

BACKGROUND GUIDE



UNHRC

UNITED NATIONS HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

AGENDA

*Religious, Ethnic, Racial and Cultural
Genocide- Equivocacy & Stigma.*



EDITION XII
**CHIREC
MUN '24**
Represent • Reason • Resolve

INDEX:

1. LETTER FROM THE EXECUTIVE BOARD	2
1. POSITION PAPER POLICY	4
○ What is a Position Paper?	4
○ Formatting	4
○ Due dates and Submission Procedure	5
2. OVERVIEW	6
○ Definitions	6
○ Religious Genocide	6
○ Racial Genocide	8
○ Ethnic & Cultural Genocide	9
3. KEY AREAS	13
○ Historical Analysis	14
○ Current Situation	15
○ Past UN/International Involvement	17
4. QARMA (Questions A Resolution Must Answer)	19
5. BEING READY	20



LETTER FROM THE EXECUTIVE BOARD

Dear Delegates,

With a sense of elation and excitement, we would like to welcome you all to the CHIRECMUN 2024 and moreover to the norm of on-campus/physical mode of conferences. The last couple of years have been the worst this generation has experienced, and we emerged through the adversity much stronger and resilient. Nevertheless, our journey continues towards identifying and fighting against some of the deep-seated and ingrained health, political, social, and economical issues the world faces.

Over the past few decades and especially the past couple of years, we have witnessed the integral part the Human Rights Commission (HRC) plays in safeguarding and leading the fight to ensure human rights advancement, practice, and awareness throughout the globe. Goes without saying the HRC has implanted constitutionally and fundamentally it's importance as one of the committees to look out for. You delegates will be seeded with the responsibility of being part and leading one of the most engaging and riveting discussions of the conference.

On account of continuing our journey, the agenda for HRC this time around sheds light on one of the most deep-rooted issues this world is constitutionally divided on. "Religious, Ethnic, Racial and Cultural Genocide - Equivocacy & Stigma" being the agenda of the discussion, is a carefully articulated move towards introducing one of the most heated and opinionated discussions to take place in the HRC. To break down and simplify the meat of the conversation, the 'Equivocacy' stands for the difference in argumentative stances of different countries and the 'Stigma' aims to cover the diversification of social awareness and opinionated understanding of the issue.



With the abiding ambiguous mandate of the committee, the agenda of the HRC, and emphasis on the functional mandate, we expect the discussion to cover the difference in national policies politically, the nitty-gritty of the human rights aspects and the social awareness and methodology to adopt towards a certain plan of action. Advocating towards a Global policy could also be an interesting approach to take. Nevertheless, it's the delegate's part and parcel towards defining the roadmap they wish to take, and we will be the effective mediators towards driving this discussion towards fruitful solutions.

The Executive Board also expects a Position Paper from each delegate a day prior to the conference. The instructions are mentioned under the specified category. The intention behind the same is to ensure that the delicate stance of the agenda and the fine line on which delegates have to position themselves is maintained from Day 1 so as to avoid violations and ease in proceedings.

We are always available for you to approach before, during and after the conference. We wish to provide a captivating and memorable experience with comfort for all delegates irrespective of an individual's MUN experience. We expect a reciprocated certain level of contextualized debate and commitment to research from the delegates to ensure smooth sailing and an enthralling experience. Adding to the same, we expect the agenda to be respected and for delegates to not just cram-up knowledge for awards but a genuine interest in understanding contextually the gravity of the situation, to socially be active citizens advocating the right picture long after the conference and if interested to one day be in a position to enact a real change in policy.

With this, we would officially like to welcome all of you to the Human Rights Council at CHIRECMUN 2024. May the force be with you!

Mohammed Samraan Ghouse
Chairperson

Deeksha Singh
Vice-Chairperson

Sarayu K
Rapporteur



POSITION PAPER POLICY

WHAT IS A POSITION PAPER?

A position paper is a brief overview of a country's stance on the topics being discussed by a particular committee. Though there is no specific format the position paper must follow, it should include a description of the positions your country holds on the issues on the agenda, relevant actions that your country has taken, and potential solutions that your country would support.

