

COMMISSION GUIDE

HSC



CCBMUNXVII

Historical Security Council

Federico de Lima & Laura Ospina

2019

Contents

1. Presidents' Letter

2. Commission Information

- i. History
- ii. Structure
- iii. Special Procedures

3. **Simulation:** *The taking of the Justice Palace by the M-19 movement (1985)*

- i. History/Context
- ii. Current situation
- iii. Key points of the debate
- iv. Participating organisms
- v. Guiding questions
- vi. Bibliography

4. **Topic 1:** *Falklands crisis/Malvinas war (1982)*

- i. History/Context
- ii. Current situation
- iii. Key points of the debate
- iv. Participating organisms
- v. Guiding questions
- vi. Bibliography

5. **Topic 2:** *Open Agenda*

1. Presidents' Letter

“The future has several names. For the weak, it is impossible; for the fainthearted, it is unknown; but for the valiant, it is ideal.” - Victor Hugo

Welcome delegates to the XVII edition of the Colegio Colombo Británico Model United Nations. Thank you for being part of the group of young people who seek peace for their country and for the world. Thank you for taking on this challenge. We are Federico de Lima and Laura Ospina, both 12th grade students at the CCB. This year we have the honour of being your presidents for the Historical Security Council, a commission which we both believe will be a great challenge, but also a great opportunity for you and us to learn more about the past, where we come from and where we are going.

The Historical Security Council is a commission that presents challenges to its delegates, by providing cases of conflicts that have already occurred, enabling you to learn from the mistakes made by the diplomatic leaders of the past, who sought war instead of peace. We invite you to change history, to learn from history and to seek peaceful resolutions.

We thank you for both choosing this Commission as your option for the CCBMUN and trusting in us to guide you through it. We hope to provide you with an amazing experience; you will gain a lot of new knowledge and we are sure that you will go away with good memories. We hope you do your best to get the most out of this experience, and that you come to the Commission with the disposition to be the best delegate you can be. We expect nothing less than the greatest effort from each and every one of you. Do not hesitate to ask anything, and do not be embarrassed to intervene at any point during the Model. We await you with great emotion, and hope to see all of you performing your best.

Federico & Laura,

HSC Presidents

2. Commission Information

i. History

The first Security Council meeting took place on January 17th, 1946 at Church House, Westminster, London. Nowadays, the Security Council meets at the UN headquarters in New York, although it has also been moved around the world, holding meetings in countries such as Ethiopia and Panama, for which a representative of each of its members must be present.



The Security Council is one of the five most important organs of the United Nations Organization. Its purpose, in accordance with the stipulations of the UN Charter of 1945, is to maintain international peace and security. The Security Council has the right to intervene in armed conflicts that threaten global security, and to seek alternative solutions to them through peaceful means.

ii. Functions and powers

- Maintain international peace and security in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations;
- Investigate any controversy or situation that may create international disagreements;
- Recommend methods of adjusting such controversies, or settlement conditions;
- Develop plans for the establishment of a system that regulates armaments;
- Determine if there is a threat to peace or an act of aggression and recommend what action should be taken;
- Urge Members to apply economic sanctions and other measures that do not involve the use of force, in order to prevent or stop possible aggressions;
- Take military action against an aggressor, when all other methods prove to not work;
- Recommend the entry of new Members;
- Exercise the functions of fiduciary administration of the United Nations in "strategic zones";
- To recommend to the General Assembly the appointment of the Secretary General and, together with the Assembly, elect the members of the International Court of Justice.

iii. Structure

The Security Council has 15 members. Five of these members are permanent and the other ten are changed every two years. The permanent members are the allies of the Second World War and have the veto power. The permanent members are the following:

- United States of America
- United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
- French Republic
- Russian Federation (formerly Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, 1989)
- People's Republic of China (formerly Republic of China, 1961)

The other ten members are changed every year, having a two-year term on the Council, and are chosen with the following criteria: 3 countries in Africa, 2 in Asia and the Pacific, 2 in Latin America and the Caribbean, 2 in Western Europe or others, and one from Eastern Europe.

