

COMMITTEE GUIDE

GLS



Global Leaders Summit

Gabriela De Oliveira & Santiago Velásquez

2021

Contents:

1. Presidents' Letter

2. Committee Information

- I. History
- II. Structure
- III. Special Procedures (if applicable)
- IV. Bibliography

3. **Simulation:** *The effects of imperialism in world development*

- I. History/Context
- II. Current Situation
- III. Key Points of the Debate
- IV. Guiding Questions
- V. Bibliography

4. **Topic 1:** *Does the end justify the means?*

- I. History/Context
- II. Current Situation
- III. Key Points of the Debate
- IV. Guiding Questions
- V. Bibliography

5. **Topic 2:** *To what extent should manifestation/political activism be allowed?*

- I. History/Context
- II. Current Situation
- III. Key Points of the Debate
- IV. Guiding Questions
- V. Bibliography

1. Presidents' Letter

Honourable Delegates,

Welcome to GLS! Our names are Gabriela de Oliveira and Santiago Velásquez, and we are both seniors at Colegio Bolívar and Colegio Colombo Británico respectively. It is a great pleasure for us to be your presidents; we are excited to see how this committee, and the topics we've selected, will create an interesting, and fun environment for debate. Between us, we have participated in a large number of models, so we will be using the experience we've accumulated and the knowledge we've obtained to focus on making this model a wonderful experience for you all.

GLS is a distinctive committee that allows each of you to represent an important leader in history, leaders that stand out or who have left important footprints in human history. We expect each delegate to be capable of identifying and coming up with a concrete position regarding these topics in accordance with your leader's point of view. To do so, you must be aware of their socio-economic background, time period, studies, way of thinking, actions, beliefs, experiences, and the overall mentality of the leader you were assigned. In order to be successful in this committee, you must faithfully represent their opinions, setting aside your personal point of view. You need to impersonate and adapt towards your leader's mindset, considering everything you know about your leader as a potential tool, and you must have a clear understanding of the topics we are addressing.

GLS is also a unique opportunity to step out of your comfort zone by accepting the challenge of representing someone else and making informed assumptions about how they would react. Finally, you must keep in mind that you will all be representing some of the brightest and most influential people in history, therefore you must understand the limits of each leader.

We would like to remind you that we are here for you and that our job is not only to guide you but to make this experience enjoyable for everyone. Please don't hesitate to contact us before or during the model if you have any doubts, questions, or simply need some advice. You can contact us through our committee email: glscali@ccbcali.edu.co

We look forward to seeing you at CCBMUNIXIX!

Yours sincerely,

Gabriela de Oliveira and Santiago Velásquez
GLS Presidents

2. Committee Information

I. History

GLS or Global Leaders Summit is a Model United Nations committee in which delegates represent different leaders and recognized individuals' ideologies, as opposed to representing countries. These leaders can be from different historical periods and different nationalities. They may have led countries or organizations, or have had a significant impact on the way that society thinks and acts. The point of this committee is to dive deep into your leader's actions and beliefs, while also taking into account their time period and the reasoning behind their principles.

This committee will allow delegates to have a philosophical debate on world issues with historical input. Throughout the discussion, delegates will be able to see different perspectives towards world issues, while also exploring the philosophy of well-known historical leaders. The committee was created in CCBMUN in order to allow older delegates or delegates with a lot of experience to try something new.

II. Structure

The committee is made up of different leaders from past and present, who will bring their own experience into the debates. It is also important to know that during GLS your leader will be aware of all historical events prior to and after their death. They will also know all technical terms and current technologies. Finally, it is imperative for you to classify your leaders' decisions and experiences, in order to judge different global challenges and their reactions and opinions toward these.

Leaders must have in mind all their experiences and the important events they have lived through in order to propose and find solutions to the debate, according to their mindset. Leaders must also maintain their point of view and personality portrayed during their own lifetime, hence, their decisions and thoughts regarding the topics must be according to what their reaction would be if they were alive today.

