The term Aegean dispute refers to a set of interrelated controversial issues between Greece and Turkey over sovereignty and related rights in the area of the Aegean Sea. This set of conflicts has had a large effect on the relations between the two countries since the 1970s. Twice this has lead to crises coming close to the outbreak of military hostilities, both in 1987 and in early 1996.

The delimitation of the territorial waters, national airspace, exclusive economic zones are some of the issues of the dispute. Since 1998, the two countries have been coming closer to overcome the tensions through a series of diplomatic measures, particularly with a view to easing Turkey’s accession to the European Union. However, as of 2006, differences over suitable diplomatic paths to a substantial solution are still unresolved. Since the case has yet to come to a resolution, the MICJ will preside over the case and decide the rightful owner.

During the case proceedings, Greece was the applicant of the case. Greece started by saying that the MICJ has jurisdiction over this case because the dispute between Greece and Turkey that violates natural rights. Greece and Turkey brought this case to the MICJ because they would like a peaceful settlement. Greece feels that Turkey is violating the UN Charter by not allowing the nation all of her rights. Greece stressed that the MICJ should step in because Turkey will not extend the ten miles of territorial waters and national airspace. Greece feels that if they try to extend the territorial waters to ten miles, Turkey will declare war on Greece under the Law of the Sea Convention. Greece states that declaration of war would be violating the UN Charter and maintaining international peace and security. Greece ended the arguments by stating that the MICJ should recognize that the territorial sea limit should extend to twelve miles and the national airspace should be extended to ten
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Security Council sets agenda, opens debate

By Chris Lassiter
Co-Editor

AMUN Security Council convened with a roll call vote on the afternoon of November 17. Delegates attending from high schools across the state immediately began with a unanimous vote to set the agenda of the following topics in order: the Taliban in Afghanistan, North Korea, Darfur, Israel and Hezbollah, Iran’s nuclear program, global terrorism, and insurgency in Iraq. This year’s Security Council committee is chaired by Tim Hurley, co-chaired by Manuel Rapalo, with Legal Counsel Nick Cox, all students of the University of Central Arkansas.

Delegates began discussion and debate on forming a working paper concerning the Taliban insurgency in Afghanistan. Early efforts focused on educating the military of Afghanistan by groups such as the already present NATO forces, implementing elements as basic as literacy and extending as far as the cultivation of a political spirit. The representative of Ghana began authoring the working paper, with particular sponsorship from Argentina and the United Kingdom.

When drafted as a resolution, the paper was sponsored by Ghana and the United Kingdom and signed by Argentina and China. The resolution called for the education of the Afghanistan military with the goals of literacy and improved military defense. Upon seeing success in military education, the resolution suggested the same efforts be taken with regard to civilian populations. The resolution passed, and immediately the committee’s attention turned to the nuclear crisis involving North Korea. The delegate representing Ghana, student Katia Kotcherguina of Pulaski Academy, said she saw the committee going in circles and determined to sit down and write something. Furthermore, Ghana’s government is particularly concerned with Afghanistan insurgents crossing borders into Africa.

SPECPOL fails to reach consensus

By Seth Thomas
Staff Reporter

Delegates could not agree on the UN’s role in promoting democracy in developing nations. Whereas some debated specific policy options, others fiercely argued against UN endorsement of the Western-Influenced governing system.

Critics of resolutions establishing democracy were against UN support and funding of a particular form of government, noting inherent bias in this policy and the subversion of national self-determination. Cuba was most adamant against these measures, reminding delegates that efforts to spread democracy has caused violence and subverted the state’s capacity to govern itself.

Proponents explained to the delegation that democracy would never be imposed on a country outside of its people’s will, despite the self-evident economic and cultural benefits. Regimes bent on resisting mandates from the masses would not be tolerated.

While some delegates could agree on the basic principle of UN support for infant democracies, just how to implement a new political system in willing countries split votes even further. Resolutions A1 and A3 recommended creating committees and advisors to educate developing peoples on the benefits of democracy and how to implement it. UN aid would support rising democracies until the fledgling governments could stand on their feet. Another resolution (A2) advocated a divide-and-conquer strategy, carving the country along ethnic and historical lines and establishing regional autonomies.

Resolution A1 failed with a vote of 25 for and 18 against with 9 abstentions. Haiti and India felt that committees and advisors were unnecessary while Iraq noted that the resolution wasn’t strong enough. Resolutions A2 (8-41-2) and A3 (26-27-3) also failed.