Each nation has one vote. The general decisions of the council require an affirmative vote of at least nine of the members. According to article 27 of the UN Charter, the decisions of the council go through a minimum of 9 votes, however a negative vote or "veto" by one of the permanent members prevents acceptance of the proposal, even if this has obtained the minimum votes necessary. General procedure matters are not subject to the power of veto, since this power cannot be used to avoid discussing a topic on the agenda. Abstention from voting is not taken as a veto in the majority of the cases.



Chapter VII of the letter stipulates that the Council has the power to enforce its decisions. For this, it may implement economic sanctions, fines, or in extreme cases the use of armed forces to enforce the provisions of the resolutions. According to the UN Charter, all the member countries of the organization are obliged to abide by the decisions taken by the Security Council in all scenarios.

The Council presidency rotates monthly in alphabetical order of the English language according to the members present in the Council.

iv. Historical Security Council

The Historical Security Council is a commission that is set in a state of crisis in an exact point in history after the Second World War. Delegates are expected to propose solutions for conflicts that have already taken place, in order to reach more peaceful and diplomatic solutions than those taken at the time. Time goes by with the development of the Commission, so that delegates must stick to the historical events that are occurring.

v. Special Procedures

Special Delegates

In the Commission, for its ideal development, delegates will on occasions represent presidents or important leaders who were crucial in the development of a certain conflict. These delegates will have an opinion in the Commission and are allowed to intervene like any other delegate, however they **cannot vote**. These delegates can speak in the first person, but they must generally maintain a good use of parliamentary procedure.

3. **Simulation** *The taking of the Palace of Justice by the M-19 movement (1985)*

i. **History/Context**

During the second half of the 20th century, the world wide impact of the Cold War (1945-1989) divided the world into two; the capitalist and the communist. The ideological confrontations of this period led to the formation of groups in different parts of the world that used armed forces to put pressure on the state, both capitalist and communist, and demand the recognition of new positions and representatives in national and international politics.

Inside Colombia, the formation of the first generation of revolutionary armed groups was influenced by the Cuban Revolution, led by Fidel Castro and Ernesto "El Ché" Guevara. These groups included: *Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia - Ejército del Pueblo* (FARC-EP) (1964); *Ejército Popular de Liberación* (EPL) (1965); and *Ejército de Liberación Nacional* (ELN)(1964)—(1953-1959) A decade later, after the creation of these three fronts, a second generation of armed groups began to form in response to national processes and injustices. One of these groups was the *Movimiento Armado Quintín Lame* (1984), an indigenous group which used force to defend indigenous communities' rights. Another was the *M-19* (1970-1974), which was the result of the discontent unleashed by the results of the 1970 elections, in which the ANAPO (National Popular Alliance) - Gustavo Rojas Pinilla's¹ party,



supported by the socialist left, denounced the victory of conservative Misael Pastrana Borrero, the last president of the National Front (1957-1974), to be the result of fraud. After Pastrana, in 1978, liberal Julio Cesar Turbay was elected president. Then finally, in 1982, Belisario Betancur was elected president, with a total of 3,168,592 votes. Betancur's presidency lasted from 1982 to 1986.



¹ *Gustavo Rojas Pinilla* was the 19th President of Colombia from June 1953 to May 1957. Rojas Pinilla was an Army General who mounted a successful coup d'état against President Laureano Gómez Castro. He imposed a military government and went on to establish a dictatorship in Colombia.



Colombia, 1985: In the hands of Belisario Betancur

"I raise before the people of Colombia, a high and white flag of peace: I raise it before the oppressed, I raise it before the persecuted, I raise it before the raised in arms, before my compatriots of all the parties and those without a party. I don't want one more drop of Colombian blood spilled. Not another drop of sister blood. Not one more drop!"

