



The Delegation

2014.6.14



The official newspaper of GAIC-MUN

Introducing the future diplomats! Future diplomats showed up in the podium: GAIC MUN 2014

2014.6.13, Jaeho Lee(Press Corp)



▲Photo of chairs and delegates at the Opening Ceremony of GAIC MUN

GAIC MUN 2014, Gyeonggi Academy International Conference Model United Nations, was firstly held in June 13th at Daekyo HRD center, under auspices of GAFL(Gyeonggi Academy of Foreign Languages) and sponsored by Daekyo World & Youth Foundation. Students participate as Secretariat, Chairs, Delegates, Journalists, and Staffs in this Model United Nations. What was special about this conference is that Students from Japan, China, and Singapore participated as Delegates with GAFL students. The opening ceremony was held including the congratulating speech of the former Minister of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Sung Hwan Kim. The conference consisted of 4 committees, General Assembly (GA), Security Council (SC), Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), and International Court of Justice (ICJ). The delegates stated the stances regarding that is being occurred across the globe in the status quo as they were the representatives of the allocated countries all around the world. They both stated their arguments and criticized others' in order to deduct the best resolution about the agenda. There was no hesitation to them in communicating with other delegates fluently in English.

Interviews:

Seungmo Gu: The Delegate of South Africa (ECOSOC)

Q. Nice to meet you! Where are you from?

A. I'm from South Africa...Oops, don't take this too serious. Actually I'm from Gyeonggi Academy of Foreign Languages (GAFL) and I'm a first grader, majored in Chinese.

Q. Is GAIC your first MUN? Could you tell me your past MUN careers?

A. Actually, I don't have any experiences in MUN, so GAIC is my first experience and I'm bit nervous now.

Q. What was the most interesting thing you have experienced during the conference?

A. I was really surprised because many students who are in similar age with me brought up with brilliant ideas dealing the agenda with their talented English skill.

Q. What are the difficulties you have faced during the conference?

A. First, even though I have a good idea, I couldn't state it actively because of my poor English ability. So I determined that I should read more newspapers from now on to get lots of information about the global issues.

Q. What is your determination for this conference?

A. Many friends of mine who have attended in MUN, told me that MUN is really fun, and if you participate more and more, you can improve your English and develop your opinions about the world issues. I should communicate more with participants to improve my English skills and thinking ability.

Jiyeon Lee: The delegate of France (General Assembly)

Q. Is GAIC your first MUN? Could you tell me your past MUN careers?

A. This is my third MUN. My first MUN was GAMUN(GAFL MUN), and YMS(Youth Model Summit) was my second.

Q. What do think are the differences between GAIC and other MUNs?

A. I think students from other countries participate in this MUN which has international committees, I believe that it is very unique experience for the delegates who participate in this conference.

Q. Why did you join GA among other committees?

A. Actually I don't have any experiences in other committees, but because General Assembly talks about the most general and most common sources, I was attracted because it had a lot of things in it.

Q. What do you think is the key to deduct the best resolution regarding to the agenda?

A. I think that the best thing is the analysis of the status quo. We should analyze the status quo to deduct the best resolutions.

Hyeri Lee: Staff (ECOSOC)

Q. How come you have applied for the GAIC staff?

A. Since the GAMUN Spring Session opened, I wanted to apply for it, but I am not that good at English so I wanted to apply as a staff that I can make some experiences and it will be good for me in the next time when I attend other MUNs.

Q. What do you think is the staff's role in the conference?

A. I think staff's main role is passing notes and helping overall conference to flow smoothly.

Q. What do you think is the most difficult thing in the staff's role?

A. It is exhausting because I have to stand all day long, but I think it is worth doing.

Q. What do you think is the advantage while working as a staff?

A. First of all, I can be in a very good relationship between other staff members, and also I can learn many things about global issues by listening the delegates' opinions in the conference.

The official newspaper of GAIC-MUN **The Delegation**

ICJ Day 1 predicts possibly bright output

Eden Jang

The current issue of whaling of Japan in the Antarctic oceans has led the International Court of Justice to be opened. The delegates of this mock trial-form committee focused on two major issues: first to decide whether the member states of the international society should penalize the Japanese government, and the methods to prevent imprudent whaling in the future. The former issue was concluded that Japan should be punished by strict laws due to the overwhelming majority of the delegates' agreement. The general flow of the conference concentrated on the prevention of whaling, confirming the fact that the action undoubtedly violates animal rights.

Above all the points that the delegates have stated, several ideas were distinguishable and were practical. First and foremost, the delegate of USA has set three main purposes of whaling as traditional, scientific,



and commercial purposes. The delegate further elaborated that whaling done for traditional purpose were the remaining customs of several cultures, scientific purpose as whale hunting done for research and experiments, and finally the commercial as the action done for benefits purely for human beings. The delegate of Lithuania supported the idea by emphasizing the importance of prioritizing one of the three aims, which would efficiently lead to an effective solution for whaling. Another point was made by the delegate of the United Kingdom, which was to establish an international organization for the regulation of whaling, with specified policies compared to the one present, the International Whaling Committee. The delegate's idea was that even though Japan is currently involved as the member state of the organization, the people violate the regulations set from the community. With a newly created organization with further restricted rules, the chance that this crisis could be alleviated through time and cooperation slowly surfaced.