III. Special Procedures

The GLS committee functions differently from the rest of the committees in CCBMUN. This is because, during GLS, delegates will be able to talk in the first person, being able to use pronouns such as "I", "me" and "we". They will also be able to specifically refer to different leaders during the debate. In addition to this, delegates can and are encouraged to come dressed as their leader, and won't be restricted to the formal attire of the Model. For example, if one's leader is Cleopatra, one may come dressed in ancient Egyptian clothing. Nevertheless, it will still be required for students to respect the dress code of the model while remaining

respectful and tolerant of all cultures. If there are any doubts about this you may contact the presidents for clarification.

Another important difference between GLS and other committees is the resolution process. On terminating the debate, the leaders will form together in different groups, where they will be required to write a guideline document. In this document, the leaders must explain a step-by-step process plan as to how the current issue should be resolved, or how the current issue should be handled. In this prescriptive document, the leaders must use historical and current quantitative and qualitative data to support their claims.

Finally, delegates will be required to send a portfolio before the Model. This portfolio should include three different documents. The first document should contain two opening speeches, one for each topic, maintaining the same format as those in other committees. Additionally, delegates will submit a research document that will discuss both topics, and give the leader's perspective and possible solutions for each one. Finally, delegates must submit a biography of their leader, including a short description of their childhood, education, important events that marked their life, and their most recognizable work.

IV. Bibliography

de Oliveira, G. Robinson, K (2020). CBMUN XVII GLS Commission Guide, Retrieved from: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1xPPMnwZgYHFsbXOs0qEiAe0WRqQc-EykzsOUaH5Tv>

Riascos, P. Arboleda, N (2019). Retrieved and adapted from: CCBMUN XVII Global Leaders' Summit Commission Guide

3. **Simulation:** *The effects of imperialism in world development*

I. **History/Context**

To begin with, the term or the concept of imperialism has generally been defined as “Imperialism, state policy, practice, or advocacy of extending power and dominion, especially by direct territorial acquisition or by gaining political and economic control of other areas. Because it always involves the use of power, whether military or economic or some subtler form, imperialism has often been considered morally reprehensible, and the term is frequently employed in international propaganda to denounce and discredit an opponent’s foreign policy.”¹ Investigators and psychologists from the University of Pittsburgh have reached a more precise description of certain behaviour by stating, “Imperialism is a state of mind as much as it is a structure of domination. That truth is central to understanding the attitude of those who presume to impose their will on others, to run the affairs of alien people, to control what they may do and what they may not do”. In other words, both the physical action and the psychological mindset and behaviour, assimilate or reflects the idea of superiority and dominion over others.

Throughout human history, imperialism has been performed repetitive times all across the world, it has been present since the beginning of civilization. Humans, as psychologists have stated, have always been driven to power and status through the means of wealth and physical power, which is driven by our primal instincts. Imperialism can be evidenced everywhere, from the Sumerians in Mesopotamia, the first Chinese dynasty, the English and Spanish empires, to our current time with a more evolved concept of imperialism. For this committee, we will stick to the more traditional example of imperialism, i.e. empires throughout history that have successfully established colonies in foreign nations.

For the debate, it is pertinent to have in mind the difference between imperialism and colonialism, as these two are fairly similar and thus people often confuse them or even categorize them as the same. The simplest way to differentiate these two terms is by thinking of colonialism as the action or the practices, and imperialism as the idea or motive that drives the action. In more specific terms, colonialism is the act of settling colonies in foreign nations, for example, the actions of European countries which colonized many parts of the world from

the 1500s onwards. On the other hand, there is imperialism, which is the desire to extend power and dominion over others, who are often seen as inferior. Having this clarification in mind, it is pertinent to highlight how they exist and present a dependent relationship, let us imagine that Imperialism is the mind and colonialism is the fist. If delegates are able to understand the difference between the terms and use them simultaneously in their favour, those delegates will stand out and perform as the topic truly requires them to.

II. Current Situation

Imperialism, as mentioned before, is like a mindset, a concept that people embrace and develop among themselves; however, as time evolves, so does the concept. In our modern world, there is almost no imperialistic based colonialism, the world nations now have more “respect” towards the territories they own as well as towards those of others. Despite there being few examples of strict colonialism activity in the world today, the term imperialism has now expanded to include monetary terms and, what is known in the business world, as hostile takeovers. Furthermore, it sometimes touches the boundaries of certain cultural issues.