Belisario Betancur, 1982

During his presidency, Belisario Betancur focused greatly on the obtainment of peace for the country of Colombia. He wanted to find a way out of the armed conflict that doomed the country. His predecessor, Julio César Turbay, had directed a government that used large numbers of the National Armed Forces to repress all social protests. However, Betancur's proposals of peace accords were completely different, and contrasted greatly with the idea that the people had already accepted of how the Government should reacted towards insurgent groups, which was by using extremist methods. The people were used to violence, and they accepted it.



As an attempt to change this, on September 19th, 1982, Betancur created the *Comisión de la Paz*, focused on the development of these peace accords, expecting to make negotiations with the ELN and FARC to bring peace to Colombia. On November 19th, 1982, he sanctioned the Amnesty Law, liberating 1,384 guerrilla members from jails, forgiving politically related crimes (EL PAIS, 2018). This followed the disposition of FARC and the M-19 to open dialogue with the Government, to establish direct relations with the Peace Commission.

On March 28th, 1984, a ceasefire agreement was signed with FARC. From that day on, the armed fronts were to retract all belligerent activities, as would the the National Military Forces. The same pact was signed with the M-19 later that year. However, as these accords were being signed, the country found itself under a period of mass drug trafficking and great drug cartel activity; Rodrigo Lara Bonilla, the Justice Minister, was killed by these activities on April 30th of that same year. Whilst peace was being attempted, a new conflict began inside the country. (EL PAIS, 2018)

The country was polarized. Dialogues with armed groups were against the ideals of the Conservative Party. Polarization weakened the peace process, as did the economic crisis, the social deterioration of a country lacking common agreements, and a new wave of violence and drug crimes. Peace was interrupted, and violence seemed to be an easier route than negotiations.

The M-19

The *Movimiento 19 de Abril* wanted to combine armed forces with politics. They sought to be involved with the people on the streets, contrary to insurgent groups such as FARC or ELN, which resided in the countryside. Its leader, Israel Santamaría, stated that the organization was against the structure of Colombia at the time, because it lacked a military structure that would allow people to defend their opinion and position regarding the development of the country.

The group named itself after the day of the April 19th, 1970 elections, as a reminder of the day in which "the oligarchies (...) trampled the decision of the great majority of our people"(EL TIEMPO, 2010). This was the day General Gustavo Rojas Pinilla lost the presidential elections as a result of fraud, as the ANAPO claimed. The core of the M-19 was composed of **Jaime Bateman** (a member of the Communist Party and FARC), **Alvaro Fayad** (a member of the Communist Party and FARC), **Iván Marino Ospina** (a member of FARC) and **Luis Otero Cifuentes** (a member of the Communist Party), among other members. Bateman, Fayad, and Ospina eventually all became part of ANAPO, Rojas Pinilla's political party.

Jaime Bateman Cayón, a former FARC member, and Carlos Toledo Plata, a former ANAPO member, are the ones said to have formed the M-19 (Stanford, 2019). The movement was founded on Marxist-Leninist ideals, to create changes in what they believed to be a corrupt Colombian electoral system. The M-19 sought to implement a representative democracy in Colombia. The group focused its militant activities in



Colombian cities. The party sought to lead political reforms by democracy within the country, including a more open electoral system (Stanford, 2019), which would be inclusive to the majority, including marginalized Colombian citizens. Its strategy was to act through urban and rural struggles, creating connections with people inside disadvantaged popular sectors in order to generate a sense of approval in the general population, by making use of national symbols and media strategies.

The M-19 activities started in 1973 with a series of robberies, but they gained national notoriety in January 1974, when M-19 guerrillas stole Simon Bolívar's sword from his former villa.

Originally named *Operación Antonio Nariño por los Derechos del Hombre* (Operation Antonio Nariño for Human Rights) by the M-19, Álvaro Fayad, militant of the M-19, is

said to be the person responsible for planning the taking of the Palace of Justice. The operation took six months of planning. During this time, militant members of M-19 were captured surveying the Palace with building plans. A house belonging to the movement was raided by the National Armed Forces, where they found a cassette with instructions on what was going to be said once they took over the Justice Palace. The Truth Commission reported that the Military Forces and the SIJIN² received anonymous messages on October 16th announcing the takeover. However, all warnings were ignored.

ii. Current Situation

It has been one year of the settled peace accords between the Colombian Government and insurgent groups operating inside the country, including FARC. However, none of the accords have been met, and no progress has been made from the government's side.

