COMMITTEE GUIDE

GLS

GLOBAL LEADERS' SUMMIT

Rosario Carranza & Daniel Nuñez

2022

Contents

Presidents' Letter

Esteemed global leaders,

We want to welcome you to this year's CCBMUN! Our names are Daniel Nuñez and Rosario Carranza, and we are both seniors at Colegio Colombo Británico. As avid MUN participants, both of us have long admired GLS for its uniqueness in both procedure and subject matter, and especially for its ability to allow delegates to confront problems and debates in a novel, challenging way. As your presidents, we hope to use our past experience as both presidents and delegates to make sure that your experience in the model is just as enriching as it has been for us.

The Global Leaders' Summit is a singular committee in the sense that it is not based on any real UN organism, but is instead a fictitious committee premised on the idea of allowing delegates to represent an important global leader from any point in history and joining these characters in order to debate complex modern-day issues. Because of this, there is a particularly high bar for our delegates as we expect you to immerse yourself in your leader and use your research on their life, historical context, and ideology to develop what you think their perspective would be on a topic today. Success in this committee is achieved by representing your leader as faithfully as possible whilst also participating in the debate in a relevant manner, having a good understanding of the issues discussed as well.

This kind of MUN committee might be slightly daunting to many delegates who are used to conventional procedure, but we encourage you to take this opportunity to challenge yourself with new kinds of representatives and debates, and to continue to grow as a delegate by gaining new skills in research and critical thinking.

We would like to remind you that our role is not only to evaluate you, but also to help mould the committee and to guide you when you have any questions or concerns about the topics or your leader. Don't hesitate to contact us if you need any help– our email is gls@ccbcali.edu.co.

We look forward to seeing you at CCBMUN XX!

Best regards,

Daniel and Rosario
GLS Presidents

Topic 1: *Should governments control telecommunications and media in order to improve social cohesion?*

I. History/Context

Social cohesion: In order to understand this topic, it is important to be clear on what is meant by "social cohesion". In general terms, it is a term often used in sociological spaces to describe how much a group or society trusts each other and is willing to cooperate in order to prosper as a group. The concept was initially developed by sociologist Émile Durkheim when he tried to define what he believed to be lost in society after the social erosion of early industrialization - social cohesion - and he described it as the *"consciousness collective; the belief held by citizens of a nation-state that they share a moral community, which enables them to trust each other"* (Larsen). Basically, examples of flailing social cohesion can be found in countries with so much political polarization that it ends up bleeding into the cultural and social sphere, leading to groups of people within the same country harbouring severe distrust of each other on the basis of anything from political beliefs to race, class, or religion.

In today's digital ecosystem, telecommunication has become the foundation for businesses, governments, communities, and families to seamlessly connect and share information. Since prehistoric times, communication has been an essential feature of human development in every possible way. Nevertheless, it had a transformation after the invention of technology. It started with smoke signals, the creation of sounds, animals, arrows, stones, and paper, among many other forms that humans were discovering. However, it was not until 1885 that the American inventor Joseph Henry developed the first electric telegraph. Its impact in the social and technological order was tremendous. The electric telegraph was the first mechanism of communication that allowed the speed of a message to exceed that of the human body. It also has a huge impact since it broke the historical connection between transportation and communication.

As expected, its impact was far-reaching, eventually spreading to almost every corner of the world and, due to its great utility, it continued to evolve. This invention gave impetus to other

creations such as the telephone in 1876 by Alexander Graham Bell. A few years later the Italian, Guillermo Marconi developed the first long-distance wireless telegraph. This tool had a great impact on the First World War, triggering the creation of other forms of communication, such as the radio, due to its great efficiency. In addition to helping with communication between soldiers, the radio played a crucial role as it made it easy for ordinary people to communicate, despite being in different cities. The Second World War was no exception since much of the German government's propaganda was done employing telecommunication. However, not all its impact was negative; many families trying to escape used the technology of the time to be able to communicate with people from abroad and thus improve the poor level of social cohesion that emerged at the time.

