

GECMUN IV

Newsletter

DISEC
ECOFIN
FOUNDING FATHERS
HUAC
ICJ
IOC
JURASSIC WORLD
UNODC
UNSC

COPYRIGHT © 2018 GECMUN IV

All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, mechanical, electronic, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the prior written permission of the publisher.

Published by The GECMUN IV Press Corps
Designed by Minyoung Lee and Taejoon Kim

DISEC

One step closer towards PEACE in Syria

Eunjoo Jeon

The Disarmament and International Security Committee (DISEC) is the first committee of the United Nations General Assembly (GA) whose primary goal is to discuss the topic of disarmament and world peace. During the GECMUN IV, DISEC, with the topic of Syrian War, primarily dealt with the disarmament of destabilizing weapons within Syria, and promoted international security issues via addressing SDG number 16: Peace, justice and strong institutions.

After the opening statements from every delegates, the delegate of France made a motion for moderate caucus to discuss the possible solutions. The active communication between delegates from Russia, France, DPRK, Canada, and China after several caucuses lead them to draft four resolutions at around 11:30a.m, and had the majority of the votes to be approved until Russia federation altered their stance. The delegate of Russia commenced by agreeing to Israel's solution of creating a discrete committee for Peacekeeping in Syria. As a neighbour of Syria, Russia could easily provide weapons and military supplies through negotiations with other nations. Yet, as this could trigger Russia dominating Syria, other nations firmly disagreed. China and DPRK stated, "As it might exacerbate a problem, there shouldn't be two sides and every nation should be involved. Russia shouldn't be the only country helping." Hence, France brought up a resolution: "Declare international condemnation towards Jihadist convention on their action."

What are the motifs of countries to join in the prolonged war in Syria?

What might the countries gain from doing so?

Delegate of France delivering her motifs of joining the prolonged war in Syria



The delegate of France opened up the debate. "When there is an action, there is a reaction. Because Syrian government tortured a 13-year-old boy for writing graffiti, supporting the Arab Spring, the uprising of the protestors occurred." Thus, she emphasized that ethics should be prioritized when considering humanitarian aids and people in Syria.

The delegate of Russia rebutted, "France is trying to paint the Assad regime as an oppressive government, which lacked support for basic human rights. However, rebellions are full with criminals and terrorists, which was proven by the threats Assad has received from the peaceful protests.

The delegate of Russia questioned the irony of France emphasizing 'ethics', as France have once colonized Syria. (How France could say that they have the ethical high ground when supporting a cause filled with people who attack and kill for the sheer purpose of infighting terror within the general population.) Hence, Russia believes that the Assad government is the correct side to take as they are the legitimate rulers and national sovereignty must be respected when trying to reinstate peace in Syria. Unlike other countries, Russia joined on purely ethical motives as they cannot bear to see people dying. Their stance is to protect Syria's government impeachment as Libya doesn't have a government even after overthrowing their government.

Delegate of France mentioned the requirement of checks and balances in the system and further emphasized the ultimate goal of the conference: to create a balance of power between Assad and anti-Assad groups.

Although the resolution was agreed upon the countries with power, delegates from DPRK and France held unmoderated caucus to communicate with delegates from other countries that haven't expressed their opinions. As resolutions should be formed with inclusion of all countries.

At around 2:50 p.m, the delegates have further moved onto the amendments. As vast majority of delegates did not have any repulsion, the delegate of Russia altered his stance and tackled on several amendments. This triggered the group for fruitful discussions to result with the 'best' resolution possible.

What is your stance towards the amendment suggested by the delegate of Russia? Why?

"For the Clause 5, this delegate would like to strongly support the amendment, giving financial supports wouldn't be enough in terms of sustainability to provide technology or facilities would be a long-lasting solution." The delegate of China ended with a quote, "Don't give a fish. Teach how to fish."

Throughout the conference, despite the disagreements that occurred between delegates, they eventually came together and passed the first resolution. The first resolution issued by the delegate of France, Russia, and DPRK addressed the problems including: Abolition of the Jihadist, Refugee Crisis, Chemical Weapon usage, and immediate ceasefire in Syria War. This resolution covered existing problems with a holistic view, craving a better future for the world.

JOURNALIST: Eunjoo Jeon
jeoneunjoo01173@branksome.asia

GECMUN IV

ECOFIN

One Step Towards a Better Future

Cherynne Kim

“No generation has ever had the opportunity that all of us now have to build a global economy that leaves no one behind and, in the process, to create a new century of peace and prosperity in a world that is more constructively and truly independent.”

It was no other than William J. Clinton who argued that now is the time when a global economy should be formed with no country isolated. Following the words of the former president of the United States, the United Nations sought various ways that would support globalization, but at the same time, prevent possible side effects. On October 1st, 2012, a committee was specially convened for that purpose. Short for Economic and Financial Committee, ECOFIN emphasizes financial sustainability and economic cooperation between countries, simultaneously focusing on the issues such as sustainable development and gender equality in the job market.