Beyond the mass drug trafficking and drug cartel activities going on, the country finds itself under a state of polarization. The Conservative Party is opposed to the dialogues being made with these insurgent groups. This opposition has weakened the peace process. Not only is the country under political division between conservative and liberal parties, it is undergoing an economic crisis, social deterioration, and new types of violence and crime (related to drugs and drug trafficking) are arising. There is tension between the government and insurgent groups, which have grown impatient to the point of taking matters into their own hands.

November 6th, 1985, Bogotá, Colombia: The Palace of Justice is being seized by the M-19. Operación Antonio Nariño por los Derechos del Hombre (Operation Antonio Nariño for Human Rights) is in action, and members of the M-19 are entering the building armed, holding individuals inside as hostages.



² SIJIN: Directorate of the Colombian National Police in charge of judicial and certain intelligence tasks.

The guerrillas have entered the basement in a truck and opened fire with their machine guns against all individuals inside. Bombs are being detonated inside the building. The guerrillas have neutralized the security personnel guarding the building. Chief Justice Alfonso Reyes Echandía, President of the Supreme Court, is being kidnapped by Commander Luis Otero and a group of M-19 members.

300 people are being held hostage, including magistrates, employees, visitors and members of the M19. As the takeover is going on, media sources are interviewing individuals who had seen something, been inside or near the Palace. This media takeover is complicating operations for the State, which is trying to retake the Palace (Pacifista, 2018). Noemí Sanín, Communications Minister for Belisario Betancur, has sent a telegram prohibiting media interviews with people who are, or have been, inside the Palace. However, some journalists are saying that they have received calls from the Minister asking them to suspend transmissions, threatening to send the Army to turn off the equipment.



iii. Key point of the debate

- Political interests
- Disputes over political issues affecting the citizens of a nation
- Power and jurisdiction
- Possible measures to cease the conflict at an early stage
- Methods used by the Government to prevent further damage to be caused to civilians
- Resolutions which are acceptable for both parties
- Possible alternatives to the political and guerilla crisis of the nation
- Fast-acting and long-lasting resolutions to the issues and similar ones that may arise
- Strategies that can be applied to other similar conflicts at the time



iv. Participating organisms

- INTERPOL
- SIJIN
- United Nations
- Fuerza Pública de Colombia
- Comando Operativo de Inteligencia y Contra Inteligencia
- Dirección de Inteligencia

v. Guiding Questions

1. Has your delegation ever faced internal/guerrilla conflicts? If the answer is yes, how were these disputed resolved?
2. By which means is the Colombian Government's retaliation justified? How should this be determined?
3. Could the taking of the Justice Palace have been prevented? State if *yes* or *no*. Explain your answer.
4. What is your government's position over the rise of communist movements in Latin America?
5. What role does your country play within the cold war?

vi. Bibliography

Cassman, D. (2019). April 19 Movement | Mapping Militant Organizations. Web.stanford.edu. Retrieved 27 June 2019, from <https://web.stanford.edu/group/mappingmilitants/cgi-bin/groups/view/91>

Tiempo, C. (2010). M-19, una guerrilla sin precedentes (1974-1980). El Tiempo. Retrieved 27 June 2019, from <https://www.eltiempo.com/archivo/documento/CMS-7934180>

Toma del palacio de Justicia | Archivo de Bogotá Secretaría General Alcaldía Mayor de Bogotá. (2019). Archivobogota.secretariageneral.gov.co. Retrieved 27 June 2019, from <http://archivobogota.secretariageneral.gov.co/tour360/toma-del-palacio-justicia>