Later in history, new electronic devices such as televisions came out that had a great impact within the field of companies worldwide. This occurred as the news industry shifted from being primarily in newspapers to being virtual. This facilitated the spread of news and propaganda worldwide and drastically affected the usefulness of newspapers, which had been very efficient for many decades. However, the evolutionary impact was positive, since television increased the number of people who received news and the credibility it had. This device generated a great change in social cohesion since it made it easier for people to actually see what was happening around the world. This generated an impact at the international level as news reached other countries very quickly and contributed to cooperation between nations. However, it also had weak points since the governments and companies that had control of the industry could take advantage of their great influence to spread false information that would benefit them economically or politically.

To conclude, social cohesion and telecommunications have gone hand in hand throughout history. Historical events such as wars, agreements, and discoveries have been achieved through the use of telecommunications. Given its great importance, in the construction or destruction of social cohesion, telecommunications will always be a very dangerous weapon which, if in the wrong hands, can cause a lot of damage. More than anything because they can control the information that people receive, so much so that they can control their history. As George Orwell emphasizes in his book "1984", *"Who controls the past controls the*

future and who controls the present controls the past." This means that whoever controls the media and telecommunications can regulate the social cohesion in a society.

II.   Current Situation

Today, every event or news that occurs around the world is quickly disseminated thanks to the telecommunication and social media industry that evolves at an astounding speed. These two industries, incredible as they may seem, are part of our daily lives, playing an essential role in our society as they facilitate interaction between people of different races, languages, countries, and religions. Given the wide variety of societies that telecommunications and social networks can reach, their usefulness may have positive and negative objectives.

One of the greatest risks people are suffering today when participating in activities related to these industries is freedom of expression. Digital platforms like Twitter have generated a lot of controversy in recent years due to the policies towards their users. Being a social network in which people can express phrases, photos, and videos, requires a system of rules in which there is a limit when it comes to expressing themselves so as not to violate the integrity of other users. But why is this happening if greater communication and transparency between people would improve social cohesion? Unfortunately, social media has not been successful in this sense, as people had taken to these platforms in order to destroy social cohesion by violating people's integrity guidelines.

This happens, since many people, companies, and political parties tend to benefit from the division and polarization that is created through social networks and television media. What polarization does is create extremes, for example making the majority of people who can vote only take into account the two main political parties of a country. The objective of this is to make people only select two types of ideas and not find a balance between them to reach an agreement. This type of problem is suffered by countries like Colombia where people from different political parties have not been able to achieve cohesion since there is no balance between both ideologies. Unfortunately, the telecommunications industries only increase

polarization since most newspapers and newscasts have a preferred party that they support. An example of this is the "Revista Semana", which more than once has been questioned by several left-wing politicians who complain that it only gives information that benefits the right-wing parties. It has even been known for social media platforms to ban politicians and supporters by directly attacking other political parties or even other countries. One of the most recent is the ex-president, Donald Trump who nowadays is banned from Twitter after the platform affirmed that, *"After assessing the language in these Tweets against our Glorification of Violence policy, we have determined that these Tweets are in violation of the Glorification of Violence Policy and the user @realDonaldTrump should be immediately permanently suspended from the service."* (Permanent Suspension of @RealDonaldTrump, 2021) Emphasizing the above, it could be said that when the news and social networks support a political party or an ideology, they are being indirectly regulated by the government, which brings us to the question, "Is it possible or necessary for the telecommunication and media to be independent of government control? And if it is, how would this independence be achieved?