One example of modern imperialism is given by Professor John Smith, where he describes the new imperialism of North America taking over South America economically, “Neoliberal globalization must therefore be recognized as a new, imperialist stage of capitalist development, where “imperialism” is defined by its economic essence: the exploitation of southern living labour by northern capitalists.”⁵ Another example to better understand the concept of modern imperialism is the way Lenin saw it, “The systematic violation of equality between proletarians, deriving from the systematic inequality between nations, was a central preoccupation of Lenin, who argued that the division of nations into oppressor and oppressed is the essence of imperialism. The export of capital, one of the most essential economic bases of imperialism...sets the seal of parasitism on the whole country that lives by exploiting the labour of several overseas countries and colonies.”⁶

In other words, modern imperialism is still a mindset, an idea or motive of superiority that has now expanded its horizons to the economy, socio-cultural aspects, and even to the race for technology. Modern imperialism is based on the idea of overcoming others and showing greater strength or power. It is pertinent to affirm that modern imperialism has kept its original bases and roots, however, it is the means and the paths it takes for it to reach its goal that has evolved into what now is known as a more “civilized” way. This can be seen most particularly with large multinational corporations, which try to impose their way of working and thinking on populations in other countries where they have their business, forcing people to change their work and social habits to fit in with the corporate culture, and even sometimes pressurizing local governments into making the political decisions that best suit the corporation.

III. Key Points of the Debate

- Nations that had an imperialist approach
- Old and modern imperialism
- Benefits and consequences of imperialism
- Accomplishments of imperialism
- Morality of imperialism
- Imperialism mindset becoming independent from colonialism
- Multinational corporations as a form of imperialism

IV. Guiding Questions

1. Does your leader live in an active imperialistic time period?
2. What is your leader’s background and how does this affect their thinking about imperialism?
3. How have colonised countries benefited from imperialism, if at all?
4. What are the positive effects of imperialism?
5. What are the negative effects of imperialism?

6. Does your leader think that imperialism has brought more benefits or disadvantages to the world?
7. Would the world be a better place without imperialism?
8. Is imperialism morally justified?
9. Are multinational corporations the latest form of imperialism, and what should be done about them, if anything?

V. Bibliography

Britannica. (2021, July 9). Imperialism. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/imperialism>

The University of Pittsburgh. (n.d.). UR Imperialism [PDF]. Retrieved from <http://www.pitt.edu/~mbren/Papers/UR%20IMPERIALISM%20N.pdf>

Lehigh University. (2001, October). Colonialism/Imperialism. Retrieved from <https://www.lehigh.edu/~amsp/eng-11-globalization.htm>

Magdoff, H. (n.d.). New Imperialism. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/New-Imperialism>

Wolff, R. D. (1997, May). Economics of Imperialism. JSTOR. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1815810>

John Smith (Jul 01, 2. I. (2019, January 22). Imperialism in the Twenty-First Century. Retrieved from <https://monthlyreview.org/2015/07/01/imperialism-in-the-twenty-first-century/>

4. Topic 1: *Does the end justify the means?*

I. History/Context

Objectives, goals, and ambitions are all synonyms and equal in their roots. They originate from desire and need, the principal source of motivation for human action in history. But in order to achieve a specific objective or end, the means won't always be ethical, moral or legal. So, as rational beings, we can't help but wonder if the end justifies the means. Although this has been a dilemma that humanity has dealt with for centuries, its development is attributed to Nicholas Machiavelli. Machiavelli was born in Florence Italy in 1469, a time of transition from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance.