A 30 años de las "28 horas de terror": así fue la toma del Palacio de Justicia en Colombia. (2015). BBC News Mundo. Retrieved 27 June 2019, from https://www.bbc.com/mundo/noticias/2015/11/151030_colombia_30_aniversario_to_ma_palacio_de_justicia_nc

Lo que se sabe y lo que no de la toma del Palacio de Justicia | ¡PACIFISTA!. (2017). ¡PACIFISTA!. Retrieved 27 June 2019, from <https://pacifista.tv/notas/palacio-justicia-33-anos-investigacion/>

La Policía y el Ejército habrían sabido que el M-19 se tomaría el Palacio de Justicia. (2016). Palacio de Justicia Policía y Ejército habrían sabido que el M19 haría la toma. Retrieved 27 June 2019, from <https://www.semana.com/nacion/articulo/palacio-de-justicia-policia-y-ejercito-habrian-sabido-que-el-m-19-haria-la-toma/467982>

Tiempo, C. (2018). La paz de Belisario: una esperanza presa de la confrontación política. El Tiempo. Retrieved 27 June 2019, from <https://www.eltiempo.com/politica/gobierno/procesos-de-paz-que-lidero-belisario-betancur-expresidente-de-colombia-302436>

4. Topic 1: *The Malvinas/Falklands War*

i. History/Context

The Falkland Islands or Malvinas are islands in the South Atlantic Ocean, which were originally uninhabited, but later colonized by the French, Spanish and British at various times in their history. The French first set up a settlement in 1764, and the British followed with their own settlement on another island in 1766. Since that time, disputes about who rightfully own the islands has been ongoing between Britain and Spain, and later with Argentina after it had gained independence from Spain. The UN had taken made various resolutions about the situation of the Falkland Islands, including:



1947 The Falkland Islands are listed at the United Nations as a Non-Self Governing Territory (NSGT) subject to the UN's decolonisation process.

1960 UN Resolution 1514 grants the right of Self-Determination to all peoples of NSGTs.

1965 United Nations Assembly passed Resolution 2065, following lobbying by Argentina. This reminded members of the organisation's pledge to end all forms of colonialism. Argentine and British Governments were called upon to negotiate a peaceful solution to the sovereignty dispute, bringing the issue to international attention formally for the first time.

1966 Through diplomatic channels, Britain and Argentina began discussions in response to UN Assembly pressure.

(taken from Falkland Islands Government page <https://www.falklands.gov.fk/our-people/our-history/>)

The Malvinas, South Georgia and the South Sandwich territories are all considered territories in dispute by the UN in 1981. This conflict first originated due to the debated discovery of the island (CESCEM, 2015). The UK points out it was English explorer John Davis in 1591 and therefore the territories belong to them; nevertheless, Argentina claims it was actually Amerigo Vespucci who first traced them, so the territory should

belong to whomever is closest to administer them. Netherlands and France also claim discovery but are currently not involved in the disagreement, given that they have their eyes in other territories (CESCEM, 2015).

The conflict aggravated in the 1980's and finally exploded due to the unstable internal situation of the two nations in dispute. In the UK, the Conservative Party which was in power, had lost popularity due to the difficult economic situation the country was in, since the post-war struggle had led to an increase in inflation (EB, 2019). There were



protests by coal miners. There was also discontent in the British Navy, since the Conservative Party had decided to reduce the Navy's capacity (at a time of Cold War) as a strategy to redirect the public budget. In addition, the Prime Minister, Margaret Thatcher, was also unpopular with many citizens due to her policies of closing and/or privatising public industries.

Meanwhile, in Argentina, the Military Reorganization Process, which had begun in 1980, had suffered multiple failures. Economically, the country was in complete decay: there was an inflation rate of over 90%; a state of recession; extreme tax values, especially on VAT (Value Added Tax - taxes paid on earnings); impoverishment of the middle class; and exponential reduction in salaries (EB, 2019). This eventually led to massive protests against the military government. Leopoldo Galitieri became the new military leader of the country in March 1981. He proposed to secretly invade the Falkland Islands as a strategy to regain sovereignty over them, and also to regain popularity for the military regime. The successful capture of the Islands would help to disguise many of the problems that the country was going through.

