

STRAWBERRY FIELDS HIGH SCHOOL  
MODEL UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE AND POLICY CONTENTION 2023



# THE SENTINEL



DESIGNERS:  
SALONI SHELKE  
VIDHITA JAIN  
KAASHVI KAPOOR  
RISHAAYA KAKAR

ISSUE 2  
22 JULY 2023

EDITORS:  
ASHNA AGGARWAL  
ARMAAN KAPOOR  
AMREEN SIDHU  
RUBAB KHATRA

## ***Principal's Note***

The Model United Nations Conference (MUN) is a unique platform that emphasizes the significance of the United Nations and fosters the importance of intercultural understanding and diplomacy to resolve issues of universal concern. By engaging young learners in meaningful discussions around topical issues, such as, the accountability of UN Peacekeepers, the autonomous use of lethal AI/ML based weaponry and the Sudanese refugee crisis, among others, the platform has provided students an opportunity to extend themselves beyond the curriculum and connect theory to practice. The themes for this year's event encouraged students to transcend disciplinary boundaries to impress upon them the value of collective problem-solving and cooperation, to address community-identified needs.



On the decennial anniversary of the Model United Nations Conference at Strawberry Fields High School, we are delighted to have hosted India's first-ever inter-school Policy Contention, which has culminated in meaningful interpretations of domestic and global policies, while leading to tangible, promising solutions to the most pressing social issues that our world faces. The Policy Debate has looked inward and evaluated issues of national concern through a legislative lens. Over the last weekend, we have observed students critically and objectively analysing potentially game-changing policies and bills, such as the National Education Policy, Gati Shakti Masterplan, the National Action Plan for Climate Change, the National Mission for Sustaining the Himalayan Ecosystem and the Digital Personal Data Protection Bill, and many more. Once again, the policies and bills chosen by the MUN Secretariat, find deep relevance with the school's vision and future direction. For instance, taking into consideration the importance of protecting the personal data of our staff, students and parents, we are in the process of drafting a Data Protection Policy at School. The insights generated from the young learners will, we hope, inform the development of a policy that is comprehensive and ethical in its approach. With the School's demonstrated commitment towards global citizenship, both in its mission and practice, we feel that such initiatives promise to continue to inspire our students to develop a socially conscious mindset, that will revolutionise solutions towards conventional problems.

Going forward, we aim to provide more platforms for internationally-minded dialogue among students, while encouraging them to remain committed towards nation-building. As a School that emphasises the importance of driving social change at local and global levels, we recognise the importance of nurturing conversations among individuals who understand the challenges that grassroot India faces and the benefits of undertaking a value-centric education in rebuilding our country as it recovers from perhaps the greatest humanitarian crises of our time.

**Ms. Nisha Kaul**  
**Principal**



## **Policy Contention**

### **Round 1 - Manya Dhillon**

In the first round of the Policy Debate, the delegates argued against and for the National Action Plan for Climate Change introduced in India, an act introduced specifically to target climate change in India and promote the introduction of renewable energy sources.

The first speaker from the affirmative side kicked off the debate by addressing just how devastating the events of climate change can be if not properly dealt with. The main idea behind the plan is to serve as a comprehensive policy to combat climate change. The plan focuses on the promotion of renewable and energy-efficient sources and towards the idea of a greener and more viable India. Moreover, the affirmative side pointed out that India has already been making strides towards a more sustainable future with its implementation of solar panels in virtually every building and home in India and continue on this path all thanks to the plan. Furthermore, India also holds conferences and regularly cooperates with foreign countries for a more global approach to tackling the climate problem. The team rests their argument by emphasising the sheer importance of the plan in laying out India's future as a developed and livable country.



The negative team countered this by pointing out that the plan is largely symbolic instead of being transformative. There is a severe deficiency of ambition on the country's part and a clear lack of direction in implementing the plan successfully. Additionally, the plan would require huge amounts of funds not in the reach of the country, impeding the plan's progress and potentially even leading to degradation in dealing with climate change. Furthermore, there's also a lack of accountability due to the work being shared between several stakeholders, causing unnecessary confusion and stripping people of any responsibility. The team brought their argument home by declaring that the plan taking significant steps towards a greener and more sustainable India does not free it from scrutiny.