The Middle Ages (IV-XIV CE) were characterized by the feudal system, ethnocentrism, and the oppression of science; while the Renaissance (XV-XVI CE) was distinguished for promoting science, the growth of cities, and anthropocentrism. The Renaissance left the Middle Ages behind and generated an artistic and cultural movement. It was a step from a feudal society based on agrarian activity to a mercantile society. Scientific research, art and education were promoted and all these aspects were influenced by classical works. It was believed that everything could be explained by reason and science. In addition, there was a significant division between the church and the state. Furthermore, the bourgeois class began to grow, paving the way for the Commercial Renaissance, while advances in navigation connected the world. As a result of this, there was a great cultural exchange between the East and the West that was key to the Cultural Renaissance. Ultimately, there was a crucial transition from theocentrism to anthropocentrism. The fundamental historical events that were key to the development of the Renaissance were the invention of the printing press in 1450, the taking of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453, the discovery of America by Europeans in 1492, the protestant reformation in 1517, and the development of the heliocentric theory of Copernicus in 1543.

In this context, Nicholas Machiavelli renewed political theory and was one of the fathers of political realism. In his book, *The Prince*, he details how the state should work and its relationship with the people. He was also among the first people to propose the separation

of church and state. In his writings, he reflects on the politics of his time and he became a propeller for the secularization of society and culture.

To understand Machiavelli, his philosophy and the ultimate origin of the phrase, “The ends justify the means” we need to identify the key principles he established in his book, *The Prince*. When analysing these principles it is important to keep in mind that Machiavelli believed men are selfish, opportunistic, treacherous, and self-interested. According to Machiavelli, a good prince is one who knows the true essence of men (described above) so he knows that he must strive to be loved and feared, but that it is more important to be feared than loved. Additionally, a good prince is: able to adapt to the circumstances; act according to the law or with force depending on the situation; abandon his principles to act with force when required; appear to be one thing whilst being the opposite (hide certain things from the people); and finally, a prince can’t let chance determine the future, instead, he must take destiny into his own hands. Machiavelli states that the ultimate objective of a prince is to conserve his power and always overcome the difficulties of the state to maintain order above all else.

II. Current Situation

Consequentialism is the class of normative ethical theories that state that the consequences of one's conduct are the ultimate basis for any judgment about the rightness or wrongness of that conduct. It holds that a morally right act is one that will produce a good outcome or consequence. The idea of consequentialism is commonly captured in the saying, "the end justifies the means", meaning that if a goal is morally important enough, any method of achieving it is acceptable. Consequentialism is challenged by deontological ethics, which argues that the morality of the conduct is determined by the actions rather than the outcome. It is also contrasted with virtue ethics, which focuses on the character of the person that executes a specific action instead of the means or consequences. Consequentialism is also opposite to pragmatic ethics which has a scientific focus on morality. Another important theory of morality to take into consideration for the debate is utilitarianism which advocates for the action that benefits the greatest number of people in a society.

Now that we understand the distinct ethical currents that hold different positions regarding the statement “the end justifies the means” we can explore cases and situations that can be framed within the question, “Does the end justify the means?” For example, is it justified to destroy a city, vandalize it, and terrorize its people to make a change? Is the use of violence justified to establish order? Is it justifiable to take over the capitol in order to send the message that elections were rigged and that democracy is being threatened? Is it justifiable to invade a country and violate its sovereignty to destroy its threatening nuclear weapons? As you can see, every decision can be put into perspective using the question, “Does the end justify the means?” This leads us to compare the benefits of actions versus the consequences. Based on this idea, is it possible to define an action as morally correct or justifiable if the benefits outweigh the consequences? But who does it benefit? The concept of the benefit itself is subjective, so how can we determine if the end justifies the means? Well, it's your task as the world's most prominent leader to figure it out!

Hitler, Stalin, and Mao Zedong are the most recognized leaders to have ruled based on the philosophy that the end justifies the means. For instance, Hitler’s dream was to create a community of racially pure Germans loyal to their leader, who would lead a campaign of racial cleansing and world conquest. To achieve this, Hitler started a war and ordered the murder of 11 million victims he deemed inferior or undesirable, “life unworthy of life” among the Jews, Slavs, homosexuals, and Jehovah’s Witnesses. For Hitler, establishing Aryan supremacy, cleansing inferior races, and conquering the world justified murder.