It is not only government that can benefit from polarization, but also large companies. Thanks to the large number of people that telecommunications can influence, many companies spend a lot of money to be able to promote products. The dilemma begins because the telecommunications industries make it possible for companies to provide false and/or harmful information in order to sell their products. For this reason, politicians with authoritarian traits support control within the news and advertising industries so that their citizens do not fall for what they consider to be false information, and which can generate an erosion of social cohesion. Governments are also wary because these industries have vast collections of private information about their citizens. According to New York Times, "U.S. lawmakers are introducing bills to regulate social media companies and technologies that spread harmful content." ("Mark Zuckerberg Will Be Added to a Facebook Privacy Lawsuit.," 2022) However, not everyone agrees with this assertion; they do not accept that the government should have power within these platforms. They say that if governments have complete control over the media, they can manipulate and control society to their own advantage, which would take away the citizens' freedom.

On the other hand, social cohesion is also greatly affected depending on the economic status of a country. Cryptocurrencies have been revolutionary in this field and since they do not have any type of government support, they generate greater freedom for buyers. Telecommunications and the media have been responsible for making these popular and even altering their behaviour. The owner of the companies Tesla and SpaceX, Elon Musk, speaks publicly through social networks to manipulate the market for this type of currency. This means that governments worldwide put the economy of their countries at risk by not having control of what their citizens buy and sell. Therefore, by not having control of this market, people could easily acquire gadgets that violate personal integration.

Considering the above, what kind of conclusion could be reached? Government control over telecommunications industries would put people's freedom of expression and thought at risk, in addition to running the risk that their government falls into the hands of ideologies that promote totalitarianism. If this happens, the government may limit the information to its people and manipulate it in its own way, creating a forced social cohesion. On the other hand, the non-participation of the government would mean that people, having greater freedom of expression, could cooperate with each other without any type of restriction and could acquire and explore knowledge without any supervision. But at the same time, will have a social and economic disorder, in which the policies of integrity of the people are not respected and the hate speech has no limits.

By taking this into account, leaders, which is the best decision to make?

III. Key points of the debate

- The influence of media on people

- The benefits of freedom of speech and its limits

- Importance of people's integrity guidelines

- Economic and social manipulation of government through media

- The type of information allowed on media channels

- The regulations and changes the telecommunication industry should or should not have

- The effect and participation of companies in telecommunication and media industries towards social cohesion

IV. Guiding questions

1. How important is the idea of social cohesion for your leader?
2. Does your leader place individuals' liberty and freedom above all else, or do they consider that there are more important principles? If so, what are those principles?
3. Is the concept of inalienable "rights" something your leader has an understanding of? If they do, what is their stance on them? If they don't, how do you think they would react to this concept?
4. According to your leader, are there any truly inalienable rights, or are there situations in which any right could be violated? What are these situations and rights?
5. Does your leader consider hate speech part of freedom of speech or something that must be banned?
6. Does your leader consider that people generally benefit from, or are harmed by exposure to ideas and beliefs that differ from their own?
7. Can governments be trusted to be the arbitrators and controllers of a society's ideas?
8. If the government should control the telecommunications and media industries, what ideological basis should they have for their censorship?

V. Bibliography

Larsen, C. A. (2013). The Rise and Fall of Social Cohesion: The Construction and De-construction of Social Trust in the US, UK, Sweden and Denmark. Oxford University Press. http://www.amazon.com/Rise-Fall-SocialCohesion-De-construction/dp/0199681848

Larsen, C. (2014). Social cohesion: Definition, measurement and developments. https://www.un.org/esa/socdev/egms/docs/2014/LarsenDevelopmentinsocialcohesion.pdf

Mark Zuckerberg will be added to a Facebook privacy lawsuit. (2022). *The New York Times*. https://www.nytimes.com/2021/10/20/technology/mark-zuckerberg-facebook-lawsuit.html

Permanent suspension of @realDonaldTrump. (2021). Twitter.com. https://blog.twitter.com/en_us/topics/company/2020/suspension

Rojas, N. (2021, February 19). *The Relationship Between Social Media, Cryptocurrency and Blockchain*. Top Dog Social Media. https://topdogsocialmedia.com/social-media-cryptocurrency-and-blockchain/#:~:text=Social%20media%20and%20other%20media,Bitcoin%20value%20dropped%2020%20percent.