On the other hand, even small steps towards combating climate change are imperative in the fight against it. The supportive side vehemently denied that the huge funding would deter the progress of India and pointed out that an investment in this act is an investment in our progress. The plan tackles many issues that plague our country including deforestation and adopts several adaptation strategies, enabling the government to thoroughly dispute the many effects of Climate Change. In addition to this, the plan also invests funds in environmentally friendly forms of technology through which India can

progress towards a low carbon economy. In doing this, India sends a powerful message to global communities and helps bring in collective effort towards dealing with climate change. Lastly, through this plan, India embraces responsibility and moves towards a sustainable future.

However, the opposing team drew attention towards the fact that the inadequate attention to adaptation can potentially lead to vulnerable communities and minorities being affected. It could also lead to displacement of the aforementioned minorities in favour of building renewable energy centres. Furthermore, Global cooperation may be hindered due to lack of commitment and ambition as well as the difference in opinions which could lead to infighting. Additionally, there may be technological and knowledge gaps between countries and even citizens of India especially as the plan relies on advanced and novel technologies which can cause disturbance and lead to hindrance in carrying out the plan.

The opposition continued their argument, bringing up the fact that the solar energy centres fail to target off grid areas to which the supporting teams added that this plan is only a small step forwards and is the maximum the government can do at this point in time. As the plan is integrated and more successful in India, the government can work towards targeting off grid areas as well. There is also concern that India is already developing so why should it focus on trying to cooperate with less developed countries. All in all, the plan is an essential step forward for India but that does not negate the fact that it has many issues which need to be addressed before it is fully accepted.

## Round 2 - Sabeer Singh Balhalya

In Round 2 of the exciting Policy Debate, debaters took up the Gati Shakti Master Plan, which aims to establish a multi-modal network supported by seven branches of infrastructure so as to provide comprehensive support for planning, innovation and technology. The debate took off as the affirmative team began explaining how the Gati Shakti Masterplan has a positive impact on the rural economy due to the fact that it enables farmers to access better infrastructure by providing seeds and crops for free.

The Gati Shakti Master Plan would also provide better and more accessible transport running on renewable energy, in addition to construction of buildings made of green and eco-friendly materials. All this would unlock India's true potential and provide more job opportunities, facilitating a much-needed revival of the coronavirus-fatigued Indian economy.



In response, the negative side argued that the infrastructure of India has to be improved through another plan wherein the cons do not outweigh the pros. Claiming that the green materials being used in the construction of buildings are weak, it was their belief that a minimum of 1,000 trees would need to be uprooted to facilitate the implementation of this plan.

The affirmative side proceeded to explain the other facets of the plan, saying that not only would the plan improve tourism greatly in India but also make India a preferred tourist destination. They explained that the healthcare facilities would also prosper due to the plan's intentions to improve accessibility to healthcare and medication in underdeveloped, rural areas. Furthermore, Indian products would become much more prominent as this plan would attract investors, making the Indian economy more competitive in the global front. All this would be achieved through environmentally-friendly means optimising energy use, making for a better, greener future.



The negative side replied that it will prove to be difficult to convince so many people from rural areas to give their land to the government in fear of displacement and relocation.

At this juncture, the debate drew to an end, thereby illustrating the multi-faceted nature of the master plan and, in turn, the many complexities and challenges presented by it. Through lively debate and discussion, participants were able to paint an incredibly revealing picture of the Gati Shakti Master Plan's reality and how, when implemented, it would impact citizens and the environment.



### Round 3 - Siddhartha Jain

The I.T. Amendment Rules introduced in 2023 have ignited a heated policy contention debate concerning their potential effects on digitalisation and freedom of expression.

The affirmative team strongly supported these rules, asserting that they are essential in addressing critical issues plaguing the digital landscape. They argue that the rules will tackle the widespread dissemination of fake content, ensuring the safety of users in online gaming platforms, and promptly removing racially objectionable content and non-consensual sexual images from the internet.