Stalin's “revolution from above” sought to build communism by means of forced collectivization and industrialization. Stalin's deep desire was to industrialize the Soviet Union, lead it to become a military power and impose a communist totalitarian regime that would ensure his absolute political power and make the Soviet Union a great superpower. To achieve this goal, Stalin ordered mass deportation, which usually meant execution, and persecution of ethnic, religious and opposing political groups. Under his rule famine, disease, and war took the lives of millions. Studies developed by several scholars such as Soviet/Russian historian Dmitri Volkogonov, and the director of Yale's "Annals of Communism" series Jonathan Brent, put the death toll from Stalin at about 20 million lives. Ultimately, Mao Zedong fostered a revolution in China, purged, exiled, and executed approximately 45 million

people to seize power, establish an absolute totalitarian communist rule, and restore ancient Chinese values. Mao proclaimed that "to rebel is justified" supporting the idea that the end justifies the means.

More recent examples include the United States support of rebel groups in various parts of the world in attempts to stop communism or to satisfy a specific interest. For example, during the Cold War, the United States supported coups, dictatorships, and mechanisms like "El Plan Condor" to ensure capitalist control of the continent. Under this justification, we have also seen United States involvement in the Vietnam War and the Korean War. There is also speculation regarding the United States support of ISIS in its early stages in order to destabilize the Syrian government. Another example is Australia's harsh and often violent crackdowns on the Australian population in the fight to stop the spread of COVID.

These are just a few examples of some of the most famous examples of leaders that devastated entire nations under the idea that the end justifies the means. For this committee, we encourage you to dig deep into the mentality, background, and philosophy of your leader in order to represent them in the most honest and loyal way possible. The objective is to develop a resolution paper with the same structure and format as a formal MUN resolution paper justifying whether the end justifies the means or not.

III. Key Points of the Debate

- Human nature and its effects on decision making
- Events in History where the end has or hasn't justified the means
- Morality and ethics vs the "common good."
- Benefits vs. consequences of leaders' actions
- Utilitarianism as a basis for decision making
- Circumstances in which the end justifies the means are acceptable

IV. Guiding Questions

1. How do you weigh benefits vs. consequences?
2. Are benefits subjective?
3. How does your leader's position towards this question vary according to the circumstance?
4. Has your leader justified any action under the pretext of it being for a greater cause?
5. In what sort of scenario might your leader consider the end to justify the means?
6. Does your leader believe in a universal definition of what is right?

V. Bibliography

Driver, J. (2014). The History of Utilitarianism. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2014). Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2014/entries/utilitarianism-history/>

How Did Hitler Happen? | The National WWII Museum | New Orleans. (n.d.). Retrieved October 20, 2021, from <https://www.nationalww2museum.org/war/articles/how-did-hitler-happen>

Joseph Stalin—Legacy | Britannica. (n.d.). Retrieved October 20, 2021, from <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Joseph-Stalin/Legacy>

Remembering the biggest mass murder in the history of the world. (n.d.). Washington Post. Retrieved October 20, 2021, from <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/volokh-conspiracy/wp/2016/08/03/giving-historys-greatest-mass-murderer-his-due/>

What Can You Learn from Machiavelli? (n.d.). Yale Insights. Retrieved October 20, 2021, from <https://insights.som.yale.edu/insights/what-can-you-learn-machiavelli>

5. Topic 2: *To what extent should manifestation/political activism be allowed?*

I. History/Context

There will always be a deep desire in people to express their disagreement with rules and edicts and to demand change. Yet the manifestation of these ideas can often result in violence that threatens stability and order. Considering this reality, to what extent should manifestation/political activism be allowed?

Throughout history, influential philosophers like Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau developed positions and arguments regarding the relationship between the state and the people, the purpose of the state, and in what circumstances the people can rebel. These theories have transcended through history and can still be applied to issues we face today; it's fundamental to understand the political theories of these philosophers when attempting to answer the question proposed. Considering this we will do a basic overview of these philosophers and the ideas they proposed.

