An individual nation in the committee’s agenda could jeopardize the community from aiding those who promptly need the military intervention. An alternate method for a successful application of R2P should be contemplated.

Canadian High Schools Model United Nations 2012

Also, according to the report by the ICISS, the requirements that need to be made before military interventions are applied are: just cause, right intention, final resort, legitimate authority, proportional means, and reasonable prospect. These are all vague and antiquated requirements that need reconsideration from the committee.

Questions to Consider

To what extent should the R2P's scope of application be, considering the effectiveness and practicality of the said scope?

What are the criticisms related to the R2P? Are they sound concerns of the doctrine? What are ways to assuage the discontent of the principle of R2P?

Why was the R2P not utilized for the instances of humanitarian grievances?

Does R2P take precedence over other principles of UN such as Self-determination, and if so, how is the UNSC justified in doing so?

Is the doctrine of R2P necessary? Why is the founding principle of collective security not sufficient to prevent mass atrocities and to maintain international order?

Topic Three: Situation in Côte d'Ivoire

History

In the 1880's, the French established a colony in the Ivory Coast, and proceeded to exploit it for its natural resources without preparing the natives for any kind of self-government. Until World War II, Ivory Coast was under the French colonial rule. It was only through war that Ivory Coast was able to throw down the shackles of the colonial power.

The man who took over in 1960, the first president of Ivory Coast, Felix Houphouet-Boigny, ruled as a competent dictator for 30 years. Under his rule, religious and ethnic harmony was present, along with economic stability. He was a major contributor towards the creation of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and economic liberalism was adopted.

Then Houphouet passed away in 1993, and the political system, which he single-handedly bound together, broke down. The country was not used to the democracy; the nation had run by Boigny as its leader for so long. With democracy came voting problems; approximately a quarter of Ivory Coast residents were of foreign origins. Henri Bedie, who consolidated his position by jailing many of his political adversaries, succeeded him. Also, in order to further his position, he tried to interject an idea of "Ivority", a policy aimed to exclude his rival, Alassane Ouattara, from running for the presidential election. However, as the population of Ivory Coast was composed of a large number of people who originated from foreign countries, the policy excluded many of the population and strained the relationship among the different ethnicities, causing numerous ramifications.

Bedie was eventually ousted by Robert Guei in a 1999 coup. But before Bedie fled, he tried to instill xenophobia against the Moslems in order to rile his supporters against the opposition, who in reverse, also instilled similar xenophobic perspectives. This racial tension created served to intensify the growing frictions among the different ethnic groups.

In the 2000 presidential election, Laurent Gbagbo won against Robert Guei, but the divided country went into an uprising, and violence erupted. The country's underlying ethnic and religious fault lines (poorer Moslem north, richer Christian south) came out with full force. The public uprising resulting in 180 deaths eventually replaced Guei with Gbagbo.

In 2002, the Moslem north revolted after an attempt to exclude the northerners' preferred presidential candidate from the upcoming Presidential elections, leading to a full-scale civil war. Most of the fighting ended by late 2004, until the spring of 2011, open warfare continued, punctuated by brief cease-fires enforced by UN (mostly French) peacekeepers.

Current Situation

The most recent cease-fire was made contingent on a free and fair presidential election being held. That election took place in 2010, and the northern candidate Alassane Ouattara came out on top, recognized by the African Union, the Economic Community of West African States, the international community, and the election observers. However, the incumbent president, Gbagbo, refused to accept the results, and declared himself the winner of the elections. With both claiming themselves as the winner of the election, conflicts were about. Gbagbo demanded in December for all foreign troops to leave the country. UN in response rejected Gbagbo's claim as the president and stated that its peacekeeping troops would stay to support Ouattara. This led to the resumption of hostilities, and the eventual capture of Gbagbo in the spring of 2011 by the Republican Army of the Ivory Coast.

However, even after Gbagbo was put in custody, the atmosphere in the Ivory Coast has been volatile. The Republican Force of the Ivory Coast (FRIC), which is based on the Moslem north, has been reported to be committing a gamut of human rights violations. The feeling of retribution has coerced the FRIC to attack former allies and supporters of Gbagbo, particularly around Duékoué. Essentially, the FRIC has replaced Gbagbo's army as the new subject of fear. The force also loots heavily and prevalently.

