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Letter from the Chair

Dear Delegates,

My name is Conner Johnson and I hail from the heart of Appalachia, in Central Pennsylvania. I’m currently a sophomore pursuing a concentration in Linguistics with certificates in French Language and Culture as well as Translation and Intercultural Communication. My love for language coupled with a passion for volunteer work led me to apply to Princeton’s Bridge Year Program in Brazil. There, I spent a gap year working as a volunteer schoolteacher and learning Portuguese. I spent this past summer taking French through Princeton in the sun-kissed town of Aix-en-Provence and also interning with the Sheraton in Lisbon. With this exposure to the international community and my extensive Mock Trial experience in high school, my passion for international diplomacy and law should come as no surprise, which is exactly why I’m chairing the ICC! After competing in over 100 trials up and down the East Coast over the course of my high school career, the ICC—a harmonious blend of Model UN and Mock Trial—seemed like a natural fit. I staffed the committee last year and also helped write the manual on how to run it, so I’m ecstatic to show you the fruits of our labor as Chair this year. Apart from academics and PMUNC, at Princeton I volunteer as a youth basketball coach, play intramural sports, and actively participate in the lusophone community on campus. Can’t wait to see you all in November!

Sincerely,

Conner Johnson
Introduction

Though the ICC is a relatively modern institution, widespread interest in an international court was first recognized by the United Nations in 1948, spurred by the fruits of post-war introspection. Drafts of statutes that aimed to prevent and punish genocide were even drafted and sent to the General Assembly as early as the 1950’s; however, no meaningful legislation of the like was fully ratified until much later, leaving a void in an ever-growing international political landscape.¹

It wasn’t until April 3, 1995, that the United Nations appointed a new Ad Hoc Committee to research the feasibility and implementation of what would later become the ICC.² After initial proposals, months of editing, and a final draft submitted in 1998, the governing doctrine of the ICC, known as the Rome Statute, was submitted and put into force by July 1st, 2002. With its home base at The Hague in the Netherlands, the Court was ready to begin trial.

The ICC, or International Criminal Court, now serves the international community as a formidable legal body that wields the power to prosecute individuals for crimes that have not been recognized or successfully tried by national courts. Drawing inspiration from the Nuremberg and Tokyo War Crimes Tribunals, the ICC seeks to impose international justice, backed by the heavy hand of The United Nations. The four types of crimes that are pursued by the court are genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes, and crimes of aggression.³

Reception of the Court has been mixed within the international community. Though some, particularly in the Western world tout the Rome Statute as Intelligently written and smoothly implemented, critiques of its efficiency and priorities abound. For example, the trial of Thomas Lubanga Dyilo, founder of the Union of Congolese Patriots, was the first successful case tried in the court and, though Mr. Dyilo was found guilty on all charges, his conviction was only completed in

¹ http://legal.un.org/icc/general/overview.htm
² http://legal.un.org/icc/general/overview.htm
2012, making the first conviction a nearly 10 year process. Adding to the complications for the Court, sovereign nations often fail to turn over their own criminals, leaving suspects at large for indefinite amounts of time.

Criticism aside, the International Criminal Court has undoubtedly filled a void that has critically plagued the international community since the First World War. Though in its infancy, it is certain that the Court will have a lasting effect, particularly in the digital age, where everyday citizens are bringing previously unheard of atrocities to light and, with more than 100 participating countries, its power and reach may very well serve to prosecute the worst of criminals that the world has to offer.

---

**Introduction**

The international community has played a rather apathetic hand in confronting African despots, historically speaking. Despite names like Kony spreading like wildfire in the social media age, there has been one particular dictator who has miraculously flown under the international radar: his name is Yahya Jammeh. President of Gambia, self-proclaimed healer, and former army officer, Jammeh has been in control of the country as either president or military ruler since the mid 1990's. He profits from an almost god-like status within Gambia, and has been reelected continuously since he seized power from the government in a military coup. Along with this reverence, Jammeh has cultivated an autonomy enjoyed by relatively few. In doing so, he has adopted some questionable practices as a leader.

Rising from a military dictator to elected official, Jammeh has been adamant about keeping his power in tact. Rumors of his suppression of human rights have reached far and wide, leading to a widespread perception that the democracy afforded to Gambian citizens is merely a thin veil for the dictatorship run by Jammeh. Voter suppression, opposition aggression, political kidnapping, and more offences have all been attributed to Jammeh's rule, though perhaps the president's strangest practices involve his insistence upon treating patients as a practicing doctor.

An active practitioner of homoeopathy, Yahya Jammeh has treated thousands of Gambian citizens and has all but industrialized homeopathy in Gambia. Though many of his practices might seem strange to Westerners, homeopathic medicine is much more commonplace in other parts of the world. Jammeh's most noteworthy exclamation, however,
was his 2007 proclamation that he had found a combination of boiled herbs that could cure both HIV and AIDS. The controversy intensified when it was revealed that President Jammeh had already treated hundreds of citizens before actually coming forward with his remedy. Jammeh's action's, if left unchecked, could be hugely detrimental to the people of his country but is it really the role of an outside, Western entity to intervene?