To bolster their case, the affirmative team proposes the involvement of experts in digital content monitoring and moderation to ensure safety and accuracy. They advocate for fact-checking collaborations with reputable websites to combat the spread of misinformation. Additionally, the team suggests that the government should supply fact-checking bodies to enforce content accuracy and reliability. Furthermore, they propose Internet Service Providers (ISPs) block URLs of risky websites, exemplified by platforms like Twitter's manipulative media policy. These measures are envisioned to create a more responsible digital environment that protects users from harmful content and misinformation.

However, the negative team expresses substantial concerns regarding the I.T. Amendment Rules, asserting that they could lead to unintended consequences and infringe upon crucial democratic principles. They argue that giving more power to censorship might lead to misuse and arbitrary takedowns of legitimate content without adequate justification, creating a chilling effect on free speech and expression. The negative team raises the alarm on the political impact of misinformation, cautioning that manipulating public opinion through digital platforms could lead to increased political polarisation and undermine democratic processes. Moreover, the negative team highlights potential privacy issues, warning that these rules could be misused by governments or private entities to gather private information from users without transparency or accountability. They fear that the lack of transparency in content removal decisions might stifle diverse voices, impacting comedians, parody makers, and alternative viewpoints, leading to a suppression of creativity and freedom of expression.

The affirmative team emphasises that these rules are essential for creating a safer online space, protecting vulnerable users, and combating the rampant spread of misinformation. They argue that by collaborating with fact-checking bodies and experts, the rules will promote credible content and foster a culture of responsible digital citizenship.

In response, the negative team contends that the potential misuse and abuse of censorship powers could hinder the democratic exchange of ideas and suppress voices that challenge the status quo.

They asserted that a balanced approach is needed to protect both the digital ecosystem and fundamental democratic principles. Moreover, the negative team raises concerns about the potential for unfair political advertisement and its consequences on political processes. They argued that political forces could influence these rules and stifle opposition voices, exacerbating political polarisation and undermining the democratic fabric.

The affirmative team rebuts these claims, stating that the rules are designed to ensure a more accountable digital space by engaging experts and reputable fact-checking bodies. They asserted that these measures will not curtail freedom of expression but rather strengthen the veracity of digital information and create a more responsible online environment.

In addition, the negative team warned about the economic repercussions of the proposed rules. They contend that startups and small businesses may suffer due to increased financial and administrative burdens, leading to reduced innovation and foreign investment. Data localisation requirements are also criticised as potentially constricting data to India, making it expensive for importing data and leading to legal disputes.

The affirmative team acknowledged these economic concerns but argued that the benefits of a safer digital space and reduced dissemination of harmful content will outweigh any short-term economic challenges.

Furthermore, the negative team pointed out the proposed rules' lack of transparency, accountability, and responsibility. They questioned the potential for misuse and abuse of power by both the government and private organisations, which may lead to breaches of user privacy and erosion of trust in digital platforms.

In response, the affirmative team emphasises that safeguards and oversight mechanisms will be put in place to prevent any abuse of power. They assert that transparency in decision-making processes will be encouraged to build trust and credibility in the implementation of these rules.

The future of digitalisation and the boundaries of free speech hang in the balance, prompting a critical evaluation of the proposed I.T. Amendment Rules and their potential implications for society as a whole. Both sides presented valid arguments, raising crucial points that demand careful consideration in shaping the policies that will govern the digital age.





## ***Russia and Ukraine- Will they ever see eye to eye?***

The pamphlets crisis, a new initiative launched by the Russian Defense Ministry, was directed at using Russian military planes all over Ukrainian cities, copying World War 2's tactics. Thousands of pamphlets showcasing false information about Ukrainian casualties were dropped, decreasing morale. The Russian GRU launched an operation using operatives disguised in Ukrainian Army Uniforms to smuggle counterfeit Ukrainian currency and put it into the Ukrainian Money Supply. The plan of action by Navy Admiral 1 to prevent the citizens from turning against the Ukrainian government was to ensure citizens were aware that they were false. However, the operation was foiled by the Ukrainian SZRU, and five operatives were arrested. Ukraine claims that someone inside the Russian Military gave him the confidential information.

