



# Munificence

December 3rd

## Wrapping Up PAMUN 2017: A Word From the Press Team

By: Shouq Al Tamimi

The time has come for PAMUN 2017 to end as delegates wrap up their debates, finalise their resolutions and congratulate one another on their hard work. We would all like to congratulate the executive team, chairs, delegates, press team, and admin staff for all their hard work on this conference, as it wouldn't have come to fruition, or been successful without them.

Many delegates from all around the world have traveled to attend PAMUN; some for the first time while others have attend for many years in order to contribute to today's modern society and resolve world issues.

This conference wouldn't have happened without the hard work and determination of the director Ouriel Reshef, who has devoted his time and efforts in order to build this conference from the ground up, and give international students like us a chance to participate and enjoy the magic of coming together to solve worldwide issues. These Delegates help move towards a new world order and tackle problems that surround us, and this enriching experience allows them

to understand how the UN works and to be more knowledgeable about their surroundings. It is safe to say that each of these delegates is now aware of the ways in which they can make changes to carve a path to a better world.

These past three days have been a journey for many of the participants in PAMUN as it has created a sense of family and a home for these delegates. The delegates have gotten a chance to communicate with one another and create friendships through this experience, and the resolutions show the efforts of delegates working together to come up with the best solutions to their issue. PAMUN has taught delegates that this is not just a regular conference, but a way in which the future generation is able to lead and acquire the knowledge that will guide us to a new world order. It has taught delegates that they should follow their goals and implement them in order to achieve a new world order. Just as Nicolas Julian said during his opening speech, "only those who dream greatly, can ever achieve greater".



Photo By: Eloïse Seager

# HRC: Reviewing and Updating the UDHR

By: Himani Someshwar

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) was adopted on December 10th, 1948. As of 2018, it will not have been updated for 70 years. As a response to offences committed by Nazis in World War II, the declaration aimed to guide member states in promoting human rights. Yet, during the course of the Cold War, this declaration was largely ignored by member states. Instead, propaganda was pushed onto the UN platform. The Human Rights committee debated and discussed the question of the effectiveness, validity and relevance of the UDHR. Although a number of clauses involving women's rights, internet use and medical care were passed, the majority of the proposed clauses failed. In response to this, a delegate from the committee said, "The UDHR is more like suggestions, not actions, and I don't think that many people take that into consideration. So, they start getting very picky with the clauses." The UDHR does not consist of directives, it only encourages the countries to follow certain rules. Two clauses, proposed by Australia and Finland, specifically sparked a lot of commotion and debate.

Australia's clause of 'All nations protect and respect the rights, land and resources of indigenous people.' was met with a combination of negative and positive responses. China and Honduras disagreed with this article because of the 2007 release of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Since this article pertained specifically to indigenous people, they begged the question of why this should be included in a document for everyone. The delegate argued that they were debating the question of relevance of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and not rights specific to minorities. Honduras asserted that minorities are but one portion of the large sect of the hu-



man race as a whole. New Zealand supported this clause, backing up their argument by utilising pathos through speaking about indigenous children that are put up for adoption. When it came to voting, the result was met with the room echoing in sighs because the clause failed by a single vote.

Finland's article, "Everyone shall have access to the worldwide web and benefit, to the best of each country's capacity from digital development" was defended by France, using the 21st century global outlook to support their statement. Portugal on the other hand disagreed, listing dangers of the internet including bullying and cyber-terrorism as support for their argument. The delegate asserted that promoting an article like this, promotes the use of these means. However, the clause did pass by the end of the committee to the sound of the applause, heard throughout the Maison de la Mutualité.

# In the Courtroom: United States v. Islamic Republic of Iran

By: Hugo Ward

*The 2017 International Court of Justice case for PAMUN is the case of “United States v. Islamic Republic of Iran: Concerning Certain Iranian Assets.” For this case, the government of Iran is suing the government of the U.S.A. for what it believes to be an unlawful freezing of its assets.*

So what does “United States v. Islamic Republic of Iran” concern? Following several terrorist attacks that claimed to have been sponsored by the government of Iran, the United States government froze assets of the the Central Bank of Iran (a.k.a. the Bank Markazi) held in an account in the state of New York. The total assets frozen are estimated to this day to equate about \$1.75 billion.