The Islands hold a critical strategic position, since their proximity to Antarctica could provide leverage in future negotiations over the territory; also, they are located in a crucial position as they give maritime control over the region to the nation in power (EB, 2019). This was the last motive for the dispute.

ii. Current Situations

Since 1981, the British have been reducing the military personnel in the region of the Falkland Islands as a means of reducing military spending.

On March 19, 1982 a group of workers is sent to the island of South Georgia in order to work on a scrap metal project. Galtieri knows that there is limited British Army presence in the region and seizes this



opportunity to raise Argentina's flag on one of the South Georgia Islands (San Pedro). In Spanish, this is known as the “chatarreros” crisis, which is the triggering event of the conflict (EB, 2019).

Margaret Thatcher, after being informed about the situation, sends the Endurance with



24 soldiers (TIWM, 2019). A diplomatic protest takes place in the British Embassy in Buenos Aires on March 21 to request for the Argentine flag and workers to be removed.

On March 23, Caesar Trombetta, captain of the ARA Bahía Paraíso, is being deployed to avoid the workers from leaving the island and

maintaining control over port Leith (San Pedro) (EB,2019). The situation remains tense but none of the parties take further action.

Today, **2 April 1982**, Argentine forces mount amphibious landings, known as Operation Rosario, on the Falkland Islands. The invasion is met with a nominal defence, organised by the Falkland Islands' Governor Sir Rex Hunt, giving command to Major Mike Norman of the Royal Marines. **The Security Council is in a state of crisis.**

iii. Key points of the debate

- Political interests of both countries in the Falkland Islands.
- Power and jurisdiction over land and sea.
- Possible measures to cease the conflict at an early stage.

- Resolutions which are acceptable for both parties.
- Ways in which the UN can operate in disputes over land jurisdiction.
- Strategies that can be applied to other similar conflicts at the time.

iv. Participating organisms

- The UN
- Security Council
- International Maritime Organization
- SPECPOL - Special Political and Decolonization Committee
- NATO - North Atlantic Treaty Organization

v. Guiding Questions

1. Has your country had any land/sea disputes until 1982?
2. How has your country solved any conflict/dispute up to 1982? Could this framework be applied to the Falklands crisis?
3. Who does your country support in this conflict? Why?
4. What strategies could be used to cease the conflict at an early stage? Would they benefit both parties?
5. How can the UN operate in this conflict?

vi. Bibliography

CESCEM Corrientes (2015). *Historia de las Islas Malvinas*. Retrieved 27 June 2019 in <http://www.cescem.org.ar/malvinas/historia/pag02.html>

Encyclopaedia Britannica (2019). *Falkland Islands War*. Retrieved 27 June 2019 in <https://www.britannica.com/event/Falkland-Islands-War>

The Imperial War Museum (2019). *A short history of the Falklands War*. Retrieved 27 June 2019 in <https://www.iwm.org.uk/history/a-short-history-of-the-falklands-war>

5. Topic 2: *Open Agenda*

You will need to be aware of the political and social situation in China from the period between 1960 and 1980. One incident during that time will be the subject of the agenda for this topic.

The following is the context for the possible topics of debate on the day of the Model. You will not be expected to include any research on this topic in your delegate portfolio, but we will expect you to be prepared to debate any possible topic from this time by being informed about the background history of China, and about your delegation's position towards China at that time.

Global Context: The topic will be located in China, in the post-Mao period of the People's Republic. The topic will have to do with human rights violations, oppression and the cultural diversification that characterized this period in China.

The following websites will give you an idea of what was happening in China during the period from 1960 to 1980:

http://www.china-profile.com/history/hist_list_1.htm

<https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-pacific-13017882>

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/may/11/the-cultural-revolution-50-years-on-all-you-need-to-know-about-chinas-political-convulsion>

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/may/29/chaos-hope-change-stories-from-70-years-of-the-peoples-republic-of-china>