The Russian cabinet is thrilled with the operation's success, triumphant at creating confusion, fear and uncertainty between the Ukrainians. With the victory came the loss of the five operatives that were arrested. Volunteer Militia 1 believes that this is an opportunity to plan a new mission in the realm of disorder and divert Ukrainian attention from more significant topics. The cabinet was enraged by repeated betrayal from one of their own. During this time of mayhem, the Volunteer Militia and the army generals got into a heated discussion, blaming each other for being the traitor. Accusations were made, and the suspicion of treason of the Wagner group got stronger, but a genuine solution of a comprehensive investigation was agreed upon.

Civil Expert 1 raised a motion for a moderated caucus to discuss and amend solutions provided by them. They gave three keys to unlock, one possibly leading to victory: the reverse Trojan horse strategy, divide and rule and camouflaging troops. The rest of the delegates asked how they would put these solutions into a plan and how they would be effective. With the satellites, it would be impossible to be furtive while hiding.

Another intriguing point Air Force Captain 1 raised was why the Russians would go further from ammunition to an inherently vacant

location. The civil expert also was adamant about mass printing roubles with the help of spies. Espionage was also suggested, sending spies to give confidential information, although that would be challenging due to the heavy guarding of the Russians. Army General 1 speaks in one of their speeches, the Russian missile, 9M79, has been continuously irregular, missing by almost one kilometer. They wanted to create a private directive and form camps to build bases on the border of Poland and Romania, starting a rumor that the Ukrainians had threatening weapons. This would trap the Russians into striking the Poland border, which would, in turn, instantly get NATO involved. Article 5 of NATO states that if any of the NATO countries get attacked, other NATO countries will also be impacted.

An alliance with Donbas caused opposing views between the Air Force General and the executive board. The Air Force General discussed creating a coalition with Donbas to help with the Russian attacks. Donbas is a region under Ukraine. However, Russia wanted Donbas to be under their rule as numerous Russians were presiding there. Saying that Ukraine wanted to create an alliance with Donbas is a logically flawed point, as it is already under Ukraine. Going into a moderated caucus, the air force captain 2 wanted to sabotage railway lines to stop Russians from advancing. They also wanted to create corridors in Mariupol, leading to civilian casualties as Mariupol is a densely packed city. The point of conflict among the delegates was if the Ukrainian government were willing to take upon civilian casualties, giving the Russians moral authority to do more killings.





The Russian Forces also increased their operations in Ukraine with additional troop deployments. Wagner mercenaries attacked from the north of Kyiv, While a larger Russian Army force attacked from the East. Both divisions were successful in penetrating. Kyiv's defences and Russian forces entered Kyiv's outskirts for the second time. Surprise Ukraine's allies also took up Ukrainian forces and didn't share any intel about the Russian buildup with them. This is also causing Anti-Ukraine sentiments to rise in the West. As the session drew towards an end, both Ukraine and Russia were spiralling into madness and paranoia.

This culminated in Russia resorting to rather revolutionary methods. Curiosity got the best of the Air force Captain 2 of the Russian Cabinet during tea. He was found snooping around the Ukrainian cabinet, reading the Delegate's privacy. This act was not taken lightly. A complaint was forged by one of the faculty advisors, which was further dealt with by the secretariat. The Delegate was questioned and received a solemn warning from the Executive board. The rivalry between the two countries drastically increased. This act deeply hurt the sentiments of the Ukrainian cabinet.

On the other hand, the Russian Foreign Ministry has informed the International Press that Ukraine launched the missile which destroyed Marie Antoinette, and Russia has no involvement whatsoever. American Satellites have confirmed that the missile was launched from a Ukrainian base in Odesa. Nations of the world are blaming Ukraine for not giving a warning. The Russians receiving sympathies were in want of answers.





## ***Justice Delayed is Justice Denied: Delegates Collectively Stand For Comprehensive Training of Peacekeeping***

On Day 2 of the MUN, the delegates convened to address the critical issues on accountability of peacekeepers. They brought forth crucial motions to tackle the issue of criminal accountability of peacekeeping forces, emphasising the need for new reporting mechanisms and cleaner investigative measures.