The topic was tabled to discuss Peacekeeping reform at the time of writing.
OAS passes resolution unanimously

By Elizabeth Philpott
Co-Editor

After setting the order of agenda three separate times, the Organization of American States finally seems to have things together. Once setting the order of agenda, the committee decided to table their first topic of “agricultural subsidies and free trade in the western hemisphere,” to be discussed later in the conference.

Moving on to the next topic of “poverty, education and job creation,” the committee caucused, un-moderated, until reaching a consensus. The eleven countries in the committee, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Cuba, Ecuador, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Peru, United States and Venezuela, co-authored a working paper.

Unanimously, the countries collaborated and voted to turn their working paper into Resolution 1-1, which passed 11-0.

This resolution establishes the South American Public Works Organization (SAPWO). SAPWO will oversee all public works within all member states of the Organization of American States. SAPWO will be granted the authority to determine the importance of specific projects, thus determining the order in which the projects will be started. SAPWO will determine the importance of projects based on how much of an impact it will have upon South America as a whole. The South American Public Works Organization will obtain finances from the World Bank.

The committee will continue to work on the topic of “poverty, education and job creation.” Next, the committee will discuss their third, and final, topic of “regional integration in the Western hemisphere.”

The committee is chaired by Melissa Tuttle, of the University of Arkansas; co-chaired by Laura Stump, of the University of Arkansas; and the Legal Counsel/ Special representative of the UN Secretary-General is Ryan McCormack, of the University of Central Arkansas.

---

WHO creates subcommittee on healthcare

Essential healthcare and medicine was the subject of the World Health Organization’s first resolution to be passed. Conway High School as Canada, DeSoto Central High School as Liberia, and Russellville High School as Jamaica and Pakistan submitted resolution 1.A. with signatories Australia, Thailand, Vietnam, and Iraq.

Primarily the resolution creates a subcommittee of the World Health Organization designed to monitor and educate the global community on the “misuse and distribution of essential medicine to those with certain diseases.” NGOs such as Doctors Without Borders and the Red Cross are petitioned for funding and education materials. Responsibilities of said subcommittee are outlined as well as membership. The resolution concludes that the name of the newly created subcommittee be the Committee on the Monitoring of Misuse and on the Education about Essential Drugs (COMOMEED).

Presiding over WHO discussion is Chair Hassan Rayaz, Co-Chair Ari MacPherson, and Legal Counsels Murad Elsaidi and Lindsay Hampton, all of the University of Arkansas-Little Rock.

---

Have an opinion?

All AMUN participants are invited to submit letters to the editor or articles of their own for publication.

Please send all materials to:
modeltimes2006@yahoo.com
miles. Greece also wants the MICJ to recognize that Turkey’s threats are in violation of the UN charter. Greece states that under the Law of the Sea Covenant the 12 miles belong to them, but they want the MICJ to recognize their rights to the sea.

Turkey’s main argument is that the court does not have jurisdiction over this case. On reason there is no jurisdiction is that both parties must consent to the court to rule over the case. Also the court ruled in a 1978 case about the Aegean Continental Shelf that it does not have jurisdiction to the case and does not have jurisdiction now. Turkey also said that it did not sign the Law of the Sea Covenant so it is not bound by it. However, if the courts rule that they do have jurisdiction, then Turkey wants a ban on the territorial limitations and to see that the Aegean Continental Shelf rightfully belongs to Turkey.

After both sides made their arguments, the court had to make its decision. The first issue was whether or not the court had jurisdiction. The court made a 10-0 decision that they did in fact have jurisdiction over the case. One judge stated that when the court that didn’t have jurisdiction in the 1978 case, it was before that Law of the Sea was signed so the court does have jurisdiction. Then the court had to decide which side it favored. It was another unanimous 10-0 decision in favor of Greece. The court ordered Turkey to recognize the twelve miles of territorial waters and the twelve miles of airspace to Greece. The majority opinion was read by Judge Chris Young.

---

**ECOSOC debates, passes resolution on poverty**

By Seth Billingsley
Staff Reporter

After placing the eradication of extreme poverty and hunger at the top of its agenda for the conference, the Economic and Social Council openly discussed ways to fight global poverty and hunger. Initially, each country’s delegate spoke on their respective poverty levels and gave their opinions on the status of the first Millennium Development Goal. Micro-credit financing, dropping the debt of underdeveloped countries, encouraging primary education and expanding the role of non-governmental organizations in supplying aid were among some of the first ideas to come out of the several hours of caucusing by ECOSOC.