On March 3rd, 2018, ECOFIN started the first day of GECMUN IV by debating which agenda to discuss in priority. After few unmoderated caucus, it was decided that Agenda 1, which is “Sustainable Development and Environment Degradation”, should be brought forward first, considering the issue of scarce nonrenewable resources and the urgent call for eco-friendly energy. The delegate of France was one of the advocates of Agenda 1. “Though France had achieved a comparatively high standard of living, there is still work to be done. Environmental issues should not be neglected, especially by the developed countries,” she stated. “The delegate of Japan agreed as well. “Agenda 1 is an important topic; limited resources and sustainable energy are just few of the many problems that exist.”



>The delegate of Japan is highlighting the significance of green energy.

“This delegate urges other delegates to contemplate different methods to solve the current problem.”

Fully aware of the current dilemma of energy usage, the delegates begin reflecting on the environmental degradation of each country and addressing the lack of alternative energy sources. In the process, the delegate of Iran made a compelling argument: “Although sustainable development is a goal that should be achieved, it may be too rapid and bring inevitable side-issues,” he said. “Redesigning current energy sources, such as oil, may be a better way to maintain sustainability.” This inspiring perspective of the delegate of Iran provided a new insight into the discussion, and with that in mind, the delegates began to organize and introduce individual stances regarding clean energy development.

Though there was no country in particular that disagreed with the mission of making cleaner Earth, the methods each had in mind showed stark contrast: for instance, while some delegates supported the usage of nuclear power, others were strongly against it. Nonetheless, it seemed that all countries were in favor of designing a solid system of sustainable energy that would support not only the developed nations, but the developing nations as well.

At the end of Session 2, the representatives of 17 countries started to work on resolutions. Below is an excerpt from an interview with the delegate of Iran.

Press: “How was the process of writing resolutions?”

Delegate: “We wrote two resolutions, one focusing on immediate solutions and another shedding light on long-term answers, but this doesn’t necessarily mean the two resolutions consist opposing views; they rather supplement each other.”

Press: “Could you specify the contents of each resolution?”

Delegate: “Sure. The short term resolution is mostly about developing nonrenewable energy sources, such as coal liquefaction or fractional distillation of oil. Creating nuclear power plants in desert areas is also one of the possible solutions that could be initiated anytime. On the other hand, the long term resolution is more about utilizing sustainable energy and renewable technology, such as biofuel production using food waste or promoting regional super grids around the world. Publicizing green certified companies is also a way to prevent environmental degradation in the long run.”

Press: “It must have been difficult, coming up with not one but two kinds of specific solutions to such a complex problem.”

Delegate: “Yes, but with the collaboration of every representatives, it was not as challenging as it sounds. Environmental issues cannot be solved without global cooperation; it is the choice, but also the responsibility of every country to work together to achieve a common goal. This could also be applied to the second agenda. Policies or regulations forced upon are not going to last. It is essential that we try to find methods which would encourage and support global development, not force or demand it.”

Press: “Thank you for your time and wise words, delegate.”



>The delegates are voting for a moderated caucus put forward by the delegate of Italy.

During the last two sessions, the delegates worked on Agenda 2, “Gender Equality in Job Markets.” In the same vein as the first agenda, sustainability and feasibility was also a substantial issue: the delegates tried to find methods which would encourage more employment of women, breaking the glass ceiling; change the overall atmosphere of the nations; and provide better working and employment conditions.

The United Nations is a place where countries are gathered together as a team to seek feasible solutions to global problems. Regardless of committee and agenda, it is the delegates’ role to share ideas with the purpose of promoting a global community in which every country thrives, and in that regard, the Economic and Financial Committee of GEC MUN IV is a group of promising, young individuals who are definitely ready to make a world a better place for all. The agendas they addressed are currently huge issues in real life, and though this might just be a mock activity, the efforts of the participants should be recognized, as their solutions might exhibit their true abilities and solve problems in the near future.

JOURNALIST: Cherynne Kim
kimcherynne02246@branksome.asia

GECMUN IV

FOUNDING FATHERS

Britain’s Over-taxation on American Colonies is Provoking a War!

Ran Seo

Life is a question of timing. We must seize the moment and resist continued oppression.

During a chess game, there may be moments when your opponent calls for leniency when they realized they made a mistake, and we may even overlook those missteps out of respect. However, in the real life conflict between Britain and the American Colonies, there are no merciful gains, and strategic blunders cannot be as easily revoked. The beginning of the end occurred in March 1717, where word of the ‘Boston Massacre’ began circulating, an incident in which British Army soldiers shot and killed several American citizens just because they started a snowball fight. While this was not the final provocation that ignited the conflict, it added kindle to an already brewing flicker of flame. The political atmosphere was one where the British government imposed immense obligation to the colonies in the form of tax collection, including the Sugar Act and the Stamp Act. Rather than resort to protest, a group of patriots in the American colonies, The Sons of Liberty, decided to initiate undercover conferences as thirteen states representatives. The members are Benjamin Edes, John Dickenson, Patrick Henry, William Hooper, John Hancock, Benjamin Rush, Alexander McDougall, Isaac Sears, Benedict Arnold, Hercules Mulligan, Marinus Willett, George Washington, James Otis and James Duane.