The Delegate of India took the floor to present a comprehensive proposal on reporting criminal activities of peacekeepers. The delegate stressed the importance of establishing a standardised and confidential reporting system accessible to all personnel. It was a matter of priority that we create an independent supervising body responsible for investigating reported incidents impartially, thereby instilling greater confidence in the process. The delegate ended their speech by proposing a motion calling for the deliberation of new measures regarding reported crimes committed by UN peacekeepers, with a special emphasis on investigative measures, which was passed without difficulty.

The Delegate of Republic of Korea raised a critical point on the jurisdictional issues faced by the legal systems. It was imperative to bridge the jurisdictional gap between the national and international courts by harmonising legal systems and promoting cooperation between countries involved in peacekeeping. In response, the Delegate of Netherlands expressed that peacekeepers should be prosecuted on the grounds of international humanitarian rights. Crimes would be reported within the country in which they were committed, and the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) would investigate the crime thoroughly. This proposal was supported by an overwhelming majority, with the Delegate for the United States of America expressing their confidence in a system having a central legal authority. Several other delegates put forward their views on the importance of collaboration between nations to foster the creation of joint investigative units. The establishment of extradition treaties was seen as an essential step towards ensuring that peacekeepers who are facing criminal charges are brought to justice, irrespective of their home country's jurisdiction.



The delegates also advocated strengthening the limited investigative capacity within OIOS by equipping them with essential resources for conducting thorough investigations and delivering impartial outcomes. To fund an international and impartial tribunal, the Delegate of China proposed utilising funds from the World Bank, International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD). Allocating resources for training and establishing a hybrid tribunal were also discussed by the Delegate of Liberia.

In the end, the progress from constructive discussions about this issue to coming up with diverse solutions about reporting and investigative mechanisms has been tremendous. The delegates came to a consensus on a robust framework that not only expedites but enhances the transparency in peacekeeping missions. With this, we can finally expect some justice to be served to the erring peacekeepers on account of the proposed creation of an international tribunal holding their crimes accountable.

-Priyanjali Goyal

## ***Assault Weapons, Red Flag Laws, and More!***

Day 2 of the US Senate Committee saw a heated and eventful debate wherein the Senators continued their deliberation on Gun laws in the US, picking up from their discussion yesterday, which was focussed on the causes of gun violence across the US.

Starting, the Senator from Maryland emphasized the urgent need to eliminate ambiguity surrounding the term 'self-defense'. Vermont proposed implementing crucial laws to close loopholes like the Brady Handgun Loophole, Gun Show and Private Sellers Loophole, a significant concern of Maryland, New York and Indiana. Vermont also introduced the Project Sustainable Neighbourhood, which aims to reduce firearm violence through community counseling and data statistics.

The Senator from Pennsylvania raised a crucial issue by focusing on red flag laws. They emphasized the idea of the removal of Second Amendment rights from the cohabitants of the accused due to red flag laws, proposing a solution involving the safekeeping of firearms by a trusted third party. Additionally, they sought to implement double medical checks, promote safe storage practices, and clarify existing gun laws.

The Filibuster of this speech sparked a comprehensive discussion on mental health and its correlation with violent intrusive thoughts, engaging Senators from Wisconsin, Tennessee and Maryland in the dialogue. In their speech, the Senator of New York brought up the Gun Show Loophole and cited the Michigan High School shooting as an example of the Boyfriend Loophole leading to intense scrutiny from the Democratic Senator of Wisconsin regarding New York's discriminatory laws against providing guns to people with Italian heritage. Furthermore, the Republican Senator of Wisconsin called for implementing equal gun laws across all American States, citing a suicide case in Delaware where a person's gun was seized, and upon its return, the person tragically committed suicide.

The Senator of North Carolina defended the

Second Amendment Rights of the people and proposed to increase the legal age to carry a gun to 21 years old, arguing that armed men surround ministers and presidents at all times. Yet, some Senators propose that civilians should not be able to carry a gun for similar reasons. This gave rise to a counterpoint by Indiana arguing that the President of the Country must not be compared to a homeless person on the street, leading to doubts about Indiana's stand on Human Rights.