Hobbes was born in 1588 in Westport England and died in 1679 in Devonshire at the age of 91. He lived through a revolution and civil war, events that led him to conclude that the worst that could happen to a country was anarchy. This experience led him to create his political philosophy based on absolute power to prevent anarchy at all costs. Hobbes was the son of an Anglican pastor, studied at Oxford and later went on to work with the British aristocracy. He knew the classics very well and was very interested in science. Hobbes promoted modern political philosophy using contractual arguments, focusing on political thought. According to Hobbes, "man is a wolf to man". He establishes that humans are guided by sensations and passions, making us desire power above all. That is why, in the state of nature, it is all against all, and there is a state of war. Hobbes also highlights that all men's biggest fear is death, but in a state of war, death is certain. This situation leads men to say that it is necessary to create a state that puts an end to war and protects the people. Since power is what generates conflict, the people give all their power to the ruler in exchange for protection, peace, security, employment, education. This ideal state is embodied by the "Leviathan", an

authoritarian, absolute ruler that can never be challenged or opposed because he ensures order and security and, according to Hobbes, that is more important than any freedom or right.

In the 17th Century, Hobbes' ideas were challenged by the ideas of John Locke. According to Locke, men are rational, social and cooperative beings who are aware of and respect natural laws (life, liberty and property). The state of nature is a state where men have the right to punish those who harm them and to seek redress. However, although we all live in freedom, it is not freedom without limits, since freedom is moderated by the natural rights of all. Locke affirms that all men are equal and says that a state of war is only entered when bestial beings violate natural rights. Locke also says don't do to another what you don't want them to do to you. Men unite to form civil society and to punish beastly beings impartially and correctly. A man joins political society because it guarantees us the protection of our property (life, liberty and possessions). Under the ideas described, a contract is between the men and their representatives. The representatives make the law and are subject to the law, and that is why men have the power and the right to punish the representatives (opposite to Hobbes). The purpose of the state is to protect the natural rights of man: life, liberty, and property. To achieve this objective, the state focuses on creating laws that guarantee the protection of natural rights and punish bestial beings. For this, a liberal democratic system is used, where there is a division of power and where men choose representatives to make laws; these people make up the legislative branch that is the soul of the state. There is also the executive branch that is the one that executes the laws and punishes the bestial men in an impartial and just manner. Finally, we have the federative branch that is in charge of international relations. Under Locke's political philosophy, men have the right and the duty to rebel against the state and representatives when these aren't satisfying their purpose to protect the fundamental rights of the people.

Finally, we will jump to the 18th Century to analyse Rousseau's philosophy. Rousseau began by describing men in the state of nature; he stated that natural men before entering society were not moral beings because they need interaction with others in order to develop morality. Humans are all born with a reason but not with reflection, language is what gives way to the development of reflection and therefore morality. The natural man is good

because he is accompanied by a feeling of empathy and has harmony with nature, which is very important for education. The feeling of empathy leads men to accept natural inequality and ignore any ideas of superiority. When humans discover agriculture and mining, they become sedentary and sexual attraction leads to the creation of families. At this point, because of the necessity to communicate, languages are developed and along with them, reflection and morality. Because families begin to face various necessities, humans decide to live in a community where they can depend on each other. This leads to private property, inequality, and domination of one over others, which generates war. Passions and inequalities lead to evils for all men, for example, property. Locke's state is one of the owners for owners, but Rousseau says that this is convenient for some but excludes others, which leads to comparison, conflict, war, and political and moral inequalities. That is why Rousseau criticizes the contracts of Hobbes and Locke. Rousseau said that the two contracts created new obstacles like the law of private property to legislate inequality. Rousseau says that these contracts are useless because they formalize inequality and because they erase natural beings. Rousseau says that society corrupts the good nature of men and that, although there is progress in the letters and in the arts, we have become morally degenerate because not all people are included in the concepts of the enlightened. The purpose of Rousseau's contract is for men to reflect and acknowledge they are wrong. The only contract that can improve men is that of men between themselves. This contract makes each citizen a participant in a general will, and joining others generates strength. The general will is the force of a society that has made a contract that leads men to vote in a moral way. At this point, individual interests and prejudices disappear. Laws are made to improve the people, and men have to obey the law because they passed it. This ultimately creates a sovereign society that makes decisions as a whole towards a future that benefits the greater good. To Rousseau, the government is simply an intermediate body that, as a legitimate form of government, is in charge of executing the law voted by the sovereign (people).