“America never used to be like this! This is not the country of peace and freedom that we dreamed it would be,” proclaimed Hercules Mulligan as soon as the conference began.



>A moderated caucus in the process of voting for a public directive.

Most of the members nodded as Mulligan spoke and George Washington yelled, “Yes, and I believe war not only inevitable, it is the only choice we should all agree upon.” James Otis responded, “I agree, but if peace is indeed possible, with the condition that all colonial rights will be respected and the people receive equal treatment, we must consider all possible treaties. Still, we can’t let Britain continue using us like a piggy bank.” As the room continues to fill with agitation, the majority of the committee finally voted to send a letter for further investigation to the British government but in the official name of John Hancock, while Sons of Liberty remained anonymous.

As soon as their decision was made, the committee faced several unexpected crises. The people of Boston started to trigger local disputes against Britain by their own accord and another incident called ‘Boston Tea Party’ occurred, which awoke the sleeping British lion. The committee was forced to make a public directive in preparation for a long war in each state as a response to the escalating conflict. Internal dispute between the members was also surging as they could not come to a consensus as to when, how and why they should ask for help from the French and Spanish governments, who were enemies of the Britain, without being publicly noticed. The debate continued even further as John Dickinson brought up the issue of military backup and post-war plans, which were concerns that James Duane and Benjamin Rush also shared. More considerations were added to the debate as the British government had already mobilized their troops towards the colonies. Additionally, many colonial citizens have revealed themselves to be loyalists who are opposed to the war, resulting in segregation amongst the people. In a situation when time was of the essence, the 13 representatives were driven into a corner.



>In an unmoderated caucus, representatives are discussing if the French and the Spanish should be made allies.

Interview of James Duane and Benjamin Rush

Press: So, Mr. Duane and Mr. Rush, what are your thoughts on the current situation and are there any strategies you would like to implement?

Rush: Mr. Duane and I both think the final outcome of this debate is already clear and obvious.

Duane: Yes, we believe there is no point in wasting time on convincing the French and Spanish governments. There are bigger questions to be dealt with. How are we going to handle the Loyalists? Who’s going to be part of the United Nations’ government and become the president? Also, ‘if’ we win the war we don’t know if we are going to be a republican state or a democratic state.

Press: So what would be the first thing both of you would like to do prior to the initiation of the war?

Rush & Duane: Uniting colonies!

Duane: Yes, we will see how the discussion goes but for now, uniting the people and gathering what we have as much as possible is more swift and a higher priority than the 50/50 chance of convincing France and Spain.

Press: Thank you taking the time to answer these questions.

As Rush and Duane expected, the dealing with France and Spain were a lost cause as they identified the Sons of Liberty and its members as terrorists, rather than allies. The plan of sending a member to the two countries became more complicated and many committee members were reluctant in continuing the plan. As time passed and the internal deliberations continued amongst the committee, their plans came to a halt as British soldiers on patrol discovered the members of the committee and their identities were revealed. All the members quickly and safely fled to George Washington’s house but it seemed both futile and impractical to continue their conference at the present moment. But, a helping hand from the French government abruptly came to the rescue of the Sons of Liberty. A representative sent from the French government called the members ‘my beloved friends,’ and came to make agreements prior to sending their troops to support the American colonies. While the Sons of Liberty viewed the French’s sudden support suspiciously, all members came to an agreement under the following conditions:



[Public Directive Submitted by Isaac Sears]

- commence discussions with NA immediately, negotiate boundaries
- agree to the French demands, subsequent discussions to take place after we have ensured Britain’s defeat
- commence military preparations to support the French navy

The negotiations ended successfully, another milestone followed in the heels of that feat. The Continental Congress declared Independence from Great Britain due to a majority vote of 6:5 and now, the document is ratified. What is now evident is that the 13 representatives are ready to fight against Britain; the citizens of each colonial state are starting to show signs of arming themselves with guns and ammunitions. Everyone in the American colonies is now preparing themselves for a historical milestone that may spell the end of British colonization as war is on the brink of eruption at any given moment.

JOURNALIST: Ran Seo
seoran01052@branksome.asia

HUAC

[Exclusive] Chaplin's letter to the President What really Happened on March 3rd, 1952

Minyoung Lee

On March 3rd, 1952, the House Un-American Activities Committee, the committee of US House of Representatives, has created to weed out communist threats in the US, including not only the government, but the society in a whole. The delegates were finest American gentlemen who initiated heated discussions to maintain the social stability of America. As the letter from the chairs, which declares “[We] hope and pray our combined efforts will lead to the arrest and death of many, many communists”, implies, the widespread desire to eliminate the continent of communism had risen to its fluid mark, following the front of World War II and the Cold War fought on American turf.