A new theme that most states echoed was the historical influence of the National Rifles Association over gun control laws. With states like Indiana appreciating the NRA and calling them a friend they tried to establish a sense of trust in the citizens and pointed fingers at immigrants, blaming them for mass shootings and giving the US a bad reputation, quoting the example of Texas' Robb Elementary School shooting where the perpetrator was not of American origin and Vermont acknowledging their presence and influence over gun control laws.

Most states emphasized stricter laws, harsher punishment, and closed loopholes in pre-existing laws. Upon completion of the General Speakers List, the Session moved into drafting the bill with the Majority Bill drafted by Pennsylvania with Maryland as a sponsor and Wisconsin(Democratic), Indiana and Alabama. The Bill of the Minority was drafted by Texas and Florida as sponsors and Tennessee, Wisconsin(Republican) and North Carolina as co-sponsors.

As the drafting took place, a moderated caucus on the topic "Deliberation of private companies with special emphasis on the National Rifles Association" was opened by Wisconsin, accusing the NRA of bribing various politicians in exchange for lenient gun laws. On the other hand, Florida acknowledged the NRA's role, and called for financial transparency and stricter responsible gun ownership laws. It demanded more cooperation between law enforcement and private players in the gun market.

Indiana continued defending Second Amendment rights by commending the NRA, which promotes responsible gun ownership by giving one safety tutorial before gun purchases.



Kentucky highlighted the economic significance of gun manufacturing in the US, while Massachusetts sided with Wisconsin's argument of the NRA's history of influence over gun laws.

After the drafting was complete, the Democrats, Republicans and the Independent Candidate, Bernie Sanders, presented their bills to the Senate upon which the voting commenced. The Bill made by the Democrats, the Comprehensive Assault Weapons Buyback and Reduction Act(CAWBRA), mainly focussed on Buying Back illegal assault rifles in exchange for governmental support. The Republican Bill focussed on allocating funds to implement more security measures as a preventative measure against mass shooting at schools, updating the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, and closing the Boyfriend Loophole. The Bill by the Independent Candidate mainly focused on Mental Health, frequent psychiatric checks, and improving the requirements to obtain a gun license. It also sought to close the Boyfriend Loophole and Background checks as a mandate to get a license.

The highly anticipated voting took place after introducing these three bills wherein the Democratic Party's Bill won the maximum number of votes, with Bernie Sander's Bill with the least number of votes. This led to the conclusion of the Second day and the first agenda of discussion of the US Senate. Deliberation over the second agenda focused on the CHIPS Act will occur tomorrow, with enthusiastic participation anticipated by the Senators.

-Vaasvi Kuthiala





## **WEF**



The second day of the World Economic Forum began with great ardour and enthusiasm amongst the delegates. The PM of Canada kicked off the session by emphasising the scars left by recession post-COVID which left the nation dependent on immigrants, giving rise to unforeseen circumstances like medical emergencies, high rates of debt and vast unemployment. In the midst of this chaos, the PM iterated that Canada has still shown unmatched resilience and continues working to help students be debt free whilst giving a significant portion of income to the healthcare sector. They asserted that the strength of an economy is determined by not how hard it is hit but how hard it bounces back. This served as an example for other delegates regarding what possible solutions may be pursued to overcome this problem.

As the discussion escalated into a heated debate, Ireland targeted the West by claiming that the rich are exploiting the poor in the name of sustainability. The West colonised the East in spite of its continuous growth, imposing a financial restriction on these marginalised countries. The Prime Minister of Ireland suggested the formation of a debt relief initiative for poor countries funded by the rich who had earlier profited off exploiting and draining the wealth of the East.

The criticism towards the liberal policies of UK and USA continued as Russia claimed that these policies have unimaginable consequences, suggesting instead the formulation of policies prioritising physical management and transparency. Piling on the hate bandwagon, Bangladesh accused the UK and USA of handing out loans on high interest rates to earn profits, disregarding student welfare. The Prime Minister of Bangladesh demanded that the voices of the students be heard so as to call attention to and subsequently repair the disparity between developed and developing nations.