Another problem with FRIC is that they are largely unregulated; Ouattara does not have the ability to coerce the FRIC to go back to its poorer North without cutting his alliance with it. A military intervention, with UN support, or even unilateral action by France could expel these soldiers back to their Northern homelands, but again, such action would cut the ties between the president and the FRIC. One proposal made was to assimilate the FRIC to the normal armed forces but their penchant for looting makes it not so viable solution.

It is also imperative to note that many within the ranks of the FRIC are potentially culpable for war crimes. Around 97 Gbagdo supporters are being prosecuted while none of Ouattara's supporters are. This type of bias is aggravating the divided country even more, and the lack of action in this regard could hurt the unity of the country.

In terms of unity of the country, the subject of former president, Gbagdo's fate is also in question. Gbagdo is being prosecuted by the International Criminal Court, but many of the citizens of Ivory Coast want to see him tried in an Ivorian court.

All of this violence in what was once a prosperous country has led to the breakdown of social order, and a massive refugee crisis in what is already a very troubled area of the world. With the fear of reprisal from the supporters of Ouattara, thousands of former supporters of Gbagbo are refugees in countries such as Liberia and Ghana. And as the dispersion occurred, surges of violence are taking place, especially in Liberia. Because of the 2010 disputed election, 200,000 refugees fled the country seeking asylum. The refugees do have ground though, as Human Right Watch have reported that violence is continued even after Gbagbo's capture. In June of 2011, 149 pro-Gbagbo have been reportedly killed by Ouattara's supporters, with similar reports being submitted recently.

Canadian High Schools Model United Nations 2012

With the former president being held in trials, the Ivory Coast has much work to reestablish the ethnic harmony maintained during the Boigny's era. To do so, the constant violence from the FRIC needs to be addressed. The possibility of international intervention should be contemplated by the international forum. Racial tension and divide between the North and the South need to be eliminated or mitigated. The deluge of conflict between these two entities is the driving force behind the refugee problem present in the Ivory Coast. The interconnected problems in the Ivory Coast need solutions from the international community, although the mission of the UN Operation in Côte d'Ivoire and Operation Unicorn are helping out to facilitate the country, it is apparent that problems in Ivory Coast are rampant.

Questions to Consider

How can the Republican Force of the Ivory Coast be persuaded to return to its native northern part of the country?

Is it in the best interest of the UN to pursue a peacekeeping mission in conjunction with France as different operations are taking place?

Should peacemaking forces be applied to the region in lieu of peacekeeping forces?

Is it prudent to hold the supporters of Ouattara, especially those in FRIC, accountable for the war crimes and human right violations they have committed in the past?

Will stabilizing the country's domestic problems alleviate the refugee problems the Ivory Coast is facing?

Should the trial of Gbagbo be held internationally or domestically, and what would be the ramifications of either choices?

Conference Rules

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 1 – Date of Meeting

The bodies of the Canadian High Schools Model United Nations shall meet every year in regular session.

Rule 2 – Delegations

The delegation of each Member State shall consist of no more than two representatives in any committee.

Rule 3 – Duties of the Secretary-General

The Secretary-General of the Canadian High Schools Model United Nations shall act as the highest presiding officer and shall direct the staff of all bodies. The Secretary-General may designate an officer of the Secretariat to act on his or her behalf.

Rule 4 – Duties of the Chairman

The Chairman, as a presiding officer acting under the authority of the Secretary-General, shall declare the opening and closing of each meeting of the committee, enforce the rules of procedure, accord the right to speak, and announce decisions. The Chairman shall rule on points of order and may propose motions to the committee. Motions shall be addressed by the Chairman upon his or her discretion. The Chairman shall accept, approve, and introduce draft resolutions to the committee.

Comment: Working papers will be submitted to the Director of each committee, who will provide stylistic and substantive edits. Working papers will be introduced to the floor at the discretion of the Director; delegates no longer move to introduce a draft resolution.