The Committee started with a prompt report: Charlie Chaplin and his film studio were planning to release “A King in New York,” a film presenting a satirical view of McCarthy’s communist-hunt era as well as other aspects of US policies. The movie was going to be released at the end of Session 2, and the delegates showed perseverance in order to come up with a felicitous resolution. Moreover, unfounded rumor that some of the delegates were spying on famous media figures spread, creating tension among HUAC members.

It was then when an anonymous spy working for the US government declared that John Lennon and Ethel Rosenberg were “obvious communists”. Though no evidence supported this claim, its intended result was achieved: the tension among the HUAC members was heightened as ever.

However, the committee did not even have the time to react: while the members were dealing with the confusion that the spy presented, being suspicious of one another, Pennsylvania News have introduced a new legislation to not accept any Asian or East European immigrants.

Enraged, the civil rights advocates from the same state showed strong criticism, accusing Francis E. Walter of discrimination and racism. Alongside with the advocates, Charlie Chaplin wrote a letter to President Truman and made it public. He then started a petition to impeach President Truman, which already has more than 50,000 signatures.

With this efficacious letter, the first two sessions of the conference terminated, leaving the members in bigger chaos and confusion.

Dear President Truman,

No. I refuse to censor my own vision, my own work of art. My message is an explicit opposition to the corrupt and failing system of capitalism that feeds the rich and steals from the poor. Your offer to pay me money to censor my movie was the last straw. For this, I have decided to release my movie to theatres in 3 days, and will personally spend money to make admissions in major cinemas to be free. I am not a communist but I know that mankind lusts after money - an insatiable thirst that leads to war, poverty, and greed. I will invest every last penny, I am willing to give up my life, for my mission of peace and equality. Shame on you Mr. President.

Charlie Chaplin

In a time of crisis, it is the representatives’ responsibility to act calm and do the best they can do for the country. The citizens are waiting for their wise decisions.



>The de Distressed delegates after the crisis update

JOURNALIST: Minyoung Lee
leeminyoung01390@branksome.asia

GECMUN IV

ICJ (International Court of Justice)

Parties Meet for an Agreement

Amy Cho

With the opening remarks of Secretary General Dennis Kim, the Global Education City Model United Nations (GECMUN) finally begun its first day at March 3rd. This year's conference was noticeably bigger in size as delegates from 7 different schools, including students from Philippines, flew all the way to Jeju to participate in the region's one and only MUN conference. Among the 9 committees, International Court of justice (ICJ) committee was very special indeed not only because of its different rules of procedures but as it was an opportunity for the delegates to experience a "trial." Unlike the traditional General Assembly and specialized committees, the ICJ committee was a mini-mock trial.

With 11 judges, including the President and Co-President, and two advocates each from the Pakistan and Indian party present, the ICJ met its decorum. As for many people, since it was their first time participating in the ICJ conference, the president, namely the chair, briefly explained the rules to the newcomers. After, advocates from both party presented their opening speeches to deliver their stances regarding the territorial sovereignty over the Indo-Pakistan Border conflict, as the main agenda of the committee was deciding whether the Kashmir and Jammu region should be handed over to Pakistan or the Indian government.

After the opening speeches, both parties presented their evidence to bolster their claims. Each advocate had the opportunity to present each evidence and explain their justification of why each government should take over the Kashmir region. The judges also had the opportunity to ask specific questions regarding the evidence and pointed out any logical fallacies or improvements that could be made from each side.

The evidence session was a good reminder for the judges that they should consider multiple aspects including social, economic, or religious circumstances when making their decisions.

The final decision was coming close at hand. During the judges' deliberation in which judges could freely walk around and talk within each— similar to an unmoderated caucus — everyone came up with high quality and thought-provoking points regarding the agenda. For example, as both parties blamed each other for violating human rights, the judges reached a conclusion that it would be a waste of time arguing which party committed more violence or crimes but rather to shift the focus to which government would be capable of handling the future of the Kashmir region.

Later with break sessions in between, advocates from both parties brought their witnesses to add creativity to their case. The applicant party and the respondent party had cross-examination sessions by asking witnesses questions, and judges also asked questions as well. The first day was a challenge indeed, but all delegates knew they had to finish it strong.

The second day started with the closing speeches of both parties and the continuous debate among the judges. It was evident that all the judges showed great passion and determination by constantly raising motions and expressing their notions upon the issue. Debates and cross-talks among the judges definitely improved the substantial quality of the discussion, and a final vote was made: 5-6 for India. The committee session was concluded with the judges writing a final verdict.

At the end, everyone agreed that their hard work and effort definitely paid off as the conference gave students each a valuable lesson. The GECMUN was another memorable experience for all secretariats, delegates, staff, chairs, and advisors.



JOURNALIST: Amy Cho
yjcho20@kis.ac

GECMUN IV

IOC (International Olympic Committee)

Rigorous or Over Fastidious on Wording?

Yuxin Peng

“The delegations in the IOC does not merely pursue its own resolution, but works collaboratively with member nations to achieve a better olympics in the spirit of IOC” said by the delegation of Russia.