Social Cohesion - OECD. (2012). Oecd.org. https://www.oecd.org/dev/inclusive-societies-development/social-cohesion.htm

Thu, N. V. (2015). How much should we care about social cohesion?. Johnlockeinstitute.com. https://www.johnlockeinstitute.com/2019-politics-essay-social-cohesion

Topic 2: *To what extent is peacekeeping achievable without the use of violence?*

I. History/Context

Liberalism, Realism, and the UN: In the study of international relations, there is a defined dichotomy between the theories of liberalism and realism. Liberalism believes in the possibility of peace and the removal of war from the human experience through cooperation and principles of political freedoms and rights. It is important to avoid confusion by remembering that this use of the term liberalism is not the same as how it is used in political or economic spheres - this is specific to the dynamics of international relations. Realism, on the other hand, has a central assumption in the "state of nature", believing that anarchy is part of the natural state of international relations and that the role of foreign policy is devoted to ensuring each state's interests and national survival.

On this question of the use of violence and militancy in the quest for peacekeeping, it can be useful to look at the figure of Henry Kissinger, National Security Adviser and Secretary of State for Nixon's Administration of the US government, who in many ways is one of the most renowned political realists. His philosophy is best exemplified by his quote *"those ages which in retrospect seem most peaceful were least in search of peace. Those whose quest for it seems unending appear less able to achieve tranquility,"* and his extolling of the concept of international order, established in 1648 with the Peace of Westphalia (here we are talking about the international Westphalian order, that was organized purely around the centralized nation-state and thus places special value on sovereignty, order, and security of the individual state over anything else). To understand more about the Peace of Wesphalia, you can use the following link: https://www.britannica.com/event/Peace-of-Westphalia.

A realist perspective on the quest for peace would say that some degree of stability is only achieved when conflict and other factors are maintaining the balance of power. Here, the balance of power refers to the concept in international relations that states achieve some semblance of tranquility, not by actually trusting each other and cooperating in the search for peace, but by matching each other's power and ability to threaten each other.

For an example on the other side of the spectrum, we can look at the UN, which was founded on the ideas of liberalism. The United Nations was conceived right as World War II was in its twilight, a period during which world powers had to reckon with the potential for mass death and destruction that countries were now equipped with, and to agree to do everything to prevent such an event from occurring again. 50 nations gathered in San Francisco in 1945 to draft and sign the UN charter and create the international organisation we know as the United Nations. All in all, the philosophy behind the United Nations is based on the idea that peacekeeping can be ensured at a global level via diplomacy and internationalism (namely the ideological belief that states should prioritize the well-being of the world across national borders), discouraging things like nationalism and isolationism as they don't promote well-being and peace on a global level, but specifically on a national level. Hence, a liberal perspective would say that promoting globalization and interconnectedness between states and uniting the world under shared ethical and moral codes and the same economic model would ensure peace without having to enforce hard power (violence, threats, etc) upon each other. It is also worth mentioning that liberalism as it stands is generally based on Western ideals, and even as it purports to unite the world fairly, it unavoidably implies imprinting the same cultural standard around the world (whether this is for better or worse is one of the points up to debate).

Now, applied to the question of whether the UN (a historically rigidly liberal institution) should take up active militarism to enforce peace on a global level (a realist approach in terms of its basis on the idea that violence is needed to achieve tranquility), there are many ways the topic can be debated and several different camps that each leader might join. For this point, much of the debate around this will be built around two main points.