At CHIRECMUN 2024, delegates should write a position paper on the agenda - **“Religious, Ethnic, Racial and Cultural Genocide - Equivocacy & Stigma”**. The position paper ideally should not exceed two pages. For the Human Rights Council, position papers are highly recommended but not mandatory. **However, in order to be eligible for an award, delegates must have submitted position papers.**

FORMATTING

Although there is no hardcoded format of a Position Paper, ideally Position papers should:

- Include the name of the delegate, his/her country, the committee, and the agenda.
- Be in a standard font (e.g., Times New Roman) with a 12-point font size and 1-inch document margins.
- Can include national flag, national symbols, watermarks, or page borders but must not include illustrations, diagrams, decorations, or infographics.
- Include citations and a bibliography, in any format, giving due credit to the sources used in research (not included in the 2-page limit).



DUE DATES AND SUBMISSION PROCEDURE

Position papers for this committee must be submitted by 11:00pm on July 24th, 2024. Late submissions will not be entertained.

Once your position paper is complete, please save the file as your country's name and send it as an attachment in an email, to the below mentioned email address, with the subject heading as your "Country Name – Position Paper". Please do not add any other attachments to the email or write anything contextual related to the agenda, committee, or conference in the body.

Your Position Paper should be in a single PDF; position papers submitted in another format will not be accepted. Each position paper will be manually reviewed and only those delegates who send a position paper will be considered for the awards.

The email address for the submission of position papers is chirechrc24@gmail.com.



OVERVIEW

The UN draws its definition of genocide from the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, which was approved by General Assembly resolution 260 A (III) of 9 December 1948, and entered into force on 12 January 1951.

The definition of the crime of genocide, as set out in the Convention, has been widely adopted at both national and international levels. For example, the verbatim definition has been included in the statute of several international and hybrid tribunals, such as in the respective statutes of the International Criminal Tribunals for the former Yugoslavia and for Rwanda and the Extraordinary Chambers in Cambodia.

The same definition was also included in the 1998 Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (ICC), making genocide one of the international crimes over which the ICC has jurisdiction. Clearly, the reach of this Convention goes far. According to Article II of the Convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such:

- (a) Killing members of the group;
- (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;
- (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
- (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;
- (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

DEFINITIONS

The Executive Board is aware of the discourse surrounding the definitions of the terms used in this guide, and for uniformity, is requesting delegates to accept the following as the definitions of these terms for the purpose of this background guide:



Race: Notions like race are difficult to grasp because they are social constructs rather than objective, verifiable facts. Genetic studies in the late 20th century have shown that humans are not biologically homogeneous and that there are no biogenetically distinct races. Since much of our legal worldview depends on understanding objectivity, the contrast between such objective and subjective realities is further exacerbated. The law of genocide puts four categories at the disposal of the courts, as previously mentioned: the national, ethnical, racial or religious group. However, the assignment of victims to one of the four groups doesn't indicate that these divisions exist objectively, but rather that the perpetrators assume they do. The legal classification is treated as a reality, although it actually originates in the perception of the perpetrator. Thus, rather than looking for an objective legal reality of 'race', the victim's imagined identity based on the perpetrator's perception is often the reference point for a legal classification of the victims. Nevertheless, an assumption is made by the perpetrator, often on the below mentioned grounds. We request that the delegates, on this basis, accept this as the definition of race as: groups of people who share physical characteristics, such as skin colour and facial features, as well as similar social or cultural identities and ancestral backgrounds. They may also share similar social or cultural identities and ancestral backgrounds. There are many racial groups, and a person may belong to or identify with more than one group.

Religion: This rather vast topic is encompassed by definitions related to both sociology and theology. Although there are a variety of opinions being offered with regards to this definition, for the purpose of this document, we will be considering a sociological perspective. Sociologists study religion as a social institution and a belief system. Social theorist Émile Durkheim defined religion, in 1915, as a "unified system of beliefs and practices relative to sacred things". From a sociological perspective, religion is a set of beliefs that can shape people's social identities and relationships, and it can also interact with other aspects of society, such as culture, politics, and the economy. Religion is also a collection of worldviews that relate humanity to spirituality and, sometimes, to moral values. Many religions have narratives, symbols, traditions and sacred histories that are intended to give meaning to life or to explain the origin of life or the universe. In the UN system, Member States consist of a wide range of religious affiliations, including but not limited to,, Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, Judaism and Sikhism. 5% of NGOs with observer status in the UN consist of multi-religious organisations.