On 3rd, and 4th of March, IOC- the international olympics committee conference has held a in EEC, where there are proactive, and hard-working delegates representing one out of the 22 countries around the world, USA, Argentina, Denmark, Djibouti, UK, Japan, Canada, Ethiopia, Russia, Brazil, France, Germany, China, Nigeria, Norway, Netherlands, Egypt, Qatar, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand and Switzerland. 2 just and impartial chairs who diligently supervise the flow of the conference, remind delegate the manner that is supposed to be performed in MUN.

Prevention of Terrorist Attack in 2020 Tokyo Olympics has been discussed as the crisis of the forum. In the beginning of the conference some delegates voluntarily nominated themselves to make an opening speech explaining their stands and opinion toward the crisis, in the intention of informing other delegates and encourage other delegate that holds the same opinion consider of forming a bloc.

In the session of moderate caucus, the delegation of brazil stated that the past attack has a common pattern of terrorizing the public areas away from the olympics stadium, the Australia mentioned that both stadium and out in the public within 8 km radius should be in consideration of protection.



>Moderated Caucus, delegation of Switzerland raising his placard.

As soon as the unmoderated caucus begin, delegates started move around looking for people to bloc with.

Press: “As the delegate of New Zealand, which delegate or delegates to you have favor to collaborate with to come up with resolution?”

Delegate of New Zealand I have favor to bloc with Australia, because we have agreement over 8 km radius protection, so we are outlining the resolution where we set hi- technology like x- rays, facial recognition to examine people within 8 km radius.

During the amendment session, delegations actively argued on topic of usage of word ‘a amount’ referring to the budget spending on the transportation system.

“This delegate of Russia proposed to place the wording ‘emphasized’ in front of ‘a amount’ emphasizing the importance of the budget harnessed on item of security around the transportation system.” Said by the delegate of Russia. Delegate of Australia claimed that emphasized amount is not suitable since this delegate calls for balance utilization. Delegate of Switzerland claimed ‘Instead of the word ‘emphasize’ the word ‘adequate’ would be adequate”.

Conclusively, the demand of pursuing rigorous and proactive is required in the MUN. Recall back to the IOC spiritual quote from Russia that “The delegations in the IOC does not merely pursue its own resolution, but works collaboratively with member nations to achieve a better olympics in the spirit of IOC”



>Unmoderated Caucus, bloc delegations of Switzerland, Germany, Egypt, and Canada discusses on resolution

JOURNALIST: Yuxin Peng
pengyuxin01561@branksome.asia

GECMUN IV

JURASSIC World

Running Away from the Dinosaur

Olivia Moon

The Indominus Rex (I.Rex) was free. When GECMUN IV was first introduced to different schools, delegates, and chairs, one particular committee was the most controversial. A dinosaur? Who talks about dinosaurs in Model United Nations? Yet, the committee sign up was soon full. Though the committee seemed to be too light, too easy, not requiring much research, all of these expectations were proven wrong.

The purpose of the Jurassic World Committee was to solve the crisis of ‘Indominus Rex Breakout.’ The committee was consisted of members from the International Genetics Corporation (InGen), like hunters, scientists, or the CEO of the theme park. Located in the underground bunker, the delegates fully emerged in their characters to combat the I.Rex, a hybrid dinosaur of Tyrannosaurus Rex, and an unprecedented, most powerful creature of all.

Jurassic World was located on the island of Isla Nublar. The total number of tourists located at the park was 20,000, dispersed throughout the theme park in locations like Samsung Innovation Center, Gyrosphere Park, or the Mosasaurus Lake. Even though the whole setting was based on the science fiction movie of Jurassic World from 2015, many were altered by the chairs for a better application to the committee. I was in a unique position of being the chair and the press at the same time. I was involved in the committee than any other press members, not only knowing the events that are shown but the behind thoughts and plans of the chairs.

The first crisis update that the chairs provided was the issuing of “Code 19, Asset of Containment.” Following the breakout of the I. Rex, me and the other chairs presented the committee with a dilemma to observe the delegates and their responses. There were 7 employees caught in the paddock of the I.Rex urgently requesting for evacuation. The employees themselves have threatened the committee to raise the park wide alarm if not rescued.

The committee, however, went through an unexpected turn of events. The delegates did not focus as much on the first crisis update and dilemma presented by the chairs. Henry Ko, the director of this committee, recalled the day later and said “nothing went as expected.” The delegates were eager to introduce their own prepared solution, and neglected the dilemma. As a consequence, the chairs transitioned to the next crisis update, killing 5 employees and raising the park wide alarm. Like this, the committee was mostly propelled through the actions delegates took and proposed, the chairs reacting to it while keeping the ‘big picture’ in mind.

Throughout the day, me and the other chairs were truly surprised at the stream of creative ideas our delegates

presented. Honestly speaking, the chairs were overwhelmed, and it took us a few unmoderated caucuses to calmly react to the delegates. We decided to take small steps, voting or introducing the humongous pile-- not exaggerated-- of the public directives proposed to us.