The delegates of the ICJ pondered over the ideas and are currently working on their resolutions. They maintained a peaceful atmosphere, listening attentively to each other's opinions and not being aggressive when contradicting each other's arguments. The first session discussing the first agenda was done in a polite and respecting manner, which shows optimistic signs of tomorrow's sessions and the process of passing the resolutions.

Talks on Culture – General Assembly

Hee Jung Yoon



Artifacts. These are not just pieces of old-fashioned pottery, but cultural heritages reflecting each region's distinctive characteristics, often linked to everything from religion, spirit, politics, just as culture acts as a bowl of everything of humanity. Owing to this, artifacts as cultural heritages often spawn disputes between nations over the possession of them. Currently, repatriation of artifacts has been a global issue. On June 13, 2014, GAIC (Gyeonggi Academy International Conference) took place in Daekyo HRD Center. There were 4 committees and out of these 4, the General Assembly (GA) dealt with the issue of artifact repatriation: Returning Artifacts to the country of origins. Since a notion of possession

of culture is amorphous and blurring, the issue brought out disagreements among delegates. In these disagreements, there were a lot to ponder about for better comprehension of humanity

At the beginning of the GA's general speaking and moderated caucus, a reason for repatriation and responsibility for it were main issues. While the USA, United Kingdom, Turkey, Nigeria, Mexico and several other nations agreed on repatriation of looted artifacts during the world war, United Kingdom, a nation that possesses lucrative The Great Britain Museum, was against the repatriation.

The main key word here is 'cultural internationalism' cited during interviews with delegates during the unmoderated caucus. Whereas the USA opposed cultural internalization by saying it parallels the result of colonialism, the UK agreed on this by differentiating it with colonialism. The delegate of the USA mentioned that the UK's efforts to restore looted artifacts in giant museums are to justify its colonialism. Thus, the USA strongly urged the need of UN engagement in repatriation of looted artifacts. The UK, however, clearly agreed on cultural internationalism by citing the vulnerability of the current world. According to the UK, it is the duty of countries to save precious artifacts from battlefields. Plus, the UK drew a clear line from colonialism, referring it as a one-sided act and cultural internationalism as acts for the sake of whole nation by preserving artifacts.

Blaming responsibility for plundering artifacts was not a major concern. According to the delegate of Russia Federation, every nation can both loot and get looted and should rather understand each nation. Russia claimed on giving

incentives to countries engaged in repatriation and emphasized the efforts to go forward to future with constructive solutions.

The issue at the beginning seemed to lean on one side: nations should repatriate plundered artifacts. The delegates of many nations started on building up practical solutions for repatriation. Solutions for it divide into two: first short-term solutions, second long-term solutions.

For short-term solutions, funding for infrastructures of preserving artifacts, constructing a new UN branch such as TPC, banning black markets have come out. Funding necessarily brings out a question, what nation should bear responsibility for the cost? While the USA weighed emphasis on using giant museum profits, the UK tried to escape from that liability by citing the museum's short income. For constructing a new UN branch, the delegate of France suggested TPC; an organization consists of cops exterminating black markets and criminals engaged in it. According to France, TPC had numerous successful results in bringing back artifacts. Nations supporting construction of new branch like TPC are now reorganizing their ideas in a resolution. Finally, the banning of black markets has also emerged as short-term resolution. At the beginning of the session, this was not heavily considered by many nations except Turkey. However, as the phase entered a framework for repatriation, Turkey persuaded other nations that banning black market matters a lot. Turkey claimed that black market is an only source of smuggled artifacts and must be blocked for preservation of artifacts. The delegate further specified the plan by suggesting museum verify whereabouts of items and delegates of the US, Russia agreed on this.

At the end of the session, many delegates started to contemplate on long-term solutions for capability of nations receiving repatriated artifacts. This does not mean short-term solutions are unnecessary, rather it means that long-term solutions should follow after implementations of short-term solutions. What suggested as possible long-term solutions was enhancing awareness of civilians for looted artifacts. Specified ways to achieve this include education held by archaeologists, curators and volunteering and all of this under UN administration.

Delegates are now writing resolutions for the agenda and these would include contents after lobbying. Since practical achievement mainly derives from practical and detailed resolutions, considerate and constructive resolutions are required for each delegate.

EXCLUSIVE: Interviews with delegates

Thamin Yun

The General Assembly, dealing with returning artifacts to the country of origin, debated on where the artifact shines most. The delegate of UK stated that the artifact shows its value when it is safe and secure, while many other nations rebutted this by mentioning the cultural and historical value. This is an interview with the delegates of United Kingdom, France, Congo, Turkey, and United States of America.

Interview with the delegate of United Kingdom

Q1. What is the UK's main stance?
The United Kingdom is doing the duty of many other nations by protecting the artifacts. If the France and United Kingdom just send the artifacts back, regardless of the situation, it will be a total disaster. Therefore the UK and France believe that some of the national presenting could be sacrificed.