India sparked controversy by alleging that the UK and USA should borrow loans from China to eradicate student debt as a way of applying economic sanctions against China, a country India accused of spreading COVID-19 throughout the world which ultimately led to the global economic recession. The Indian Prime Minister supported his argument by drawing attention to the death rate in China being extremely low for a country with the second largest population in the world.

The intense argument gradually subsided when Tanzania listed the measures taken by their nation to bring the economy back on track like building strong foundations in industries, such as agriculture, textile and tourism, while remaining committed to international investors. The committee session ended with the delegates contemplating ways to rescue the global economy from this state of depression.

**-Arshia Sachdeva**



## ***Computers of crisis: cyber security brought under fire after threats boil to the surface***

The Committee started the day in open dialogue, reviewing the ups and downs of Autonomous Weapons Production. The Delegate of the United States highlighted the importance of controlled production of weapons systems by designating and segregating it to various private entities and manufacturing units. They further defended their stance on high investment in research and development, elaborating that it allowed them to secure control and oversight in the department. They stated that making LAWs and drones easily available in the market will let nations build a stronger military front and mitigate the possibility of asymmetric wars.

The Delegate of China explained how the process of development of autonomous weaponry and drone systems could in turn help steady the economic growth in smaller nations if given the opportunity to provide resources and material. Keeping in mind the potential consequences, Delegates of Ecuador and Japan spoke of the peaceful use of robotics as service tools under human control, indicating the requirement of a robust regulatory framework. The Delegate of the United Arab Emirates reiterated their stance of ethically led research and diligently curated developmental proceedings.

The Delegate representing Russia stressed the importance of LAWs in defence systems and threat management. They expressed a fear of western dominance, in case of an arms race, and urged the members to consider development of military drones to strengthen national arsenals and prepare for the outcomes they aim to prevent.

At this juncture, a crisis was introduced:

1. An article in NY Times Kathleen Kingsbury: in a groundbreaking paper curated by Professor Neville Hogan and Senior Research Specialist Hermano Krebs of MIT in collaboration with Oxford Social Sciences Professors Timothy Power and Victoria Murphy highlighted the implications of lethal autonomous weapons and the potential humanitarian implications it poses.

2. Reports from CIA and MI6 have concretely proved Taiwan's \$2 Billion investment in "Project Desert Star", aimed at developing lethal autonomous weapons, which are unknown to mankind. UAE's partnerships and collaborations with other countries are unknown.

3. The blueprint of MQ-9 reaper weapon has been released into the black market, the traces of which can be found in the Middle East and Eastern Europe

The delegate of China was the first to speak out about their stance on the crisis. They spelt out the consequences of such advanced weaponry being freely accessible to non-state parties and boldly stated that Taiwan was operating under a "feign government" and that the problem was escalating due to the involvement of an external, powerful nation.

The delegate of Mozambique further saw Taiwan, a non-member nation, as a threat mass producing AI weapons. Artificial intelligence was many a time referred to as robots without conscience, only reliable to deviate from rules and regulations set. Therefore, many members remained partial to an absolute standstill to research development and funding.

The Delegate of Russia deemed the "illegitimate Taiwan government" incapable of manufacturing such heavy military assets. They instead, believed it to be a ploy by the United States to instigate insecurity in the world governments. The USA, being the leading developer of AI-based weaponry, was repeatedly asked to justify their policies toward information sharing and stakes in research testing and manufacturing. The delegate reassured that their Government is looking into their cyber security and working to rule out the problem.

The committee acknowledged that solving one crisis without any extra measures is only a call to more of the same. Trying to avoid an arms race, many member states express the need to stop development and discourage testing and research. Other delegates pointed out that governments developing LAWs was necessary to protect against non-state actors who could undoubtedly use the weapons against public interest. The delegate of Switzerland reminded that "weapons are made faster than laws" and to ensure global security more was required. They recommended that a programmer or manufacturer be held responsible for the acts of a fully autonomous weapon.

With the promise of solution and understanding hanging in the air, the committee ended the day on a high note.

