

Saturday, October 21, 2012



**SLS
NOIDA**

SYM-MUN 2012

Close Call

Day II | Press Conference Issue



REBUTTALS!

Human Rights Council



Shagun Gupta Parthavee Singh

Syria - Self-sufficient enough to recover from possible international armed conflict?

The Press Conference for the current session of the Human Rights Council saw The United States of America missing in action. However, the nations of Syria, Russia and Iran, who have been the most active participants in the current debate, responded to the questions asked and although no convincing answers came across, quite a few critical concerns were clarified. In response to the question about the Syrian Government labeling rebels as terrorists in order to forward the legitimacy of the government, the delegate of Syria said, and we quote “The terrorists in our country are branded as rebels by the western Zionist regimes.” In an intelligent play of words, the delegate of Syria avoided comment on the question, however on being asked why the government has prevented the on-the-ground monitors of the UN Supervision Mission in

Syria and Special Procedures access to the victims of violence, the delegate reaffirmed that the government is ready to comply with all nations and UN authorities, and allow them access to certain parts of the country. However, the security of these very authorities has been a prime concern.

The Russian delegate fumbled over the government's stand regarding allegations that Russia has been supplying arms to Syria, and while he was unaware as to how long a government flight to Syria was intercepted by Turkish authorities, he also stated that Russia would be unwilling to disclose details of the flight to the international community. At the same time, Russia's prevailing strong stand against Washington's supply of mobile air defense systems to Syria comes across as perhaps a display of hypocrisy on

part of Russia.

Meanwhile, Iran's foreign policy, to our surprise, came across as highly dubious. On being asked if the nation would be willing to provide any form of support to Syria should war break out in the region, the delegate changed her stand thrice, moving from no support to economic support to eventually no economic support in a matter of 30 seconds. In her opinion, given the economic situation of Iran due to sanctions imposed, it would perhaps not be willing to give economic support, further stating that Syria is “self-sufficient enough to be able to recover on its own, since it has oil resources.” At this point, what remains to be seen is how the nations plan to come to consensus, as thousands of people continue to be killed in Syria as we speak.

Joint Crisis Committee

Coping with the Crisis: JCC responds



Pallav Kumar Singh Kunal Mishra

The JCC was convened under emergency circumstances yesterday. Sources tell us that the US military is coping with a sudden crisis, which till now has been kept classified. An interview with the President (USSOCOM) and President (USNSC):

Press: Sir, with regards to the current crisis in Afghanistan, would you like to comment on the current status of it. What crisis are we looking at right now? Secondly, how has the administrations' response been? Have we had any Presidential statements in this regard?

Chaitanya: There has been an escalation in the situation in Afghanistan, so preventive steps have been taken in this regard. There has been an increase in the opium trade and illegal trafficking.

Nirjhar: Sir, we have military presence in Afghanistan. What we basically need to provide them is a backup mechanism so that this escalation can be dealt with.

Press: Sir, there are unconfirmed reports of Russian involvement in the crisis. Can you define the Russian involvement? If yes, what is the extent?

Chaitanya: No official statements can be made in this regard.

Nirjhar: No comments.

Press: Sir, to what extent is the United States prepared to deal with the current crisis, understanding the fact that there are already troops deployed in the country and their withdrawal has been ordered? Secondly, does this crisis put pressure on the economy of the United States considering that as of now the US is already pumping a lot of funds into the war?

Nirjhar: Sir, what we know for a fact is that the Taliban is using violent means. We would like to say that we have adequate trust in the Afghanistan police; they are trying hard. The United States will do everything in its capacity to provide aid to Afghanistan.

Chaitanya: We have always been a peace loving nation. So we are looking forward to "negotiations" with the Al-Qaeda. We are definitely open to peaceful talks. We have evolved with time, and have been successful in bringing the perpetrators of 9/11 to justice.

Press: What is the status of development in Afghanistan, as we know that the troops are pulling out of the country. Can Afghanistan cope up with this?

Nirjhar: We are providing military aid. We are also sending envoys for political and social reconstruction.

Chaitanya: Social reconstruction is a gradual process. However, before we move out, our main aim is to empower the country.

Press: If at all the troops arrest a suspect considering there are no extradition treaty between US and Afghanistan, what protocol of investigation are we looking at?

Chaitanya: Sir, we would not like to comment considering the subjective nature of the situation. In case there is any arrest, we would request the Afghan government to cooperate with us in the extradition. That is all that can be said in this regard.

General Assembly



Anuja Malhotra



Utkarsh

SYMBIOSIS SYMPOSIUM – GA Responds

To USA: USA has been justifying the death of civilians in drone attacks by calling them “collateral damage.” Let’s consider a hypothetical situation, wherein X country attacks 100 civilians of USA and justifies them by calling them “collateral damage.” Would USA accept it? The terrorist attacks the lives of more than thousands of people and risks many more, so it is a precaution to eliminate terrorism from its roots. The collateral damage is for the long term benefit.

To Pakistan: Pakistan has been emphasising on how it does not consent USA to carry on drone attacks in their country, but still they indulge into bilateral programmes with them. Why don’t they take measures to stop the death of their civilians because of drone attacks?

USA and Pakistan are allies and have bilateral agreements. Both

of us are for a common cause: the war against terrorism. But, drone attacks are deemed as illegal by our government. Now, because of one issue, we cannot spoil our relations with the United States of America. We know that USA has a peaceful agenda, and we support it. We want to eliminate terrorism from our country, but not with the help of drone attacks. We are against drone attacks, but we support USA.

To USA: USA stated that if a country is unable to remove terrorism from their region, it is our duty and right to take measures to remove the terrorist activity. Do you mean to say that Pakistan’s government is incompetent?