Rule 5 – Invitation to a Moment of Silence

Immediately upon the opening of the meeting, a Member State may move to observe a moment of silence.

Comment: The purpose of the moment of silence may not be directed towards a single event. For example, a delegate may dedicate a moment of silence to those affected by famine, but may not dedicate it to those affected by the 2011 famine in the Horn of Africa.

Rule 6 – Provisional Agenda

Each committee shall order the provisional agenda provided by the Secretary-General. A proposed agenda shall include all topics provided in the provisional agenda. A simple majority is required to approve an agenda order. A speakers list shall be established for the purposes of discussing the order of the agenda. Motions to set the agenda will be voted upon in the order in which they were received.

Rule 7 – Amendment to the Agenda

A committee may change the order in which it considers topics. The Chairman may entertain one speaker for and one against a motion to amend the agenda. A simple majority is required to approve this motion.

Comment: A motion to amend the agenda will only be entertained after a topic has been closed and all related substantive matters have been put to a vote. A Member State may not move to amend the agenda during substantive debate.

Rule 8 – Quorum

The Chairman may declare a meeting open and permit debate to proceed or a procedural vote to be taken when at least one-quarter of the Member States are present.

Rule 9 – Speeches

No Member State may address a committee without the explicit consent of the Chairman. Member States shall address the committee in the order of the speakers list. The Chairman shall call a speaker to order if his or her remarks are not relevant to the subject under discussion. The Chairman shall establish a time limit on speeches upon the opening of the meeting and may entertain motions to amend the time limit. The Chairman may entertain one speaker for and one against a motion to amend the time limit. A simple majority is required to approve this motion.

Comment: Delegates may speak as often as they wish, but each country may only appear once in the active speakers list. For Member States with two delegates, courtesy dictates that only one delegate shall address the floor during substantive and procedural speeches.

Rule 10 – Questions to the Speaker

When the committee is discussing a substantive matter, a time limit has been placed on speeches, and the speaker has not exhausted the allotted time, the speaker may inform the Chairman that he or she will accept questions from the floor. At such time, the Chairman will recognize two Member States to pose substantive questions to the speaker in regards to the preceding speech. The speaker shall have the remaining allotted time to answer both questions.

Rule 11 – Yields

When the committee is discussing a substantive matter, a time limit has been placed on speeches, and the speaker has not exhausted the allotted time, the speaker may yield his or her remaining time to another Member State. The subsequent speaker may not yield any additional time. Representatives may not yield to another representative of the same Member State.

Rule 12 – Closing of the Speakers List

The speakers list may be closed at any time upon the majority vote of the Member States present and voting.

Comment: When a speakers list is exhausted, debate automatically ends and the committee automatically enters into voting procedure.

Rule 13 – Reopening of the Speakers List

The speakers list may be reopened upon a motion from an Member State as long as there are active speakers on the speakers list at the time of the motion. The Chairman shall entertain one speaker in favour and one opposed to this motion. A simple majority is required to approve this motion.

Rule 14 – Right of Reply

If a speaker has impugned the national integrity of another Member State or Observer, or the personal integrity of another representative, the Chairman may allow that Member State or representative appropriate speaking time to exercise the right of reply.

Comment: The delegate must submit a written statement to the Director at the conclusion of the remarks in question, explaining why a right of reply is warranted. The Director will approve or reject the right of reply; if approved, the Director will ask the delegate to read the same written statement to the committee.

Rule 15 – Point of Order

A Member State may rise to a point of order to bring attention to the Chairman an error in the execution of the rules. The representative may not speak on the substance of the matter under discussion.

Comment: Delegates should allow the courtesy of letting the speaker finish before rising to a point of order; nonetheless, we recognize the need to interrupt the speaker. The point of order will be the only point recognized at CAHSMUN in order to reflect the actual United Nations procedures as much as possible and to reduce the frequency of filibustering. If a delegate wishes to rise to a point of parliamentary inquiry or a point of personal privilege, he or she should communicate privately with the Director.

Rule 16 – Appeal of the Chair

A Member State may appeal a discretionary ruling of the Chairman. The representative may explain the nature of the appeal and the Chairman may explain the basis of his or her ruling. A simple majority is required to overturn the discretionary ruling of the Chairman.