Culture: Although a vague term, can refer to many things. You'll find that this term is a central component of this guide. Debates about who should be considered a cultural group and the utility of identifying cultural genocide without criminalizing it have led to a lack of recognition and response to group destruction. As the Executive Board, we do not wish for such a lack of definition to hinder your path to effective discussion and debate regarding this topic and therefore have defined the word, for the purpose of this Background Guide. Culture can be defined as a concept that encompasses the social behaviour, institutions, and norms found in human societies, as well as the knowledge, beliefs, arts, laws, customs, capabilities, and habits of the individuals in these groups. Examples of cultural groups include ethnic groups, nationalities, and religious communities. Groups such as professional organizations, hobby clubs, and age groups do not have comprehensive cultural systems and, therefore, do not deserve the label "culture".

Crimes Against Humanity (Source: 1998 Article 7, Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court): Crimes against humanity are defined as "any of the following acts when committed as part of a widespread or systematic attack directed against any civilian population." The acts include murder, extermination, enslavement, deportation, imprisonment, torture, rape (and other gender-based or sex crimes), group-based persecution, enforced disappearance, apartheid, and "other inhumane acts of a similar character intentionally causing great suffering or serious injury to body or to mental or physical health."

Religious Genocide

Religious differences between victimizers and their victims are a common characteristic of genocides and genocidal massacres. Violence and religion have been closely associated in a variety of intricate, often contradictory ways, since the earliest periods of human civilization. Institutionalised religions have practised violence against both their adherents and their opponents. Conversely, religions have also been known to limit social and political violence and to provide spiritual and material comfort to its victims. Religious faith can thus generate contradictory attitudes, either motivating aggression or constraining it. Even as an exclusionary ideology, traditional religion is neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for all forms of genocide in time of war.



However, religion can be an enabler that together with other propellants can lead to genocide. Sacred religious sites can be sensitive locations whose violation inspires violence. Radicalization of religious leaders can occur when their religion appears to be under attack, especially during or following a period of widespread violence. This also brings into question the need to examine several groups pursuing a genocidal agenda claiming religious justification: al-Qaeda and Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS), for example.

The intimate relationship of religious difference to genocide continues to present itself in the conflicts ongoing today. Often the significance of these religious differences is very clear, as in the religious persecutions of the Middle Ages, the Armenian genocide, the Holocaust, the root and branch annihilation of settlements during the partition of India, the massacres of Hindus in East Pakistan, the threatened genocide against the Baha'is in Iran, and the seemingly interminable conflicts in the southern Sudan. At other times, the influence of religious difference is more indirect, compounded with many other elements, for example in Uganda under Amin, or the massacres of Ibos in Northern Nigeria. This committee is encouraged to focus on one aspect of religious differentiation– the theological warrants for genocide in the texts and ideologies in the interrelated religions of Judaism, Islam and Christianity. You're encouraged to analyse the significance of these texts and ideologies in a historical perspective, with emphasis on the broad societal context, and their power to engage in genocidal action. The recent spread of religious fundamentalism enhances the significance of these texts and ideologies, namely in Israel and its occupied territories, where the clash of religious fundamentalisms introduces a particularly threatening extremist element in the ongoing conflict. This also raises the question of whether religious extremism and fundamentalism can further propel the ongoing genocides of today, in the contemporary world.

Racial Genocide

The Nazis defined the Jews as a race inferior to the Aryan race, the Khmer Rouge identified the 'new people' as enemies with a biologically dissimilar essence, and in Darfur (Sudan), the Janjaweed militia labelled their enemies derogatorily as 'Zourga', or black Africans. Clearly, these victim classifications all have a racial denominator in common. It isn't difficult to draw the conclusion that race can be a significant factor when it comes to genocide and genocidal acts.



The International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR) interpreted the protected groups of genocide, including the racial group, in a purely objective manner. In doing so, the tribunal faced criticism for not accounting for two important facts: first, as we've mentioned in the 'Definitions' section, humankind cannot be meaningfully divided into biologically distinct races. Second, the process leading up to a genocide is subjective: in the perpetrator's eyes, the victim group is different from the perpetrator's ostensibly superior group. This committee is highly encouraged to draw inspiration from this case and rectify this overlooking by the ICTR by exploring not only the prevalence of racial genocide, but also why it is prevalent.