The political theories anticipated changing times and became the base on which the modern world is built. The breaking point was the French Revolution in 1789. The revolution revealed the inefficiency of the traditional system and experimented with new systems to build a government that represented the people. Under the philosophies of Locke and Rousseau, the tragic situation of the French people justified the revolution but, unfortunately, the revolution

became a period of bloodshed, violence, and terror. So even though the French Revolution was a crucial event that marked the beginning of a new era and inspired other oppressed nations to revolt, many argue that it devastated France and it left it worse than it was before. This is the moment our question for the debate is born, considering both the positive and negative consequences of revolutions - to what extent should manifestation/political activism be allowed?

To further explore this question, let's analyse a more recent revolution, The Cuban Revolution. The Cuban Revolution was an armed uprising in Cuba that overthrew the government of Fulgencio Batista on January 1, 1959. The revolution's leader, Fidel Castro, went on to rule Cuba from 1959 to 2008. In order to understand the motives and intentions behind the Cuban Revolution, we must first analyse the situation of Cuba and its history. At that time, Cuba was extremely politically unstable. There was high unemployment amongst the rural majority, a considerable reduction of civil freedoms, and many cases of corruption, terrorism and violence. The people were under the regime of a tyrant, Sergeant Fulgencio Batista. Batista had declared himself Chief of State and suspended the 1940 constitution, dissolving all political parties and elections. He suppressed the people, and the opposition was shot, arrested or tortured. He was even known to be involved in organized crime.

Was the violent revolution in Cuba legitimate? According to the premises established by Locke and Rousseau, it was. Before discussing the revolution itself, let's talk about Fulgencio Batista. As said before, the creation of the Cuban Constitution of 1940 included a wide array of progressive changes but, most importantly, it recognized individual liberties like freedom of speech (Article 53) and the right to assemble or protest (Article 54). It also declared Cuba a democratic and representative state, and divided the government into 3 separate branches; this way only the legislative branch (chosen through voting) would be in charge of creating new laws. That same year, Fulgencio Batista was officially elected to his first term, and had earlier helped draft the newly formed constitution. This first term was considered a success because of the positive economic indicators.

In terms of a republic, the constitution would be considered to be the social contract by which a certain nation abides. People unite to create a government that will protect them under certain established rules, in this case by the book that states what government and people

can and can't do. Although Rousseau didn't necessarily advocate for revolutions, his writings on how the social contract laid the outline for a legitimate government influenced the French and even American revolutions. In this case, we can affirm that Batista broke the social contract. In 1952, Batista, following the constitution, ran for president but knew he was set for an imminent loss. Knowing he was going to lose, he decided to use military action and stage a coup. He took power and proceeded to break the contract time after time, incarcerating political opponents, allowing corruption among his friends, concentrating power on himself, killing people and even cancelling the elections. Under the terms previously stated, this would mean Batista's government would be deemed illegitimate and revolution would be deemed legitimate.

We could also take another approach. This one has to do with John Locke's theory of natural rights in which he specifies that it is the duty of the people to revolt against a government that is not serving the interests of the people, or rather, not respecting the people's individual rights. These natural rights according to Locke are life, liberty and property. These rights were recognized by the Cuban Constitution of 1940 but were violated when Batista regained power in 1952. Although he didn't really invade people's rights to property, he did limit people's liberties by limiting speech and throwing his opposition into jail. It is also estimated that he killed about 20,000 people, which included both violent rebels and peaceful opposition. Under the premise set by Locke, it was the Cuban people's duty to revolt against a government that violated their natural rights.

Regardless of the outcome, it was the people's duty to revolt against an oppressive government that broke the social contract and violated people's fundamental rights. But what is Cuba like today? What were the consequences of the "justified revolution"? These are the ideas and questions we invite delegates to explore when researching their leaders and the revolutionary contexts that surrounded them.

II. Current Situation

To begin with, activism is action on behalf of a cause - an action that goes beyond what is conventional or routine. Activism can shift from many perspectives or contexts which depend

strongly on the protesters' needs. As shown before, activism has played a major role in ending slavery, challenging dictatorships, protecting workers from exploitation, protecting the environment, promoting equality for women, opposing racism, and many other important issues. On the other hand, activism can also be used for aims such as attacking minorities or promoting war.