Comment: A “Yes” vote means that the delegate wants to overrule the decision of the Chairman, whereas a “No” vote means the delegate agrees with the discretion of the Chairman.

Rule 17 – Suspension of the Meeting

A Member State may move to suspend the meeting for a specific amount of time. A simple majority is required to suspend.

Comment: Suspensions are used for caucusing and breaks between sessions. Based on his or her judgement of the committee's progress, the Director may suggest an alternative amount of time for the suspension. In order to reflect actual United Nations procedures and to reduce the frequency of filibustering, all suspensions will be "unmoderated." Provisions for moderated debate is set out in Rule 18.

Rule 18 – Moderated Debate

At any point after a draft resolution has been introduced, a Member State may move to enter moderated debate on a draft resolution. The motion to enter moderated debate must specify the draft resolution. A simple majority is required to pass this motion.

Comment: During a moderated debate, the speakers list is temporarily suspended and the Director will identify each speaker from those wishing to speak. During a moderated debate, the discussion may only pertain to the draft resolution in question and should be used for clarification and discussions of amendments in a more structured setting.

Rule 19 – Closure of Debate

A Member State may move the closure of debate on the topic under consideration. The Chairman shall recognize only two Member States opposing the closure to speak. A two-thirds majority is required to pass this motion, and if passed, the Chairman shall declare the topic closed.

Comment: When debate is closed on a topic, the committee immediately goes into voting procedure and consider all draft resolutions and amendments on the floor. Motions to close debate are generally ruled dilatory until there has been substantial discussion on the topic.

Rule 20 – Adjournment of Debate and Reconsideration

A Member State may move to adjourn debate on the topic under consideration. The Chairman shall recognize two Member States in favour of and two against to speak. A simple majority is required to pass this motion. If this motion passes, the body will begin discussion on the following topic on the agenda without deciding on the adjourned topic.

A Member State may move to reconsider a topic that has been adjourned. The Chairman shall recognize one Member State in favour of and one against to speak. A two-thirds majority is required to pass this motion.

Comment: Adjournment of debate is used to end discussion on a topic without voting and move on to the next item of the agenda. If an adjourned topic is approved for reconsideration, it shall be placed as the following topic on the agenda after the discussion on the current topic expires.

Rule 21 – Adjournment of Meeting

A Member State may move to adjourn the meeting and reconvene the body at the next scheduled date. A simple majority is required to adjourn the meeting.

Comment: This motion can only be used during the last committee session and during the closing ceremonies.

Rule 22 – Resolutions and Amendments

Resolutions and amendments shall be submitted in writing to the Chairman, who shall circulate copies to Member States upon approval. No resolutions or amendments shall be voted upon unless copies have been distributed to the body.

Comment: All working papers must be submitted to the Director, who may provide substantive and grammatical edits on the paper and return it to the authors before approving it to be a draft resolution. The number of sponsors and signatories must add up to 20% of the quorum of the committee or five Member States, whichever number is greater. Sponsorship indicates support for and agreement with the working paper or amendment. A signatory does not necessarily support or agree with the document; this Member State simply wishes the document to be discussed. Working papers, as they are unofficial documents of the committee, will not be distributed by the Director and cannot be referred to in speeches.

Rule 23 – Voting Rights

Each Member State of the United Nations shall have one vote.

Comment: Observer delegations may note on procedural motions but not on substantive matters. Member States with two representatives still have one vote.

Rule 24 – Presence

A Member State who is “present and voting” shall only cast an affirmative or negative vote in substantive matters. A Member State who is “present” may choose to abstain in substantive matters. All Member States may only vote in the affirmative or the negative in procedural matters.

Rule 24 – Method of Voting

All motions, draft resolutions and amendments, unless specified in the Rules of Procedure, require a simple majority to pass. If a vote is equally divided, that motion, draft resolution, or amendment fails. A two-thirds majority is required for certain motions. Abstentions do not count as votes for the purposes of determining a simple or two-thirds majority. All votes shall take place by a show of placards.