Prior to any genocide, commonalities between 'us' and 'them' are removed. Instead, dissimilarities are enhanced, often by means of communication, to the point where the perpetrator calls for the extermination of the 'others', in this case, genocide. In this process of 'othering', a dichotomy between 'us' and 'them' is created. The marginalised 'other' group can, notably, have an imagined identity, entirely dependent on the perpetrator's perceptions. As such, the victim group is constructed purely subjectively, based upon the perpetrator's understanding of the victims' racial otherness. Dehumanisation is inherent to any genocidal process and abolishes all humanness from the victims, who therefore are not one of 'us'.

Dehumanisation is a belief, a way of thinking, according to which some human beings only give the impression of being human. Beneath the surface, however, they are not human after all. Thus, albeit having a human appearance, these dehumanised beings, in the understanding of the perpetrator, consist of an inhuman essence or, put differently, of a racial otherness. Research suggests that biologically grounded race-thinking is present prior to any instance of mass atrocity. It is important to note that the victim group's dehumanization alone will not lead to genocide. Rather, the mortal threat the victims' out-group allegedly presents to the perpetrator's in-group is what ultimately distinguishes genocide from other discrimination or inhumane treatment. While social sciences have long recognized the importance of the process of othering, in which a group of 'others' is identified, stigmatised, discriminated against, and finally dehumanised, it is rarely discussed.



Systemic racism is closely linked to, and can be followed by or lead to, genocide. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, which is a part of the Office of the United Nation High Commissioner for Human Rights, recognizes that laws, policies, and practices that display systemic discrimination based on race, colour, descent, or national or ethnic origin may potentially result in violent conflict and genocide.

A well-known historical example of systemic marginalization leading to genocide is the 1994 genocide of Tutsi people in Rwanda. It is often argued that a cultural mythology regarding Hutus and Tutsis, originally developed and deployed by Rwanda's German and Belgian colonizers, eventually spurred the genocide in 1994. Although these groups existed prior to European colonisation, it was the introduction of a racial ideology based on a hierarchy, with Tutsis being portrayed as socially and physically superior to Hutus, that fed into the essentialization of identity. There are more contemporary examples of this type of systemic discrimination leading to violence, as is expanded upon further at a later point in this guide.

ETHNIC AND CULTURAL GENOCIDE

The term ethnic cleansing refers to the forced removal of an ethnic group from a territory. A United Nations Commission of Experts investigating the former Yugoslavia defined it as "rendering an area ethnically homogeneous by using force or intimidation to remove persons of given groups from the area." Unlike crimes against humanity, genocide, and war crimes, ethnic cleansing is not recognized as a standalone crime under international law. However, the practice of ethnic cleansing may constitute genocide, crimes against humanity, or war crimes.

Cultural genocide, also known as ethnocide, is the deliberate destruction of a group's culture, religion, and identity. It's a coercive act that's often imposed by a dominant group on a weaker or minority group. Cultural genocide is based on the idea that a group can be destroyed by attacking its ability to preserve and pass on its culture, which would then disappear. Cultural genocide can involve the systematic destruction of traditions, values, language, and other elements that make a group distinct from another. It's been associated with imperialism and settler-colonialism, and examples of cultural genocide abound throughout history, including Tibet. However, the concept of cultural genocide doesn't fit easily within the definition of the crime of genocide, which refers to the intent to physically exterminate a people.



Both ethnic cleansing and cultural genocide are issues that have effected indigenous populations throughout history. An example of this is the treatment that has been accorded to the Native American population in the USA. Roxanne Dunbar-Ortiz, an American historian dedicated to the study of indigenous peoples, concluded that all five acts of genocide listed in the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide can be found in the crimes the United States committed against American Indians. Native Americans are undoubtedly victims of genocide, and it is of important significance to admit that U.S. policies toward American Indians are, in fact, acts of genocide.

Successive U.S. administrations have not only wiped out a large number of American Indians, but also, through systematic policy design and bullying acts of cultural suppression, thrown them into an irreversible, difficult situation. The indigenous culture was fundamentally crushed, and the inter-generational inheritance of indigenous lives and spirits was under severe threats.

The slaughter, forced relocation, cultural assimilation and unjust treatment the United States committed against American Indians have constituted de facto genocides. Indigenous children had also been separated from their families and traditional lifestyle by the State and put into boarding schools in order to "americanise" them, where they then faced inhumane living conditions and suffered abuse at the hands of cruel faculty. These acts fully match the definition of genocide in the UN Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, and have continued for hundreds of years to this day.