The Iranian government protests this. Under the U.S. Freedom from Sovereign Immunities Act, foreign states enjoy immunity from lawsuits. The council of the government of the United States has, however, noted that the FSIA includes an exception for those seeking to sue a government accused of state-sponsored terrorism. Despite further appeals by the government of Iran, the United States Senate added a section to a 2012 bill, applicable only to the case of Bank Markazi v. Peterson, stating that plaintiffs could not follow through with their claims. This section 8772 has served as evidence for the council of Iran. In the case of “United States v. Islamic Republic of Iran,” the council of advocates representing the government of Iran argue that this is a breach of the American separation of Constitutional powers.

When asked by our reporters about the prospects of a verdict, ICJ president Joseph Hilditch says there is no clear sign of consensus.

“This case is very contentious and because there

are so many intricate elements of the case that need to be considered by the judges I do not think we can make any prospective until [Sunday] morning. Even then, I expect it will be very contentious because it does seem like the court is quite split on how to respond to this case.”

Following a revision of evidence behind closed doors, the council and judges concluded questioning their witnesses on Saturday evening.

Despite no clear sign of agreement between judges in the room, it is clear that the court has made significant progress since the first round of questioning. Although the chances of unanimity remain doubtful, the hope remains that the court will manage to reach a timely and decisive verdict.



Photo By: Eloïse Seager

# The Question of the Regulation of Electronic Commerce

By: Shouq Al-Tamimi

The ECOSOC committee used the first day of the conference to debate the question of regulation on electronic commerce and banking. Ecommerce and E-banking are methods for business, or commercial transaction, that involves the transfer of information through the internet. This method is widely used around the world however is yet to be implemented in LEDC as well as have consumer protection for online buyers. This is because some countries don't have the money or the access to these methods, making it hard for development. One of the clauses that was submitted called for the creation of the UN financial technology firms committee under the UN economic and social council. Composed of willing member states and working alongside the IMF and the world bank, these firms would meet semesterly with the aim of favoring international discussion on the matter of fin. techs to achieve collaborative process on the issue.

The debate in the ECOSOC committee tended to be very active as heated arguments between the delegates arose. The delegates seemed to have extensive knowledge about the topic which made them quick in answering questions and coming up with explanations defending their point of view. The chairs were also able to maintain a really focused and relaxed mood in which delegates felt comfortable to talk in. People were participating and engaging upon the different solutions that are needed to tackle the issue. One event in particular that happened throughout the debate was that the delegates would argue with one another and create a discussion during the POI's in order to defend their topic. The chairs later told them that they should refrain from discussing with one another as it is not apart of PAMUN procedure.

The delegates however, were still eager to go up against one another to prove their point. One delegate stood up to criticise what three other delegates stood for and said "do the delegates of Georgia, Kazakhstan and Russia actually care about the world?" as if their crucial words against this resolution showed that they do not have the best intentions. Following that the delegate of Kazakhstan debated against the resolution and said it did not mention half of the issue they were trying to resolve. As a retort one of the delegates stood up and said "was the delegate awake during that clause?" since it was actually mentioned in the resolution.



Photo By: Eloïse Seager

# Interview With DSG Serena Capilla Murphy

By: Lenoy Christy

*What keeps you coming back to MUN and PAMUN?*

Regarding MUN, it's probably the extreme competition. I know a lot of people complain about how the competition makes MUN a hostile environment, but in my opinion that's a lot of the value. The competition of MUN forces even the shyest of delegates to progress and operate outside of their comfort zone. It also is a very good simulation, in a lot of ways, of future academic and professional environment. Every single MUN conference forces development in all the participants in some way and the impact of that cannot be understated. Even if a delegate only ends up making one point of information, that's enough to give them more confidence when speaking in public in other contexts and in the future. Of course, this stress-centric method of improvement might be too much for some and some find the environment too hostile to be helpful. I think that PAMUN has tackled that by allowing ad hoc, or clause by clause debate. It's not a whole committee of people fighting to be the main submitter of one of the two or three resolutions; rather, it gives everybody a chance to submit something and participate in some way. It also allows people to attempt to solve multiple facets of an issue or try to solve the different issues on the agenda. The versatility of our debate format is probably what has kept me coming back to PAMUN.

*Do you feel the conference has changed at all from the previous years?*

I feel like in recent years PAMUN has undergone a few changes due to circumstances out of anyone's control, but now that it's settled and found its niche, so to speak, I think it's in a really good place. Given the scheduling and venue issues of previous years, I feel that the conference has found its footing and it shows. I'm sure everyone has noticed the exceptional level of debate and participation in this year's conference. I think that's a combination of factors: the new features like bloc politics and clause specialisation that allow for more cooperation and participation, the venue's team's efficiency, and the quality of chairs



Photo By: Eloïse Seager

and delegates that attended this year.