The resolution which came out of this caucusing was sponsored by the delegations of India, Nigeria, Tanzania, United Arab Emirates, Czech Republic, Belgium, Germany, Thailand, Haiti, Lithuania, Indonesia, Turkey, and Poland. The resolution began by asserting the United Nations definition of poverty as anyone “living on less than one U.S. dollar a day.” In describing the resolution, co-sponsor Jessica Craig, a delegate of Tanzania and a student from the Arkansas School for Mathematics, Science, and...
Tonight the Social and Humanitarian Committee decided to discuss the topic of National Disaster relief and aid.

From the opening comments many issues were clearly to be brought up. Greece’s delegate Will Quiyley called for all states to “give support so the effects of natural disasters will be taken effectively.” Others moved forward on the more specific. Liberian delegate Kanhun Malhatra pointed out the need for better communications, while Peru’s delegates brought the need for education to light. Honduran delegate Baily Carrol also included a mention of early warning systems.

After the delegates caucused, Nigerian delegate Amanda Johnson pointed to three points of confusion, namely, this: the consolidation of IDRLs, funding to local and regional organizations, and education on natural disasters.

After much caucusing, three draft resolutions were brought to the floor. The first draft resolution sponsored by Nigeria, Pakistan, Ecuador, and India called for a summit on the situation that would allow states to all come up with plans that would preserve a “uniform but localized” way of addressing natural disasters. This draft was voted down after many delegates question its ability to be long-term.

The next draft was sponsored by Peru, Jordan, Portugal, Ireland, and Liberia. This was an education focused draft that looked at training communities in how to handle disasters. Many said that this bill was too vague and was not qualified to do more than simply teach people “common sense.”

The third failed resolution was submitted by Canada, Argentina, Honduras, Benin, Philippines, Tanzania, Thailand, Cuba, Netherlands, Lebanon, and Algeria. This resolution called for aid budget standards and a sub-committee of SOCHUM to decide this. Unfortunately, the budget and educational specifics prevented this bill from being passed.

SOCHUM then decided to table the topic and move on to the issue of Child Soldiers. This is a problem being faced by many regions of the world. Yet, some like Cuba and North Korea seem to be embracing it.

ECOSOC from page 4

and the Arts, said, “We developed a sort of recipe that incorporated all the factors that influence poverty and how they could be solved.” The resolution did indeed include an array of long-term recommendations on poverty, which included educating people to control population levels, building an intricate system of micro-credit finance, and supporting the work of NGO’s to pinpoint specific regions of poverty within countries, instead of simply labeling an entire country as impoverished in order to determine better aid distribution.

The delegate from Nigeria to ECOSOC, Matt Swaim (Pulaski Academy), explained that “We felt strongly about education, micro-finance and the role of NGO’s in local situations in helping to eradicate poverty.” The resolution garnered general support, and it met with little resistance when it was adopted by a roll call vote of twenty-two approving countries out of a total of twenty-eight. The relatively small number of countries who were unconvinced on the resolution merely expressed their doubts with what they say as the vagueness of some of the resolution’s clauses.

Delegate Mehak Gupta, representing the United Arab Emirates, characterized the widespread approval of the resolution by saying, “I felt that we addressed a lot of important issues in terms of looking at causes of poverty/hunger and ways to alleviate poverty/hunger, especially the plan to create and monitor NGO’s on the national and local level that would lead to the eradication of poverty/hunger globally.”
ECOFIN encourages new foods market

In the Economic and Finance Committee of the 2006 AMUN, the first resolution to pass deals with genetically modified foods. The resolution was submitted by the following countries: Nigeria, represented by Pulaski Academy; Iraq, represented by Russellville High School; and Benin, represented by Little Rock Christian Academy. Signatories included Pakistan, Argentina, Jamaica, Czech Republic, Haiti, Saudi Arabia, Israel, Cuba, Lebanon, and Honduras.

The ECOFIN committee chose genetically modified foods over the promotion of sustainable eco-tourism and international development as well as the promotion of sustainable development energy resources in deciding their agenda. The resolution discussed and eventually passed “requests that the World Health Organization establish an agency for the research of genetically modified foods” to ensure safety and identification. It goes on to establish genetically modified food production agencies responsible for setting standards for international markets. Before closing, the private sector is strongly encouraged to coordinate efforts and echo support for an emerging global market.

Genetically modified foods have been advocated by many to hold substantial benefit to regions of the world with hostile agricultural conditions. Other potential benefits include increased production and higher yields for many farmers, particularly for those in developing countries. The Economic and Financial Committee acted on this promise for development in their adoption of Working Paper A.1.