Some say it is imperative that the U.S. government drop its hypocrisy and double standards on human rights issues, and take seriously the severe racial problems and atrocities in its own country. The reflection of the U.S. government looks bleak. It has not officially admitted that the atrocities against Native Americans are acts of genocide, unlike some countries such as Canada which have admitted that their histories with their indigenous populations include genocide, and real changes still seem a long way off.



KEY AREAS

The UN draws its definition of genocide from the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, which was approved by General Assembly resolution 260 A (III) of 9 December 1948, and entered into force on 12 January 1951.

The definition of the crime of genocide, as set out in the Convention, has been widely adopted at both national and international levels. For example, the verbatim definition has been included in the statute of several international and hybrid tribunals, such as in the respective statutes of the International Criminal Tribunals for the former Yugoslavia and for Rwanda and the Extraordinary Chambers in Cambodia.

The same definition was also included in the 1998 Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (ICC), making genocide one of the international crimes over which the ICC has jurisdiction. Clearly, the reach of this Convention goes far. According to Article II of the Convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such:

- (a) Killing members of the group;
- (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;
- (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
- (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;
- (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

DEFINITIONS

The Executive Board is aware of the discourse surrounding the definitions of the terms used in this guide, and for uniformity, is requesting delegates to accept the following as the definitions of these terms for the purpose of this background guide:



HISTORICAL ANALYSIS

Genocide is a crime that has been committed throughout the centuries. Its prevalence has been witnessed since ancient times. Some of the oldest examples from the premodern period include the destruction of indigenous people in the Americas. Returning to the nineteenth centuries, genocidal episodes took place in scenarios of colonial expansions across the globe. The twentieth century has been deemed by some as the “the century of genocide”, with prominent genocidal acts that were perpetrated throughout. Some well known examples of which include the Holocaust, Iraqi Genocide of its Kurdish Population, Genocide committed in the former Yugoslavia and the Soviet man-made famine in Ukraine.

Although the term ‘Genocide’ was coined in 1944 by Raphaël Lemkin, the United Nations first appropriated the term Genocide and recognised it as a crime under International Law in 1946 by the United Nations General Assembly. It was then later codified as an independent crime under the 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (the Genocide Convention.)

Violence and Religion have been closely associated in a variety of ways since the earliest periods of human civilisation. Religion has played an important role in several outbreaks of genocide since World War I. Perpetrators would often argue that they were part of superior people chosen to carry out special missions with their membership in religious institutions. Religious institutions operated as structures to facilitate genocide but not to counteract it. Religious ideologies became a means for reinforcing political ideologies which motivated people to become involved in mass killings or stand aside and witness the same.

Cultural genocide encompassed not only the physical destruction of individuals but also the intentional eradication of their cultural identity. The genocide of the Aboriginal people in Australia is a well known incident where the physical violence of British colonization was accompanied by the systematic eradication of cultural identity. Policies such as the removal of children—known as the Stolen Generations—aimed to assimilate Aboriginal peoples into European culture, resulting in the suppression of languages and cultural practices. Additionally, the destruction of sacred sites and the imposition of Christianity further eroded Indigenous spiritual beliefs.



The history of racial genocide reveals a grim trajectory of human conflict and intolerance. By the middle of the nineteenth century, racial ideologies had come to dominate European and American thought, permeating all corners of Western culture. Combined with Social Darwinism, racism, now, had even greater potential for violence. Competition among races became the driving force in history and thus humanity benefited from the inevitable disappearance of “inferior races.” Social Darwinist–fuelled thinking created an “ideology of inequality” that encompassed racism, anti-Semitism, sexism, contempt for the disabled, and other assorted social and class prejudices. Twentieth century genocide emerged from a lethal combination of social Darwinism, racist genetic theory and nationalism.

The term ‘ethnic cleansing’ which serves as an a euphemism for genocide, has over the years, replaced ‘ethnic genocide.’ Soon, journalists and politicians began adopting the term ‘ethnic cleansing’ which gradually penetrated the official language of diplomacy and international law—with the implication that it applied to scenarios which somehow could not satisfy the legal requirement for proof of intent to commit genocide. Several UN Resolutions against mass atrocities use the euphemism, despite its never having been formally defined or recognized as a term with specific legal status and mandated obligations, as genocide has been since the 1948 Genocide Convention.