- First, the basic ideological question of whether it is possible to achieve peace with the eradication of any kind of violence or conflict, or if these things are needed to sustain it and achieve it in the first place (here there may be a more clean-cut divide along the realist-liberal spectrum).
- Second, there are the more specific debatable details of how the UN should function if it is to have a standing army. Maybe there is an argument for a new kind of ideology the UN should take on if it is to have a standing army (for example, maybe a leader

believes the UN is supporting Western hegemony and needs to be led by different nations), or that the UN and its army should function more as another nation-state on the stage of international relations, or that along with a standing army, the UN should gain genuine power over existing states, etc.

II. Current Situation

The UN has been the guiding example for liberalism and violence-free peacekeeping for over 70 years, and over this time there has been continuous debate about how truly useful it has actually been. When it comes to providing relief in conflicts and tragedies, such as transporting materials and resources during natural disasters or areas with high levels of starvation, the UN has been praised for its actions, as the sheer logistical capabilities of things like the World Food Programme's airlifts cannot be matched by any other kind of organization (and certainly hardly ever by the countries experiencing the tragedies themselves).

However, most of the praise the UN receives is regarding the rigor of its humanitarian aid, in other words, how good the organization is at offering support after or along the side lines of a tragedy or conflict. The effectiveness of the actual peacekeeping UN troops, known as the Blue Helmets (who are UN "soldiers" who are technically armed, but are not allowed to use their weapons unless it's in self-defence or in defence of the mandate) have been heavily criticized and put into question due to their perceived inability to intervene successfully in several conflicts where they have been deployed.

The most well-known example of this was by far the 1994 Rwandan genocide. The way the UN gets its Blue Helmets is via deployments from member countries, meaning that countries within the UN decide to send some of their soldiers on UN peacekeeping missions. In the case of Rwanda, the Blue Helmets on the ground were Belgian soldiers, supposedly there to help cool the tensions and maintain tranquility between the citizens of Rwanda. However, when the situation turned extremely violent, the UN soldiers did not have permission to defend and protect the Tutsis from being slaughtered by the Hutu militiamen; they had been directly ordered by the Security Council to stand down in order to avoid the domestic politics

problems that would arise should any Blue Helmets be killed in action. With that decision, even with peacekeepers on the ground, around 800,000 Rwandans were slaughtered in 100 days.

Since then, the UN has come out saying that the lessons of the 1990s have been learned, using the fact that in modern peacekeeping, the protection of civilian lives is considered a priority. Besides that, UN peacekeeping has not had a lack of success; the best example of UN peacekeeping at its best is probably the Liberian mission, which started in 2003 after the end of the 14-year-long civil war and finally concluded in 2018 with Liberia's first democratic transition of power in over 70 years. During the peacekeeping mission the UN managed to disarm more than 100,000 combatants and helped more that 1 million refugees and victims of displacement return to their homes, whilst also supporting the process of democratic elections.

The Liberian example highlights the possibility of a UN peacekeeping mission done well and brought to a closure. However, this cannot be said for many other high profile UN peacekeeping missions: the Syrian mission came to an end in 2012 due to "escalating violence"; the 15 year Haiti peacekeeping mission ended in 2019 after accusations of excess of violence against civilians and increased anti-government discontent; the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) mission has been going on for over 10 unstable years, and has been beset with problems like that of 2012, in which Indian peacekeepers ignored UN officials' orders to defend the town of Goma and rather called their defence ministry, which told them to stand down, effectively making the UN bystanders to murder, rape, and terrorizing; and even more recent controversies like the DRC's expulsion of the UN mission spokesman and recent anti-UN protests in the country.

Taking a look at these failures, it is clear that some, like the Haiti mission, might have benefited from less violence rather than more. However, with the Syrian and DRC missions it is worth wondering whether a standing army would have enabled the UN to remain fighting in Syria or actually have defended the citizens of Goma without having to account for the domestic concerns of the soldiers' governments. More people could have been saved, and in a realist view of things, if there were a sort of international standing army ready at the threat

of any emerging conflict, this could discourage violent conflicts and end up ensuring peace. Of course, the Haiti mission and even the more recent events of the DRC mission show that bringing in a "strong man" to invade another country's sovereignty might not always be the answer needed to achieve peace, especially in less economically developed, non-Western countries, where there is often some bristling against entities like the UN coming and inevitably bringing in their ideology. At the end of the day, it is a question of whether peace should be monitored as it develops, or simply enforced.

