



2008 GEORGIA TECH MODEL UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE

SPONSORED BY THE SAM NUNN SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 13-14, 2008

Position Paper Policy

The purpose of the position papers is to enable the delegates to engage in good substantive debate at the conference and to ensure that each delegate is fully familiar with their nation. These papers also allow delegates to learn the valuable skill of summary. Because there is a page limit (and font size limit) the delegates must organize all of their research and find the pieces that are the most important. It is important to be able to successfully incorporate one's thoughts into written form during debate. Submission of a position paper will be a key factor in determining a delegate's level of preparation for the purpose of selection for awards.

Each background guide provided by the GTMUN staff has a section (Committee Directive) that specifies where the Director would like the debate to focus. Substantively, the position paper should address the pertinent background information to the topic, the country's stance on the issue, and specific proposals to resolve the problem.

The requirements for the position papers are detailed below. The Directors will not read papers that do not conform to these guidelines. Part of the purpose of the papers is to allow the delegates to summarize the most important part of their research; it is not meant to serve as an exhaustive report. An example position paper is included at the end of the Delegate Resource Guide and at the end of this document.

When the Director reads the papers, he is looking for the following things:

- Understanding the position of the nation in regards to each topic
- Original and knowledgeable thinking in terms of a solution to the problem
- Clearly stating the nation's policies and stance on the issue
- Correct use of grammar and spelling

Theresa Frame
Director General

Merek Gourley
Conference Director

Katherine Lange
Secretary General

Requirements:

- Maximum one page per topic
- Maximum 12 point font
- Minimum 10 point font
- Margins must be: 1" top/bottom 1.25" right/left
- Heading must include only: Committee, Delegation, Topic

Special thanks to:

Molly Cochran, PhD
Faculty Advisor

William J. Long, PhD
Chair,
Sam Nunn School of
International Affairs

EXAMPLE PAPERS

Greece

GA 4th: Special Political and Decolonization Satellite Placement In Outer Space

On May 13, 2003, Greece launched its first satellite, Hellas Sat, into orbit so as to have prepared in time for the 2004 Olympic Games. Now that this foremost purpose has been accomplished, the satellite is being used to allow communication between Greece and the Greek population of the rest of the world that has not been available until now. It is thus aiding in the commercial expansion of Greece's economy. Along with this, on January 18, 2005, the Greek parliament ratified a 2004 agreement and thus officially made Greece a part of the European Space Agency. In light of these facts, Greece understands the importance of space to its own country and to countries around the world.

In becoming part of the ESA, Greece has begun to place even more importance in space and will want to expand its satellite presence in space, with a few commercial satellites of its own, as well as scientific satellites that may be shared with the rest of Europe. For the time being, Greece will not require a military satellite, although in the future this may become a priority. Greece also understands that space needs to be split up in an orderly fashion to avoid unwanted accidents in space, and also to assure every country a right to a piece of something that belongs to all the world.

The division of remaining orbits for satellites in space should be split according to the size of the commercial sector in different countries for commercial satellites, possibly giving a certain amount of satellite room for companies from different countries that reach a certain size, with a cap on the amount of satellites based on the aforementioned size of the commercial sector. For the scientific sector, orbits can be divided according to the delicacy of the experiment to a certain orbit, or split between space agencies, thus allowing those wishing to carry out the scientific endeavors to choose which space agency will launch their experiment. They could also be split up on a first come first serve basis, with a certain number of orbits in space designated specifically as being for science. Greece is not a powerful country militarily, and thus dislikes the notion of having weapons in space; as such, it is against any sort of arm's race in space, and would rather have satellites be forbidden to carry weapons into it. While also wanting a provision to prevent the use of espionage in space, it understands the difficulty that would come with implementing this, and also the beneficial uses that it could bring. Satellites that become inactive should be equipped with a self destruct that severely alters their orbit so they are quickly disposed of in the atmosphere. Greece may be a small country, but it has a very important culture that has affected much of the world; this knowledge could be helped by more satellites in space. Also, while Greece has a stagnating economy at the moment, the allowance of certain orbits in space could greatly improve the commercial sector and help improve its economy. Thus, Greece has a necessity of at least a few orbits for the present, and will be needing more in the future.

http://www.space.com/missionlaunches/atlas5_launch_030513.html

<http://www.astro.auth.gr/elaset/esa/>

Greece

GA 4th: Special Political and Decolonization Self-determination of Western Sahara

Greece has faced the conquest of a greater power before in its history, when the Ottoman Empire claimed sovereignty over it, and it would now, as it did then, fight to preserve what it believes to be its own right to self-determination. In accordance with what it believes about itself, it also believes that Western Sahara should have a right to self-determination. When Spain decolonized the area in 1975, the region was supposed to have the right to decide what would happen to it, but both Mauritania and Morocco moved in and, in Greece's opinion, illegally and forcibly took military control of the region.