-Sanjula Kapur



On the negative side of the contention, critics raised several concerns about the Nirbhaya Act. One major criticism is the perceived discrimination against men, as the act tends to overlook female perpetrators and portrayed men solely as victimizers.

This view runs contrary to the principles of gender neutrality in justice and highlights the importance of considering all perspectives to ensure fairness and balance in the legal framework. The implementation of the Act has been a point of contention as well. Immediate availability of the Act led to retroactive application, resulting in some offenders receiving milder sentences under the old laws. This inconsistency in justice delivery raised concerns about the fairness and uniformity of the legal system.

Inefficient implementation and lack of sufficient rehabilitation processes, such as counseling and legal aid for victims, are other areas of criticism. For the Nirbhaya Act to be truly effective, it must not only focus on punishment but also prioritize the rehabilitation and support of survivors to help them heal and reintegrate into society.

The Act's failure to address marital rape is another significant concern. By excluding marital rape from its purview, the Act leaves a substantial gap in protecting women's rights within the institution of marriage. Critics argue that any legislation aiming to combat violence against women must comprehensively address all forms of violence, including within marital relationships.

Perhaps one of the most significant criticisms of the Nirbhaya Act is the lack of gender-neutral terms and the exclusion of LGBTQ+ and other marginalised individuals from its protection. By solely focusing on women's safety, the Act fails to acknowledge that sexual harassment and gender-based violence can affect individuals of all genders and sexual orientations, thus undermining the broader concept of justice and inclusion.

In conclusion, striking a balance between protecting women's rights and ensuring justice for all in society is crucial.

-Siddharta Jain





## ***"MUN Showdown: Delegates of India and China Clash in Intense Debate!" (UNHCR)***

The UNHRC convened a session to address the ongoing catastrophe that is the Sudan Refugee Crisis, an issue that has sparked political unrest, economic decline and ethnic strife since the two years since the partition of Sudan and South Sudan. The committee session commenced with the delegate of Kenya throwing light on the impact of the Sudan Refugee Crisis not only on Sudan, but its neighbouring countries as well. It was brought to the attention of the committee that the majority of the countries neighbouring Sudan are in fact facing economic challenges themselves, thus making it difficult—if not impossible—for them to provide amenities to the Sudanese refugees. The majority of the member nations pitched in, expressing their agreement on the matter, yet almost no delegate backed away from promising humanitarian aid and facilities to better the lives of the Sudanese refugees.

The delegate of India had a fascinating yet controversial take on the matter. Initially showing sympathy towards the IDPs and Sudanese refugees, they eventually delved into a matter of India's personal interest, reporting that roughly 3000 Indian citizens are currently stranded in Sudan and how India intends to launch an operation to put an end to this problem. The operation would involve the deployment of the Indian Navy's INS Sumedha, a stealth offshore patrol vessel, in addition to two air force operations. Furthermore, the delegate of India voiced their opinions on the placement of refugee camps, urging that the refugee camps be set up in areas which are relatively harder to reach. They stressed the essential involvement of developed nations on the matter, throwing light on how efforts of the developed nations could make a much more significant contribution to the matter.

This speech was interpreted by the People's Republic of China as selfish. China called out India, saying that India's plan of action implied care and concern only for the citizens of India, not taking into account the international implications at stake. Pointing out that India's approach was rather uncaring, the delegate held the belief that if India could evacuate Indian civilians from Sudan, it should be able to evacuate Sudanese refugees as well in the interest of human rights for all.

India refused to deny that the citizens of India were in fact their priority, announcing that their safety was of their utmost concern. The discussion was brought to an end by India enumerating on their plan to provide assistance to the Sudanese refugees, who they would assuredly be organising rescue operations for in the future whilst placing their own brethren first and foremost.

This intense atmosphere was brought to an end as the UNHCR's session drew towards an end. Through this clash for the ages, delegates were able to highlight not only the plight of the stranded refugees but also the attitude of the nations towards this crisis. Moreover, rescue operations which were brought up in this session represented a possible solution to this crisis, which could hopefully signal a beacon of hope for all the innocent people caught in the crossfire.