After the day, the committee was faced with the direst situations. A CCTV file of employee being devoured was released on the internet, the attempt to starve all herbivores were condemned by the environmentalists, 7% of the embryo was stolen by an anonymous spy, and innocent civilians and tourists were killed by the I.Rex.

When I asked my fellow chair, Joshua Park, of the memorable event of the day, he smiled-- one that reminded me of an evil CEO. He said that the moment he enjoyed the most was when one of the delegates attempted to blackmail another character.



The note read, “Give my money and it will help your daughter.” Another delegate then attempted to reveal that by dispatching a paparazzi.

corrected the purpose of their moderated caucus, and argued that “the true purpose of this committee is to execute the I.Rex.”

As a press-slash-chair, I was immensely proud of the delegates, but for different reasons. As a press, I was concerned when I saw the delegates confused and unable to determine the direction of their discussion. As I took note of the progress of the committee, however, I realized that the delegates were learning from their mistakes. In session two, the chairs threw in the story of a spy, who deleted the CCTV file and ran away with the embryo. I was taking notes of the discussion, expecting the delegates to be thrown off into a different direction. I was pleasantly proven wrong, however, when the delegates themselves

I was also proud as a chair of this committee. One delegate of the committee, though I cannot reveal his or her name, had a hard time participating in the committee. The person was uncomfortable talking in front of other people, but I did not know what to do as a chair. I knew it was the right thing to encourage equal participation of all delegates, but at the same time, I did not want to overwhelm and stress out a delegate. I went to the delegate and briefly stepped down from the position of a chair. I engaged in a conversation with the delegate, talking about schools, studying,



>Unmoderated Caucus

As a press-slash-chair, I was immensely proud of the delegates, but for different reasons. As a press, I was concerned when I saw the delegates confused and unable to determine the direction of their discussion. As I took note of the progress of the committee, however, I realized that the delegates were learning from their mistakes. In session two, the chairs threw in the story of a spy, who deleted the CCTV file and ran away with the embryo. I was taking notes of the discussion, expecting the delegates to be thrown off into a different direction. I was pleasantly proven wrong, however, when the delegates themselves

corrected the purpose of their moderated caucus, and argued that “the true purpose of this committee is to execute the I.Rex.”



and other subjects until I felt comfortable asking about this committee. Later, I was truly touched and proud when the delegate stepped up courageously and commented during the moderated caucus. Though there were no dramatic changes in that delegate's rate of participation, I was simply thankful at the fact that the person was trying. We were proud to be chairs that not only led the committee, but each delegates in it.

The two days of conference was extremely quick and exhausting, but it was again a conference that reminded me of the reason I've been doing Model United Nations for 5 years. I had two different name tags around my neck throughout the conference. One read: Jurassic World 'Chair,' the other read Jurassic World 'Press.' The two roles were very different from one another, but they were both an important contribution to the committee. I complained to people, saying that I had too much to do, but now I am sincerely grateful that I could be in the unique position of experiencing the two roles at the same time. I am even more thankful that I was not eaten by the dinosaur.

JOURNALIST: Olivia Moon
jwmoon19@kis.ac

GECMUN IV

UNODC

In Defense of Narco-Terrorism

Taejoon Kim

3 March, 2018- "Progress, perseverance, and hope for future. If only these three words were simple enough to implement." The GECMUN IV's UNODC (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime) conference started with a self-reflective speech from the delegate of Spain, Joshua Isleta. On March 3 and 4, delegates around the world were gathered to discuss about possible measures in which UNODC could take to put illicit drug trafficking and narco-terrorism in Central America to an end.

With an ever-increasing access to drugs, the alarming rate of illicit drug trafficking has posed threats to human lives, national development and security. On a more depressing note, the narco-terrorist organization, defined as an organized group that participates in drug trafficking in order to fund politically motivated terrorist activities, has emerged as a new threat. In the fight against such illicit terrorism, drugs, and crime, the UNODC has operated in all regions of the world through an extensive network of field offices since 1997.



>Delegate of China discussing the importance of Rehabilitation Program

During the two sessions of the conference, the delegates were passionate about the topic in question, highlighting the importance of education and funding as main mechanisms towards prevention of drug trafficking, followed by narco-terrorist activities. "Education is the most foundational rudiment that can prevent the narcoterrorist activities," declared the delegate of China, Amy Cho.

On the other side of the coin, distinguished delegate Youju Ko, from Equador, talked about the imminent threat posed by narco-traffickers in South American border countries; she went further as to raise awareness on border security. Delegate Ko's claim on border security, in support of other countries like Spain, was responded with a rebuttal by the delegate of Germany, Venessa Shim. Delegate Shim claimed that "border security is not the only problem in this contemporary virtual world, where everything is intertwined by internet." She went further to stress the importance of education.