CURRENT SITUATION

Genocide continues to be one of the gravest threats to national and international peace and security. The international community's failure to effectively collaborate and respond to genocidal threats has exacerbated tensions and undermined efforts to maintain global peace and security. This lack of coordinated action has highlighted significant shortcomings in addressing these grave challenges, resulting in some genocides around the world still being ongoing.

The Rohingya, an ethnolinguistic and religious minority, have been living in Arakan (Rakhine since 1989) state of Burma, now Myanmar, for centuries. The world has recently witnessed a massive influx of the Rohingyas, known as the most persecuted ethnic minority in the world, to Bangladesh as they fled unprecedented atrocities perpetrated by the Myanmar security forces in 2017.



The denial of citizenship through adaptation of the Myanmar Citizenship Law in 1982 rendered the Rohingya people stateless which became instrumental behind merciless killing, ruthless violence against Rohingya women including random raping, reckless burning house and properties, and an unexplainable persecution in Rakhine state. Myanmar is deliberately justifying various forms of discrimination and atrocities against the Rohingya people in what the UN Human Rights Council terms as “ethnic cleansing.” The UNHRC adopted Resolution 47/24 (2021) to address the situation of the Rohingya Muslim minority in Myanmar, condemning the human rights violations and calling for accountability for acts that may constitute genocide, crimes against humanity, or war crimes.

The 7 October assault by Hamas on Israel enacted long-established genocidal intent by Hamas against the people of Israel. Israel has declared war on Hamas and embarked on an aerial bombing campaign on Gaza. Over 2300 Palestinians in Gaza have died in the first week of bombing. Palestinian health authorities say Israel's ground and air campaign in Gaza has killed more than 38,000 people, mostly civilians, and driven most of the enclave's 2.3 million people from their homes. Israel's bombing of hospitals, the targeting of their solar panels and the blocking of fuel deliveries indicate an intent to prevent Palestinians from accessing life-saving healthcare. The UNHRC adopted 5 different Resolutions in response to this. The five resolutions focused on: human rights in the occupied Palestinian territory and East Jerusalem, children's rights and inclusive social protection, Palestinian self-determination, human rights in the occupied Syrian Golan, and Israeli settlements in the occupied Palestinian territory and the Syrian Golan.

On September 20 2023, Azerbaijan attacked Armenia during its genocidal campaign to take over Artsakh. Azerbaijani Armed Forces fired in the direction of Armenian positions in the Gegharkunik region of Armenia itself. This attack followed Azerbaijan's bombardment and firing on the remaining Armenian populated areas of Artsakh. Attacking a country's sovereign borders violates the UN Charter and international law. Since 2020, Azerbaijan has made several incursions into Armenian territorial integrity, resulting in Azerbaijan controlling 215 square km. of Armenian land. Azerbaijan faced no consequences for those incursions, nor for its war crimes in 2020. As a result, Azerbaijan was emboldened to seize Artsakh and to forcibly displace its residents without any repercussions.



Turkey has bombed multiple locations allegedly linked to Kurdish groups in Syria and northern Iraq in retaliation for the deaths of nine Turkish soldiers in Iraq. The attacks targeted 29 locations – including “caves, bunkers, shelters and oil installations” belonging to the outlawed Kurdistan Workers’ Party (PKK) and the People’s Protection Units (YPG), a Syrian Kurdish group which has been a central element in the United States-allied coalition against ISIS (ISIL). More than 40,000 people have been killed since the start of the conflict.

PAST UN / INTERNATIONAL INVOLVEMENT

The United Nations General Assembly adopted the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (the Genocide Convention) in 1948. The Genocide Convention was the first human right treaty to be adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 1948. The Convention embodies principles that are part of general customary international law. This means that whether or not States have ratified the Genocide Convention, they are all bound, as a matter of law, by the principle that genocide is a crime prohibited under international law.

The Office of the Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide analyses not only Genocide but also related atrocity crimes such as crimes against humanity and war crimes. The Framework of Analysis for Atrocity Crimes aids in early warning and preventive action by helping to recognize patterns and situations that may escalate into atrocity crimes, thereby informing the international community's response efforts. In specific circumstances where information might be limited or not available, the Special Advisers and the technical staff may undertake field missions to consolidate analysis and understanding of specific situations of concern. However, the Office does not carry out criminal investigations on specific incidents, present or past.