The article 71 of the United States constitution gives us the right to attack the country without their consent if the aim is to cure terrorism prevailing in the region.

So, it comes under the Universal Jurisdiction to remove terrorist activities for the peace and welfare of the people. Therefore, it is our responsibility to eradicate terrorism from regions where the government is unable to do so.

To Iran: Delegate, when you spoke of how you want transparency to be there in the actions of USA, it seemed ironic to us. Can you please throw light on the transparency of your country regarding the nuclear weapons?

Iran had allowed IAEA to hold their investigation in our country, as and when they wanted. Iran is not like USA. We take into consideration the other country’s viewpoint. We have transparency in all our actions, as we follow the UN principles of peace and security. Therefore would want other countries to do the same.

Futuristic Security Council



Jai Khurana



Twesh Mishra

Sketching out an erratic world

The International Press attempts to uncover the transiting world scenario, identify the alternatives to present oil resources and delve into the intricacies of foreign policy.

To Germany: How do you justify the deployment of military ships that were directed towards the Middle East?

The presence of and directives issued to the military naval fleets in the Arabian Sea was a routine military exercise. They were returning from the horn of Africa and had just come to the Arabian Sea where the other vessels were stationed at that moment.

We are not trying to send any messages to the Middle East. As said by the delegate of Iran, the ships in the Middle East were simply there for exploration purposes. Since we too were involved in a routine exercise, we have no intentions of attacking or threatening Iran.

To China: Would China come out in defence for the Middle East in case tensions escalate in the Middle East?

The People's Republic of China would not abstain from undertaking any measures to guard the interests of our people. Setting up a military base in Iran is to ensure

international peace, to equip Iran and to negate the western influence in the Middle East. We are not indulging in a 'tit for tat' approach as a response to the United States of America; we have a very well defined foreign policy and undertake measures solely for the welfare of our people.

To Iraq and Saudi Arabia: How do the OPEC nations intend to cater to the rising demand and deteriorating supply of oil, considering the fact that the amount of oil in the Middle East is greatly depleting?

Drilling deeper into our present oil wells and exploring new reserves can be attempted in order to garner more oil from the Middle East. Since Iraq has been in a state of disarray for long, the oil resources in the country are yet to be catered to. There are 4 unexplored oil fields in Iraq and as of 2007, Iraq is digging out 3.2 million barrels per day and in 2017 is digging out nearly 7 million barrels of oil per day. Saudi Arabia's oil shale reserves combined with

the potential oil reserves in the Middle East would be proportionally satiating the world oil demand for another 20 years.

To Russia: What prompted Russia to attempt directive measures and discard diplomacy in the form of directing their ships to the Arctic? Is Russia taking advantage of the dormancy of the United States of America in world politics and accepting to express dominance by expressing military supremacy?

Russia has always said that on the grounds of the continental shelf, Russia extends its claim over the Arctic territory. Russia has also invested greatly into the region in order to trace the oil resources in the region and we cannot let these resources fall into the hands of the United States after we have invested heavily in identifying them. We do have faith in world diplomacy, but we do not wish to rely on it at the cost of our heavy investment and resources.

DISEC



Ridhi Singh



Amlan J. Das

“We are a very friendly country” - China

Most of the countries of the DIS-EC committee have been in the prime focus of various terrorist groups, particularly the NATO countries and even the countries that had their forces in Iraq. As these terrorist groups, particularly Al Qaeda are making statements about having access to Biochemical weapons, it becomes very essential for the threatened countries and also the victimized countries to act convincingly to prevent the proliferation of Biochemical weapons and also information to the terrorist groups.

Belgium has been a significant part of the coalition forces that were engaged in operations in Afghanistan. The reports say that during operations in Afghanistan, coalition forces found trace amounts of ricin and anthrax at five or six sites, as well as evidence of an interest in plague, cyanide, and botulinum toxin. A detailed explanation was sought from the delegate of Belgium in the DISEC committee about their findings, particularly about the proliferation source.

The Delegate responded quite diplomatically, not mentioning the name of any particular oppo-

nent; all it raised was a concern on the potential source of leakage of information, which was pointing to the government of a country not particularly named.

The same question was put forward to the delegate of Republic of Korea, which had received a potential threat from Al Qaida in 2005 to pull out forces from Iraq. And after the group made statements confirming access to Biological weapons, the preparedness and ingestion reports of the country were asked.

But the delegate plainly refused to name anything citing national security issue and some other obligations. All he was assured of was their preparedness to combat such an attack and said that the country is self sufficient in itself to tackle such problems.

The delegate of the United States was also asked to reveal their findings of Operation Anaconda in 2002 where they claimed to have unearthed an Al Qaeda biological weapons laboratory. But the delegate directly refused terming it classified information.

More questions were asked on reports of Pakistani bulk production of sophisticated Weapons of

Mass Destruction, i.e. the Biological Weapons. The deadliest factor in this latest development is that these weapons have already landed in the hands of extremists and they have started using them even during local fights. The US delegate replied with a controversial comment saying that they are on the threshold of classifying Pakistan as a ‘Terrorist State’.

The Chinese delegate was again at the receiving end, when she replied to the question asked on its support to the Syrian Government against the rebel groups. The delegate replied by saying that China is a very friendly country and likes to maintain harmony with international bodies. On being further asked about its veto regarding a UN sanction against the Syrian government, the delegate was quite firm with their stand and believed that China believes in no intervention in Syria, which obviously raised a lot of eyebrows. The delegate of United Kingdom was totally against it and believed that Syria can be a potential threat for world community and advocated in favor of sanctions.