*To make some of the first year delegates feel a little bit better, what was a particularly embarrassing memory from your first year?*

I can't recall anything particularly embarrassing that ever happened to me because I either err on the side of caution or devolve into unapologetic shamelessness, but I do recall a girl I was acquainted with, who shall go unnamed, who had a bit of an embarrassing moment in committee. The topic was sexual violence during war in volatile regions and a clause was introduced that proposed measures to prevent the spread of STD's (STI's now). The delegate got the floor and made an impassioned speech about how the spread of STD's should be encouraged at all costs. She really emphatically declared that every person on earth had the right to have STDs: the delegate misunderstood what an STD was and thought it was a method of birth control. That was a pretty awkward moment for her.

# Inside the Special Conference

By: Ahmed Dadabai

The Special Conference Committee is aimed at discussing the future of Europe and the detrimental factors that come with dealing with that specific future. With a number of delegates of lesser quantity, this group had 28 delegates. One delegate emphasized that "a small group is better to work with" and another delegate states that there were "no notable disagreements between delegates". The delegates agreed that their fellow peers shared "incredible work and ideas" and that "it was a pleasure to work with these several nations". The chair stated that the discussion was "lots of fun", and that he was quite pleased with the level of debate these delegates illustrated.

The group reviewed a number of clauses and amendments within their resolution, including: the Atomic Energy Community, Migration policies, European foreign student programs, and the need to recognize security and defense groups. An example includes a clause where member states are required to raise the price of cigarettes by 10 euros in order to fight lung cancer and develop a better health budget. The delegate representing Italy started the discussion by stating that nations should consider regulating smoking in areas such as indoor locations and while driving, since "more people are willing to follow regulations than have their consumer rights violated." It was also argued that raising

prices of cigarettes may lead to the formation of black market dealings at cheaper prices. While a delegate argued that, "Blindly raising prices will be detrimental to low income families" and "Only the rich will have a privilege to smoke", another delegate spoke out about obesity and how it tied into withdrawal symptoms of cigarettes, but it was cleared that "random cases of [obesity] should not be taken into consideration for the specific intent of ignoring the main issue." These kinds of discussions about the various clauses led to the discussion of the resolution. The delegates agreed that they "need this resolution to ensure the EU's future, but make some alterations such as: Reviewing of migration policies, as one clause does not outline all the issues." The delegates also claimed that this resolution contained "Innovative solutions to very complicated issues" and that they believe that these delegates "Will all shape our governments even if they do not decide to get into politics".

N F F O O Q L M B A L N A N Y W N K W R  
 S U C U A C O L B O E I D P B B M R O T  
 A I W D D K Y S J H V C V V D N X C L Q  
 R M F S O X T C Z N A K O T V Z O C K S  
 D S U S N E S N O C G H C N Q B J S F A  
 N E M R N L Z Z E U O N A E A W A J A L  
 T C L T I I V T R E T X T M J S J K Q Q  
 L N I E V U C L E X T G E D J U I H E R  
 H O A A G L I N S K E T N N B P D J E Z  
 N O R I A A U N O Z K N I E U E B G J S  
 J B Z U L H T L L J O J H M C S T F E Q  
 O Z S I Z U V E U I R C M A M W A U K Q  
 N E C F E J J M T A D M I N M O H M H V  
 Y M O M O F M C I I I R J B P S C X E U  
 V X S B Y C E C O O I Z T X U I R T N F  
 X V N B X J Q F N A Z J O T R N O U E N  
 Z H Z C B J D S H G B X E X J N E X U E  
 M E R O V C B C Y J E X E C U T I V E Q  
 B G S B R G Q P K H C Z K B R W Y U M Q  
 K P B E F Z Q H M S V W P X C Z Y G A K

ABSTENTION  
 ADMIN  
 ADVOCATE  
 AMENDMENT  
 CAUCUS  
 CHAIR  
 CLAUSE  
 COMMITTEE  
 CONSENSUS  
 DELEGATE  
 EXECUTIVE  
 GAVEL  
 JUDGE  
 JULIAN  
 NICK  
 OBJECTION  
 RESOLUTION  
 VETO

		<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>		
	<b>2</b>						<b>4</b>	
<b>7</b>								<b>9</b>
<b>8</b>				<b>9</b>				<b>4</b>
<b>6</b>			<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>			<b>1</b>
<b>5</b>				<b>6</b>				<b>2</b>
<b>3</b>								<b>5</b>
	<b>9</b>						<b>7</b>	
		<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>		