III. Key points of the debate

1. Violence as a tool for peacekeeping
2. The feasibility of achieving peace without using the threat of conflict
3. The effectiveness of the UN as it stands
4. The benefits of a standing army in the UN's peacekeeping missions
5. Sovereignty versus heightened Internationalism
6. Whether the ideological basis of the UN is the most appropriate

IV. Guiding questions

1. Based on your research, could your leader be considered a liberalist or a realist?
2. Has your leader justified any violent or conflictive action under the pretext of attaining peace?
3. Does your leader believe in stronger ties between different societies, or do they support protectionism and isolationism?
4. Would your leader be a proponent or a critic of the theory of the balance of power?
5. Does your leader place a lot of importance on the idea of state sovereignty, or are there exceptions? If so, what are they?
6. Does your leader believe in the possibility of peace at all? If they don't, what do you think their stance on a peacekeeping organization like the UN would be?

7. Considering that the UN is, at its core, a Western, liberal organization, would your leader consider it a positive thing that a UN standing army would lead to a more effective enforcement of liberal hegemony?

8. Many leaders might support the idea of an international standing army, but disagree with the UN's ideological bias. If your leader is one of those, what kind of ideology would your leader prefer be adopted by the UN?

V.   Bibliography

Are UN Peace Operations Effective? - World. (2019, November 14). ReliefWeb. https://reliefweb.int/report/world/are-un-peace-operations-effective

Cabrera, M. (2017). Peacekeeping in Haiti: Successes and Failures | The Pardee Atlas Journal of Global Affairs. Bu.edu. https://sites.bu.edu/pardeeatlas/back2school/peacekeeping-in-haiti-successes-and-failures/

Haas, E. (1953). The Balance of Power: Prescription, Concept, or Propaganda? World Politics, 5(4), 442-477. doi:10.2307/2009179

Ighobor, K. (2018, April 6). Mission accomplished: 15 years of peacekeeping success in Liberia. . Africa Renewal. https://www.un.org/africarenewal/magazine/april-2018-july-2018/mission-accomplished-15-years-peacekeeping-success-liberia

Isaacson, W. (2014, September 6). Henry Kissinger Reminds Us Why Realism Matters. Time; Time. https://time.com/3275385/henry-kissinger/

Kaplan, R. D. (1999, June). Kissinger, Metternich, and Realism. The Atlantic; theatlantic. https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1999/06/kissinger-metternich-and-realism/377625/

Kissinger, H. (1957). A world restored: Metternich, Castlereagh and the problems of peace, 1812-22. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Martinez Casares, A. (2019, October 15). The U.N. peacekeeping mission to Haiti ends after 15 years with mixed legacy. U.S. https://www.reuters.com/article/us-haiti-politics-idUSKBN1WU2SP

McGreal, C. (2015, September 17). What's the point of peacekeepers when they don't keep the peace? The Guardian; The Guardian. https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/sep/17/un-united-nations-peacekeepers-rwanda-bosnia

McGreal, C. (2015, September 7). 70 years and half a trillion dollars later: what has the UN achieved? The Guardian; The Guardian. https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/sep/07/what-has-the-un-achieved-united-nations

Nations, U. (2020). History of the United Nations | United Nations. United Nations; United Nations. https://www.un.org/en/about-us/history-of-the-u

Pietraś, M. (2007). POLISH POLITICAL SCIENCE VOL XXXVI 2007 THE LATE WESTPHALIAN INTERNATIONAL ORDER. from https://czasopisma.marszalek.com.pl/images/pliki/ppsy/36/ppsy2007009.pdf