

I've entered the committee known as General Assembly, and things seem to be looking pretty good. Unlike your common committees, the GA has its own set of special rules in regards to the standard issued rules. I should also note that these "rules" are not really "rules", but more commonly referred to as "motions".

Upon entering, they recently ended debate on order of consideration of topics. The GA delegates then considered and unanimously decided to go in order of topics known as 3-1-2, and eventually voted on consideration of resolution 3-3.

Delegates speaking pro on this are Norway, S. Korea, and Russia. Those currently speaking con on this are the delegates of Luxembourg, Vietnam, France, Kuwait, Kazakhstan, China, Lebanon, Rwanda, and Columbia.

The first two delegate speakers, Norway for pro and Luxembourg for con, both spoke of amendments needing to be made to resolution 3-3.

The delegate from S. Korea stated that the resolution is passable despite a few flaws in the groundwork of the current resolution mentioned.

The delegate also states that this resolution can be used to solve civil unrest in countries that are in such a state. The Russian delegate pointed out that the resolution would be too demanding if they disbanded all weapons but asked if the S. Korean delegate agreed that changing it to the disbandment of a few weapons would make the resolution passable, and the reply was a yes.

I interviewed a delegate in the committee on his takes on the current

turn of events in this session. Here is our conversation:

"Delegate of Luxembourg, do you mind if I pull you aside to ask you a few questions on this debating topic?"

Delegate of Luxembourg: "Sure thing. I have no problem with that."

"What's your take on this resolution being discussed?"

D of L: "I agree with this resolution, but currently I am not in favor of it at the moment."

"Why is that?"

D of L: "Well, the delegate believes that the UN should monitor instead of demanding things should be done by the country. I have to go back and discuss amendments. I hope you don't mind."

"No problem. You gave me plenty of information that I can use. Thank you."

Now that the unmoderated caucus is over, I continue to watch this current scenario with great observation, and I am hardly disappointed.

The delegate from Vietnam states that the resolution is good in its base form, but still needs lots of improvement via amendments on this grave topic of civil unrest in countries. The delegate did stick with this standing throughout the whole speech.

France's delegate is questioned about the use of the word "condemns" and along with that, it seems that the main question concerning this debate is the definition of the words "civil unrest". So it seems that if this "definition" can be defined and accepted, many delegates believe this debate should come to a speedy conclusion.

It also seems there is an amendment being passed and submitted as unfriendly that strikes operative clause 1. China's delegate has suggested

to form one more unmoderated caucus to put all these amendments together and get them in order as the delegate believes that the amendments are going off in many different directions.

It also seems that this amendment being debated has 3 pro speakers and zero con speakers, which is very odd for an unfriendly amendment since no one decided to speak against this scenario.

France then motioned for closure of debate on Amendment 3-2-1.

The Chair, who is now supposed to be referred to as Mr. President, made a statement on voting procedure to be changed from a simple majority to a 2/3 majority by a motion known as G-5.

Apparently, the motion for an amendment submission is also known as G-3.

France's delegate is stating that the possible amendment 3-2-2 will not work with the current resolution in debate because of the amendment's operative suggestion. It seems France's take on the amendment gave a few delegates a change of opinion on the current amendment, as some asked to be added con and others asked to be changed from pro to con. This will likely grow out and affect other delegates as well and change their opinion on the current amendment.

The Lebanon delegate's take on this amendment was for, as he states, that a new resolution should be selected or even more topics and/or amendments be chosen to further improve the construction of a well-crafted resolution to solve the concerning topic of civil unrest in countries.