A Member State may request a roll-call vote on a draft resolution or amendment. The roll-call vote shall take place in the English alphabetical order of the names of the Member States, beginning with the Member State who requested the roll-call vote. Unless a Member State is “present and voting”, each Member State may choose to vote “yes”, vote “no”, or abstain. (continued on next page)

Canadian High Schools Model United Nations 2012

All Member States may also choose to “pass” and when the Member State is called upon a second time to cast a vote, the representative may only vote in the affirmative or the negative. A roll-call vote is granted upon request and does not require a decision from the body or the Chairman. At the discretion of the Chairman, Member States may explain their vote (yes, no, or abstain) after a roll-call vote. Sponsors to the draft resolution or amendment may not explain their vote after a roll-call vote.

Rule 25 – Conduct during Voting Procedure

Once the Chairman announces the beginning of voting procedure, the meeting room shall be closed and remain closed for the duration of voting procedure. Proper decorum shall be observed by Member States. Member States may only speak upon the Chairman’s request for points or motions.

Rule 26 – Amendments and Divisions of the Question

Amendments shall be submitted in writing to the Chairman before the commencement of voting procedure and shall be entertained first for each draft resolution. If there are several amendments under consideration, those that are “friendly” shall be automatically incorporated into the draft resolution without a vote. The Chairman shall order the “unfriendly” amendments in the order of most destructive to least destructive. A simple majority is required to approve “unfriendly” amendments.

After the incorporation of amendments, A Member State may move to divide certain operative clauses of the draft resolution. The intent of such a division is to highlight the operative clause(s) in question.

1. The Chairman shall recognize two speakers in favour of and two speakers against such a division. A procedural vote will take place to determine if the body wishes to proceed with such a division.
2. If the procedural vote passes, the body shall then consider the placement of the clause(s) in question in a substantive vote. If this vote passes, the clause(s) will be placed in the Annex of the draft resolution. If this vote fails, the clause(s) will be discarded.
3. If the procedural vote fails, the clause(s) in question will remain in the main text of the draft resolution and no further vote will take place on the motion.

Only operative clauses can be subjected to amendments and divisions of the question. Member States may only divide entire operative clauses.

Rule 27 – Voting on Draft Resolutions

Draft resolutions for a topic shall be considered in the order in which the Chairman had recognized them as official documents of the body.

ORDER OF PRECEDENCE

Motion	Purpose	Debate	Vote	Explanation
Point of Order	Correct an error in procedure	None	None	
Appeal the Decision of the Chair	Challenge a decision of the Chair	None	Majority	Applicable to the Chair's discretionary decisions
Suspension of the Meeting	Recess for a defined period of time	None	Majority	Go into unmoderated caucus
Moderated Debate	To discuss the clauses of a draft resolution	None	Majority	Moderated debate is only applicable once DRs are on the floor
Closure of Debate	To conclude topic by entering into voting procedure	2 con	2/3 rd	End discussion on current topic
Adjournment of Debate	To conclude topic without voting	2 pro/2 con	Majority	Should only be used on the final day
Reconsideration	To reopen debate on an adjourned topic	1 pro/1 con	2/3 rd	The reopened topic will be placed next on the agenda
Adjournment of Debate	To conclude the conference for the year	None	Majority	Can only be used during the last committee session
Division of the Question	To consider clauses in question separately from the rest of draft resolution	Part 1: 2 pro/2 con Part 2: None	Part 1: Majority Part 2: Majority	Motions will be voted upon in the order of most destructive to least destructive
Roll Call Vote	Vote by roll call instead of a show of placards	None	None	Automatically granted
Set Speakers Time	To set the time allowed for speeches	2 pro/2 con	Majority	Default is 60 seconds - should only be moved upon the suggestion of the Director
Close/Reopen the Speakers List	To alter the status of the speakers list	None	Majority	When closed, no additional Member States will be added and if the list exhausts, committee enters voting procedure
Adoption of the Agenda	To approve the agenda for the committee	None	Majority	Motion should include the order for all topics under consideration

DIVISION OF THE QUESTION: A VISUAL EXPLANATION