In his turn, delegate of Dominican Republic, Daniel Kim declared that instead of solely focusing on border securities and education, delegates should also consider possible benefits of drug legalizations. He reasoned his claim by posing possible economic breakdown ensued by mass unemployment of current drug legalizations. In pacifying delegate Kim's concern, delegate of China, Amy Cho made a suggestion to implement rehabilitation



> Delegate of Germany stresses the point of educating narco-traffickers in developing countries

JOURNALIST: Taejoon Kim
tjkim18@kis.ac

GECMUN IV

program that would aid and provide guidance to narco-traffickers and drug manufacturers in the third countries.

After a long heated debate, the delegates came to an agreement to reinforce border security, along with the endorsement of inter- and mutual-border agreement, as a short-term goal to prevent illegal trafficking and narco-terrorism and to increase investment in quality education system, adopted by that of Germany, and rehabilitation program as a long-term goal. The delegate of China and Spain were responsible for writing and submitting the resolution paper concerning the short-term goal and the delegate of Germany was responsible for the latter.



UNSC

Taking Matters into Our Own Hands

Anneke Lee

The world's police. The International protectors. The warriors of the wind and sea. The UNSC. For decades, the protective stability of the global population has rested in the hands of the United Nation's very own security council. Dealing with wars, attacks, and terrorism of all kinds, our council of intangible soldiers has protected us kindly, and with no ulterior motive. Today, they tackled the most critical and threatening issue, that, if left unattended, could sprout into an uncontrollable weed of war, beckoning all nations to participate in a fight that could lead the world into mass genocide and destruction: The North Korean Nuclear Missile Threat.

Also known as the Korean Cold war, The DPRK's Nuclear Weapon Threat has been an ongoing issue since 2016 when the DPRK sparked tension with not only South Korea but with the US by launch testing its first intercontinental nuclear missile into the East Sea (also known as the Sea of Japan). Ever since then it has continuously (and publicly) launch tested different types of nuclear weaponry, creating a dreadful show of its military power and as a result pressuring the US and South Korea to increase their military power and missile defense. Concerns, across the full global population, were further increased when tweets and interviews were released that recapped the icy communication between President Trump and President Kim Jung-un.

Despite the now critical situation we have, with two of the most powerful leaders (capable of destroying our world with their nuclear powers) throwing immature insults and childish names at each other (like missiles of mistrust), the UN has yet to confront this issue. Only now, after we have recognized that something needs to be done and that the most powerful nuclear and atomic weaponry is in the hands of arguing Tykes of seemingly low intelligence, have we, the adolescents of the International Community, decided to take matters into our own hands. It's time for the UNSC to become a little less intangible.

Starting off our world-changing discussion was the Delegate of the UK, expressing their support of communication and negotiation between the DPRK and other countries, stressing how important it is that most of these meetings must take place with China present and/or lead by a Chinese Government Delegate or representative. They also began a discussion regarding proactive measures against weapons in the DPRK where, for the first time, the country's delegates expressed their opinions on the matter. Multiple countries



such as Japan, Ethiopia, and the US stated their prepared solutions and ideas. Following the UK, the delegate of USA declared their belief that present military action-specifically including all allied forces (now including China, Russia, and Japan) cooperating and ‘fighting on the front lines together’ would be the most effective approach as they believed strongly that any peaceful approach to confronting North Korea was and is currently past our International capabilities. Following this, within a Moderated Caucus motioned by the delegate of the UK to ‘discuss economic sanctions’ (a counter-proposal to the US’s aggressive suggestion), the discussion began.

The UK delegate, starting again with their thoughts and opinions, looked kindly upon economic sanctions as a peaceful nonthreatening alternative to military action. However, met with the voiced agreements of the other delegates, the UK believed that the current sanctions in place were lessening tension or changing the situation whatsoever. She (the UK delegate) concluded with the declaration that new sanctions must be created and imposed with the goal and purpose of motivating the DPRK to reduce and eventually cease their weaponry-testing. This too was met with agreement, the Chinese Delegate even noting that he wished to sever ties with Korean Businesses in an attempt to internally suffocate the DPRK’s resources, preventing them from having the ability to produce further weaponry. This same point was repeated multiple times throughout the sessions and was thought of realistically, but was always met with the civil response that cutting off North Korea’s Trade entirely would negatively impact not only the DPRK’s ability to produce weaponry, but also their economy, and by default their citizens.



Multiple Country’s delegates noted that large portions of North Korea’s population were already struggling with starvation and disease due to their government’s minimal support in the way of meeting basic human rights. If sanctions against North Korean trading rights were implemented, their ever-growing infant (and premature adult) mortality rate would double, collapsing their already fragile internal infrastructure and possibly causing a cataclysmic civil war within North Korea that would destabilize their nation further. The Japanese delegate, being one of the main supporters of a peaceful resolution with the DPRK, was the first to vouch for a compromise that would eventually become a defining part of their written resolution.