Q2. If the countries improve their capability of protection, does the delegate still think that UK should keep keeping the artifact?
It seems like other delegates are ignoring the fact this delegate has mentioned in the first place, that the UK will give back the artifact if the country is capable enough.



If the nation is capable, of course the United Kingdom will give the artifact back to the Origin.

Q3. What is the standard of 'Capability'?

There is no exact standard. It needs to be viewed by themselves. Actually the United Nations should give the countries technology and funding to make the nation secure the artifact, not just giving it right away. In the long term, it will not work.

However, the capable country should not have a 1% risk of spoiling the artifact.

Q4. Do you believe there are any countries on the similar stance with UK?

This delegate believed that France is on the similar stance with the United Kingdom.

Interview with the delegate of France

Q1. What is France's main stance?

We agree with many other countries like the USA. If the country is capable of preserving the artifacts, the artifacts should be returned to the origin.

Q2. Many countries are actually mentioning France along with UK. What do you think about that?

There are similarities between France and the UK. However, France is more cooperative with other countries than the UK is.

Interview with the delegate of Congo

Q1. What is Congo's main stance?

Because the origin country has the right and esteem for the artifacts, artifacts should be returned. Also, the profits earned by using the artifacts should also be returned. Our nation expects the help from the UNESCO for future development.

Interview with the delegate of United States of America

Q1. What is USA's main stance?

The USA does have some past faults, but the nation is regretting that. And USA believes that the artifact should be turned back to the origin.

Q2. Can you explain the resolution?

Financing aid, making database, holding conventions for cooperation and prevention, Tackling black market and raging public awareness are some of the expecting resolution.

Q3. If the nation got back the artifact, but mistreated it, what solution should be held?

The primary right is to preserve the artifact itself. But if that situation happens, it is a time the United Nations should intervene.

Interview with the delegate of Turkey

Q1. What is Turkey's main stance?

Many of Turkey's artifacts have been lost. In this circumstance, this delegate believes that the artifacts should be turned back to righteous owners.

Q2. What would your nation do if all the artifacts are retrieved?

Still, many other countries would not have retrieved their own artifacts. Therefore the nation of Turkey will actively help other nations to get their artifact back. Also, Turkey will build sustainable system to preserve the retrieved artifacts.

Q3. If your nation doesn't keep the artifacts not very properly, do you believe they should be sent to another nation or it still needs to be kept?

The nation of Turkey will try its best to prevent that situation. However, if that situation happens, the artifact would be sent to the United Nations for management, not a certain country.

The official newspaper of GAIC-MUN **The Delegation**

Passion Equals Success

Phil Jin Sang

As a member of the Press Corps, I chose to attend the first session of the GAIC MUN with members from the Security Council. I decided to choose the committee since I felt a twinkle of curiosity popping out of my head when I saw the agenda which was "Addressing the situation in the Crimea".

This event had happened very recently and had been on the newspapers all around the world, becoming the center of attention for all the people on Earth. Well, maybe not Greenland. Anyways, I was wondering what sort of creative solutions would be derived from the delegates of this year's GAIC MUN. As I listened and talked with a few delegates during the session of 3 hours, I noticed the delegate of Russia participating very passionately. Therefore, I decided to approach him during the Lobbying Session.



Phil: Well Hello?

Dylan/Russia: Hi.

Phil: Nice to meet you. I was present during the session of Security Council and wanted to interview you.

Dylan/Russia: Oh really? Okay.

Phil: Thank you. So, what did you think about the discussion today?

Dylan/Russia: It was pretty good. But I was disappointed that some of the delegates did not participate in the debate. I wanted to hear the different opinions of many delegates. However, at the same time, delegates such as those of USA, ROK and France were actively participating in the debate, resulting in a more fruitful discussion.

Phil: Oh, that's nice. So what did you think was the most important point of discussion that was mentioned today? What was your opinion on the issue?

Dylan/Russia: There were 2 main points that were discussed today in the 3 hour session. The first one was the issue regarding the protection of minorities. The second was the issue of military intervention. Out of the two, I believe that the more important point of discussion was what to do with

the minorities living in the Crimea. The delegates of the United States and the Republic of Korea stated that the minorities should be respected. This delegate is also aware of the very fact that human rights should be protected. Therefore, I came up with a solution that was to give financial support to the minorities who would be migrating to other countries. Minorities, covering around 5%~7% of the population of Crimea, are showing dissatisfaction of the fact that the Crimea would be a part of Russia. So, the Russian government would give them financial aid to help them pack up their belongings in the Crimea, and settle for a new life in Ukraine.

Phil: Right.

I wanted to talk more with the delegate of Russia and have a deeper understanding of what he had in mind, however, the delegate told me that he had to go and help the others write the resolution. This made me understand how he was arduous about participating in the Security Council's discussions. I felt slightly regretful but I also felt excited at the same time, since I could not wait to see tomorrow's discussion with passionate delegates such as the one I interviewed today. I am very happy to say that these delegates would make the 2014 GAIC MUN, a success.