

lcj model un turkey syria



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Court of Justice Memorial High School - Justice The case of armed activity on the territory of the Republic of Turkey does not simply concern recent events, but more so the extended sovereignty of both nations. The main documents upon which my arguments will be based on are the General Assembly's Resolution 3314, International Customary Law; pursuant to Article 3, paragraph 1 of the Convention (III) relative to the treatment of prisoners in war, Paragraphs 138-139 of the World Summit Outcome Document, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

In order to determine the legitimacy of the previous documents, the Court must carefully consider its relevancy in regards to its accordance into law. If these documents are valid, than it is my belief that the Syrian Arab Republic did in fact come in direct violation of the standards set in all three documents.

In reference to the Memorial of the Republic of Turkey, it is asked that the Judges of the International Court of Justice find the following things: Syria has continuously carried out acts of aggression towards Turkey Syria is found guilty for its proven corroboration with the PKK terrorist group with its plans to attack Turkey That the government of Turkey has failed to uphold its responsibility to protect its civilians from mass atrocity crimes Submission 1

The General Assembly's Resolution 3314 defines aggression as " the use of armed force by a state against the sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence of another state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Charter of the United Nations, as set out in this definition. " It is the opinion of this justice that the Syrian Arab Republic has directly defied Resolution 3314 on accounts of armed aggression.

Referring to unprovoked use of force of the Syrian regime on the territory of the Sovereign Republic of Turkey on the date of 9 April, 2012 as evidenced by the unwarranted attack and destruction of Turkish planes and subsequent capture and execution of two Turkish pilots. Regarding Section II. , paragraph 3 of the memorial of the Republic of Turkey, In accordance with International Customary Law; Article 3, paragraph 1 of the Convention (III) elative to the treatment of prisoners in war, Syrian forces have made Turkey victim to unprovoked hostilities on multiple occasions including the dates of 9 April, 2012 and 22 June, 2012 . Submission 2 Submission calls for the finding of Syria's proven corroboration with the PKK terrorist group with its plan to attack Turkey. The position of the Justice is that, at this point, the Syrian Government cannot be held accountable for acts made by rebellious groups within the nation due to insufficient evidence being provided that the official government had direct connections and involvement in the PKK.

It is the opinion of this Justice that evidence that Syria has acted against the standards set in the Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism has not yet been presented. Instead, civillians who are acting in the rebellious PKK are at fault for violating the standards set in the Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. Submission 3 In regards to Submission 3 included in the Memorial of the Republic of Turkey, it is the opinion of this Justice the Syrian Arab Republic cannot yet be found guilty at this times of neglecting the responsibility of protecting its peoples from acts of atrocity.

The evidence at this time is insufficient for a finding due to the non-differentiation between criminal acts of aggression towards unarmed

populous; and a legitimate government responsibility to meet armed uprisings with appropriate and necessary force. If it can be shown that unnecessary force over and above that required to put down armed uprising against the Government, than Syria can be found guilty. Lack of decision at this time is not meant as a determination of guilt or innocence, simply that more review is needed of the direct evidence related to the proceeding charges.

Additionally, if it can be proven that Syrian Government has committed acts of aggression towards their populous prior to armed uprisings, the Court will be able to rule Syria guilty of not protecting its populous in reference to the submission included in the Memorial of the Republic of Turkey. It is the request of the court that evidence be brought up that outlines and that differentiates the acts of aggression between armed uprising and unwarranted acts of aggression toward innocent civilians.