Together, through several Unmoderated and Moderated discussions, the delegates decided that instead of severing ties with all North Korea’s trading partners regarding all products traded, that they would implement a sanction preventing North Korea from manufacturing, trading, buying, and selling chemicals used for the production of weaponry (such as uranium). China specifically supported this resolution, which, as the delegate of Ethiopia made clear, was the most important reinforcement they had as China was one of North Korea’s main trading partners (even their government alone discontinuing trades would create a major impact on the DPRK’s economic growth and ability to produce weaponry). They also made clear, however, that this sanction would not restrict North Korea from trading human necessities, such as food, water, and coal (the delegates even discussed the possibility of gifting North Korea humanitarian aid(as long as they were certain it wouldn’t fall into the wrong hands) as a reward for complying with the sanction.

Some expert points made during this time were: ‘We do not know that all countries abide by sanctions implemented by the United Nations. Commanding North Korea to abide by our sanctions won’t ensure that they do in fact abide, as the UN knows little of what goes on in the very isolated DPRK region.’ ‘Constraining



them to follow rules that the delegates determine will only infuriate them and isolate them further, negatively impacting the Korea citizens(as they will have further decreased communications and knowledge of the world outside of North Korea’ -Delegate of Japan. ‘These sanctions should be enforced as they currently have been regularly avoided and broken by the DPRK’s government and their trading partners. For example, Cargo ships regularly make their way to Chinese parts despite sanctions preventing this. More firm and strict implementation of these sanctions will ensure that they are effective.’ -Delegate of Ethiopia.

Moving on from this Moderated Caucus, a motion for an Unmoderated Caucus passed ‘for the purpose of discussing the possibility of convincing the DPRK to trade less dangerous and threatening substances and how to prevent the production of weaponry in North Korea as to not only stop trade but lessen North Korea’s nuclear power’, although this title was significantly shortened.

During this Unmoderated Caucus, two interviews took place, one between the Press and the delegate of the United Kingdom and one between the Press and the delegate of China. The delegate of China, when asked about his thoughts on the matter of sanctioning the North Korean Government, was more interested in discussing the possibility of a full-scale investigation of the International Black Market (specifically regarding the DPRK and its trading of illegal merchandise).He hoped to share the details of this proposition with the other delegates, including but not limited to: the investigation of all trading countries and their impacts on the DPRK for the purpose of research that would eventually aid the UNSC in the creation and implementation of sanctions prohibiting the trade of nuclear material (or other hazardous materials that can be weaponized).

When asked a similar question, the UK confessed that they were interested in a more threatening approach to solving the common issue. Profusely indicating that the delegate did not wish to hinder the North Korea public in any way, they explain that their resolve preference was to possibly threaten the DPRK (using sanctions that ‘hit home’) into agreeing to attend a negotiation meeting, followed by the gifting of humanitarian aid or money (specifically for the bettering of the North Korean public) as a reward for considering (and eventually agreeing to) convert their nuclear power into nuclear energy as a sustainable way to raise their economy while simultaneously denuclearizing.

Following these discussions, students separated into two groups of approximately five, with separated notions of possible resolutions: Threatening and Non-threatening resolution. However, after discussing these topics in several unmoderated and moderated caucuses, we were given a surprise visit from the delegate of the DPRK and the delegate of Russia, who were emphatic (to say the least) regarding their thoughts and opinions of the sanctions and resolutions the council had previously planned.

The DPRK specifically claimed that the council was not allowing North Korea to participate in a plethora or discussions surely happening without the DPRK being notified. Therefore, as the delegate said, the UNSC was ‘Humiliating us’ and claimed (in exasperation) that they would ‘no longer be cooperating or negotiating with the council’. This intensified the otherwise dying discussion but unfavorably turned the topic away from a hope for sanctions against the DPRK (which the Delegate of North Korea all but destroyed).

Instead, the delegates found themselves hopelessly attempting to convince the Delegate of the DPRK that his claims were completely false and that his ‘great country’, as he called it, did not ‘thrive off of internal economic growth’(as this is nearly impossible; especially with the few natural resources the DPRK has at its disposal), but instead lived ‘hanging by the edge of its fingers’ off of other countries trading with it. During

one of the Delegates of Ethiopia’s moments of speech, threatened to impose sanctions on countries trading with the DPRK (that would ‘prevent economic growth’ in North Korea) if the Delegate and Government of North Korea did not begin cooperating. As the cycle of lies and corrections continued with no real end between the council and the Delegate of the DPRK, the staff and chair members started to realize that the DPRK’s participation was hindering rather than helping the discussion.

Ergo, the North Korean Delegate was called away. After this, the Delegates arranged into their two (Nonthreatening and Threatening groups) for an extended (nearly two hour) unmoderated caucus. Its primary purpose to allow the delegates to (in their respective groups) write out their two resolutions. They typed furiously to complete their resolutions. Working together as a group of delegates, a group of world changers, but at their barest, a group of adolescents.

Today, they solved the Korean Cold War from inside the GEC, but tomorrow, they will speak in the authentic UNSC, conquering Climate Change, World Hunger, Sexism, Racism and Poverty together as a collective group of intelligent new minds.

JOURNALIST: Anneke Lee
leeannekea01102@branksome.asia