Greece believes that the referendum that was supposed to have happened in 1991 under MINURSO should be placed into effect, and any plan to do this should only have to be approved by the population of Western Sahara (i.e. unlike the failed Baker Plan, where the Polisario accepted but the plan failed because of Morocco), because it is rightfully their land, and not Morocco's. However, noting the problems that this would cause, Greece also believes that Morocco would have to receive just compensation. This just compensation could include something more trading rights with the rest of the world, or even a granting of part of the original Western Sahara region in return for the giving up of the greater part of it. Greece believes that the referendum that should have taken effect almost fifteen years ago should be placed into effect soon. This is necessary since the referendum is a great source of monetary drain (\$44.6 million for 2006-2007 alone) for the United Nations and has had fifteen years of repeatedly being extended because no agreement can ever be reached on it. The referendum should not be rushed or put into effect sloppily, though, but it should become a priority on the United Nation's agenda until such a time as it comes to pass.

Any referendum that occurs to take care of this situation should have in mind the rights of the people in the area, and the urgency to put it in place should also take into account the human rights abuses that have been reported in the area. If anything, Greece is a country that respects the rights of citizens to believe what they will; that is, it respects freedom of speech, press, etc. In retrospect, this conviction comes from the abuses that happened in Greece itself during the reign of General Papadopoulos, where these rights and other civil liberties were suppressed. Thus, Greece condemns the Moroccan practices of capturing and imprisoning political and philosophical opponents with no charge and not releasing them. It believes that any referendum will have to address those unlawfully imprisoned, and that if the referendum does not include that, a sister resolution should be created to press Morocco into releasing these prisoners. In light of these abuses, when the Moroccan presence is removed, it should be removed entirely, to prevent any more of them. Greece is thus supportive of the Western Sahara's bid for independence; at the very least, it would like to see the human rights of the population defended in the future.

<http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/missions/minurso/>
<http://www.arso.org/08-4.htm>

Greece

GA 4th: Special Political and Decolonization The Prospect of Democratic Elections in Africa

Greece is known as the founding place of democracy in the early years of civilization. Democracy has changed since then, but Greece still supports its role in society, especially after its encounter with a dictatorship in the early fifties with General Papadopoulos. As a democratic nation, Greece supports the adoption democracy in the nations of the world, including those in Africa, as a way to create a more moderate world where radical thinkers do not cause as much damage to society. It especially hopes that democracy can be used as a tool to create more peaceful world for later generations.

However, noting the difficulty of doing this that has been seen in the Middle East with the United States, Greece also supports a more moderated approach, that takes into account not only the wishes of the nations aiding the country in question in its bid for democracy, but especially giving the people of the country the final opinion on the topic. As with a lot of the European Union, Greece did not support the unilateralism that the United States showed during the Iraq war, and any new attempts to enforce democracy in nations willing to adopt it will have to come with much multilateralism in its opinion, especially using the United Nations to help. It will be very important, in retrospect of what happened in the Middle East, that a democracy is not imposed on a people, but rather that its establishment be preordained by the people of the country in question. This is especially true in African nations, where most of the time, the people are just coming out of turmoil and will likely be suspicious of foreign intervention. If the United Nations decides it wants to enforce a democracy, it should not do it militarily, but rather by pressuring the country in question to adopt one.

One of the most important parts of a well functioning democratic system is a well educated public capable of making well educated decisions. As such, to support African countries that are willing to become democratic, the UN would have to place an emphasis on sending out members to help do this, either by giving information on the government's functions or the opinions of the government officials or both. The UN would also have to send experts in to help with the infrastructure of the elections, including places that where ballots will be placed, transportation to and from those places, and ways to count the ballots. It is possible to have peaceful elections even in volatile regions, as the Congo election this summer showed, but the problem (as again is seen in that election) occurs when two of the candidates tie. It is situations like these that must be solved peacefully and will require UN's help, by peacekeepers and by having the UN educate the people. If the elections are thus controlled, Greece believes that a democratic Africa would be the next step to a more peaceful world.

<http://www.gwu.edu/~ieresgwu/2004.3.pdf#search=%22EU%20on%20unilateralism%20of%20us%22>

<http://allafrica.com/stories/200609010295.html>