In 2004, the Secretary-General appointed the first ever Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide. The Special Adviser, simply put, has four major roles:

1. Collect information on serious human rights violations that could lead to genocide.
2. Serve as an early warning mechanism to alert the Secretary-General and the Security Council.
3. Recommend actions to the Security Council to prevent or halt genocide
4. Coordinate with the UN system to enhance its capacity to analyze and manage information related to genocide and related crimes.



The United Nations Security Council (UNSC) adopted several resolutions including the Resolution 2150 (2014), which urged States to renew their commitment to preventing and combating genocide and other serious crimes under international law. Through the resolution, the Council also called upon States that had not yet ratified or acceded to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide to consider doing so as a matter of high priority. The Security Council, also, adopted several Resolutions in response to various genocides and atrocities committed globally. Two prominent examples are:- a) UNSC Resolution 955 following the Rwandan Genocide of 1994, to establish the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR) b) UNSC Resolution 827 which established the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) in 1993 to address war crimes, including genocide, committed during the conflicts in the Balkans in the 1990s.

The United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC) also adopted several Resolutions in response to Genocide and related crimes emphasising on accountability and the protection of Human Rights. Some notable ones include:

- Resolutions 28/34 (2015) which underscores the need to punish the crime of Genocide and enhanced International cooperation to prevent genocides. It also reaffirmed the International Community's commitment to the prevention of crimes.
- Resolution 37/26 (2018) highlighted the importance of early warning mechanisms, education, and the role of the UNHRC in preventing genocide and other mass atrocities. It also emphasized the need for states to fulfill their obligations under the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.



QARMA (QUESTIONS A RESOLUTION MUST ANSWER)

- What categorizes as Genocide in an international sense?
 - What the key pain-points with respect to Genocide in the current world
 - What efforts have been taken with respect to criminalizing and halting any form of Genocide?
 - Why is the need for Safe Religious, Ethnic and Cultural Practice a necessity?
 - Which national policies conflict with the basic right to Religious, Ethnic and Cultural Practice and how are they to be withheld?
 - Is there a need for an International Convention on Religious, Ethnic and Cultural Rights or a Global Cultural Policy?
 - Who are to take national policy decisions on the subject of Religious, Ethnic and Cultural Practice?
 - How can the social stigma around Religious, Ethnic and Cultural Practice be reformed?
 - Can awareness and education be a driving force behind safer and easier Religious, Ethnic and Cultural Practice?
-



BEING READY

The first step for making a good intervention and impression during the debate is to research the topic itself, in a more general way. Make sure to not only attend to not only statistics, but also research information that identify the roots of the problems and effective policies that have been promoted both nationally and by International bodies such as the UNHRC, WHO, OHCHR, UNICEF and others.

After getting a general idea on the topic itself, you should research your state's policy about it. It is crucial to know what your country's aspirations are, and what kind of measures can be put into practice. Besides that, political alliances are one of the master keys to make sure that your state's goals will be successful. How is your state in terms of diplomacy? Is it more bellicose, strategist and likes to be a leader? Or is it more peaceful and gentler, more like a follower, in an already formed block? These are some points that you should keep in mind to get information about the subject.

After that you need to have a look in statistics, legal framework and, maybe, try to find interesting facts and anecdotes that capture the Committee's attention! That will help you to reach partners and political coalitions for your ideas.

The Human Rights Council (UNHRC), The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) and the World Health Organization (WHO) website can also be useful tools for your research since you can look for information on Draft Resolutions about this topic or related issues, and some official speeches from your state, explaining its position about this problem. Beyond that, and if you have curiosity, you can also see other state's speeches to have an idea of which are the ones that are on your side and the ones that you have to convince with your views.



BEING READY

You should also keep in mind that not all sources are reliable. Then again, you must keep in mind that regarding social and political affairs, and particularly, if you search for media coverage, being impartial is almost impossible so it is likely to find more obstinate convictions about this topic. However, media articles are always very useful for your research, and you shouldn't forget to take a look at them too.

You, as a Delegate, are an official representative of your State in the Human Rights Council (HRC). Therefore, you must share its views as faithful, as precise, and as dignified as possible.

Unity makes strength so don't forget that consensus must be a goal, and this can only be achieved through dialogue and tolerance. Finally, if every delegate is open to new suggestions, the Debate will be much more successful – and even if we don't find a solution to the problem, we are making efforts to accomplish one in the near future.

GOD SPEED!