Although the differences between the positive and negative intentions of activism may be clear, there is a thin line between the methods used to carry out this behaviour. More than a line, it may be described as limits of when these means cross the line. It is said that limits are defined by the political ideology of the country where it happens, or by moral and ethical human grounds, or maybe just by logic. Nevertheless, as this topic refers to political manifestations/activism, the main focus should be to what extent and through what means should people protest against a political idea or movement. Having this in mind, it is pertinent to be aware that, currently, manifestations (in most countries) are seen as legitimate when the opposition is against an idea that undermines certain groups within the society.

In our present times, different types of political activism limits across the globe can be observed. Those defined by the country's leader as mentioned before could be for example countries like North Korea and the United States. In North Korea, where the current political structure is an extreme dictatorship, political activism is strictly punished, and is feared by the people. Manifestations in North Korea are incredibly rare and difficult to perform if not impossible, as the ruling law is one, and it is enforced with heavy repression. Opposite to this, the United States is a federal republic that has been ruled by two political parties, the republicans and the democratic. Due to its liberty, manifestations and protest are allowed in this country, and this can sometimes lead to the harming of both public and private property (vandalism) or civilians (aggression). At this point, the authorities have permission to act as public servants to defend the city, although lethal means cannot be used in order to do this. Using these countries as examples enables us to evaluate and weigh the consequences of complete negation to activism to permitted-limited activism.

Furthermore, another example could be the one that occurred in Colombia during the months of April and May of 2021. During this time, Colombia suffered a national strike that involved vandalism, murder, road blockades, product shortages and more because manifestations got

out of hand. One of the reasons the situation escalated rapidly was because there were no limitations or responses opposed by the law, protesters were free to act without opposition during the first few days, allowing them to gain power and create fear. Colombia, as a democracy and due to its constitution, is forced to allow protests and manifestations, and officials may not respond with heavy-handed law enforcement; when the situation got intense, the police and army were instructed to only defend the city and they were strictly prohibited to fight back. Unfortunately, this did not always happen, and excessive police violence exacerbated the situation in some places. Something similar to this situation happened during the strike on the capitol in Washington, U.S.A. during the presidential elections.

Although relishing for the sake of human rights and following Locke's philosophy of the right to protest is important, there have been situations that have gone the other direction in different countries. The most remarkable examples could be those in Argentina and Cuba this year, where political activism was presented several times in different areas of both countries and where the government took serious actions against it. In the case of Cuba, 1 protester died and several went missing during manifestations that were unusual for the country, In Argentina, there was a record of over a thousand arrests during the days of protests. In many countries there have been protests against COVID-19 pandemic controls, and these have also been violently suppressed by police, for example, in Australia. These countries were some of those which decided to end the manifestations through overpowering and abusing the legal rights of citizens, leading to the question of how far should rights to protest be allowed, and what actions should be taken to ensure that citizens can use this right in a safe and legal way.

III. Key Points of the Debate

- Violence as a tool for change
- Situations in which revolutions are justified
- The extent that opposition and protests threaten the stability
- Opposition and manifestation are crucial elements of society in order to evolve
- The most effective ways to handle opposition and manifestations

IV. Guiding Questions

1. Considering that democracy is a system designed to represent the will of the people, why do manifestations occur in democratic countries?
2. Is democracy effective in achieving its purpose?
3. Should freedom of speech and freedom of information be limited?
4. Is violence a justified means to provoke change?
5. Should violence be used by the government to establish order and security?
6. How should governments address the people's lack of conformity?

V. Bibliography

Lloyd, Sharon A., and Susanne Sreedhar. "Hobbes's Moral and Political Philosophy." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Stanford University, 30 Apr. 2018, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/hobbes-moral/>.

Tuckness, Alex. "Locke's Political Philosophy." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Stanford University, 6 Oct. 2020, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/locke-political/>.

Bertram, Christopher. "Jean Jacques Rousseau." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Stanford University, 26 May 2017, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/rousseau/>.