History

Gambia (formerly known as The Gambia) has a long history of unchecked government and struggle—a combination not uncommon in former colonies. Jostling around between Portuguese, French, and finally British control, Gambia became an integral player in the slave trade and contributed greatly to the British Empire's economy, particularly during the height of the slave trade. The slave trade started a long line of economic and political inequality that left the top 1% rich and the rest in chains. Leading into the modern age, Gambia also played a strategic role in World War II as a stopping point between Britain and the Middle East, allowing safe passage in a time where safety was a luxury.

A small country with a population of just 1.8 million, Gambia has reinvented itself as a relatively stable player for the last twenty years in the often-chaotic political sphere of West Africa. Yahya Jammeh's ascension to prominence began in 1994 with a military coup that managed to leave no one injured, and yet totally overthrow the previous government that had been in place since Gambia had been given its independence in 1970. Citing intense corruption and abuse of power, the military captured and exiled the former president. Though the plan was initially to carry through with democratic government, the brief instability caused by the coup led to a police state for two years while Gambia learned to navigate its new government. Eventually, elections were held and the then-retired Jammeh was elected as the new Gambian president.  

Gambia's new, constitutionally democratic government made it the jewel of a "modernizing" Africa, giving rise to numerous contributions and investments from the international community, helping to bring a previously impoverished nation into the 21st century. Over time, however, the differences between the new and the old governments became blurred and Yahya's regime began to look like the days of old. Media was limited and dissenters were systematically pursued and punished for speaking out against the regime. Murmurs of human rights abuses slowly began to rise above the filtered news programs and formulaic press releases. Just in the past few months alone, multiple peaceful protests have 

---

been shut down by what the United States has deemed as a "severe response." All of this exertion of power has led to a dictator with no more innocence than his predecessor.

**Current Situation**

Yahya Jammeh's role in the Gambian government has been a complicated one ever since his rise to power. Aside from fulfilling the country's basic diplomatic needs, Yahya has also offered himself as a medicine man, drawing perhaps more controversy in his medical practices than his politics. Undoubtedly, his supposed cure for HIV/AIDS has driven the medical world into frenzy. Done by way of a religious ritual that involves praying over a container full of an herbal concoction and spreading in on the rib cage of a patient (followed by a cup of tea and two bananas), Yahya's methods certainly seem more fiction than fact. Regardless of criticism, Jammeh has been resolute in his methods, noting that "whatever you do, there are bound to be skeptics, but I can tell you my method is foolproof. Mine is not an argument, mine is a proof. It's a declaration. I can cure AIDS and I will."

---


The president's confidence certainly doesn't stop at boisterous claims. In order for his remedy to be effective, he demands that his patients be taken off of their anti-retroviral drugs that weaken their already fragile immune systems. Backing his claims is the plethora of news releases, radio, and TV addresses that act as state-sponsored corroborations of his expertise. Furthermore, he has manipulated blood results analyzed in a Senegalese lab in an attempt to prove that his patients had actually been cured.\(^9\)

Though president Jammeh's claims have raised concerns within the international community, he has found support from an unlikely ally: the British. A homeopathic group that is officially supplied and sponsored by the same homeopathic medicine suppliers that the British royal family uses has created a mutually beneficial relationship with Jammeh, even to the extent of opening a charity specifically in support of him. The Gambia Wellness Foundation has taken its London based and expanded heavily into Gambia, even staying in

\(^9\) Ibid.
the home of one of Jammeh's ex wives.\textsuperscript{10} This legitimization of Jammeh's practices create an interesting schism between what is perceived as acceptable in the Western world, and what is not.

Aside from just his dubious medical practices, Jammeh's government has also been heavily criticized for more general human rights violations in the past. Human Rights Watch claims that "forced disappearances, arbitrary detention, torture, and other human rights violations continue under the government of President Yahya Jammeh" and that dodging the police and unjustifiable arrest is a facet of daily life for the average Gambian.\textsuperscript{11} With all of these criticisms and more, the Gambian democratic system appears to be less about replicating the model of Western democracy and more about providing a political facade for the numerous violations that plague the Jammeh administration. These violations have brought the topic of human rights to a head in the historically conservative country, calling into question the extent of the president's godlike status in recent years.


\textsuperscript{11}Unlisted Author. https://www.hrw.org/africa/gambia
International Precedent

In terms of homeopathic remedies, matching the industry's recent rise to prominence is the meteoric rise in class action lawsuits against the pharmaceutical industry's homeopathic equivalents. Companies like Hyland\textsuperscript{12} and Boiron\textsuperscript{13} have become household names in the medical field, notorious for the numerous high profile and high dollar lawsuits that had been brought against them, such as a $250 million class action suit filed against the former. Often focusing on misinformation and false advertising, these cases have shed light on the ugly side of homeopathic remedies, but almost exclusively through civil lawsuits, meaning that governments have taken very little action internationally in order to scold or address the multi-million dollar companies.


The case against Yaya Jammeh, though unprecedented in the realm of international law, has roots in common problems that plague the Western world just as much as developing nations. The root of this practice appears to be distrust in modern medicine, an issue not far from the heart of the increasingly prominent anti-vaccination movement in the United States. In fact, the anti-vaccination movement is often seen as a means to the end of encouraging homeopathic remedies not unlike those used by President Jammeh. In a comprehensive statistical analysis, one group of researchers found that 88% of anti-vaccination websites "endorsed treatments such as herbalism, homeopathy, chiropractics, naturopathy, and acupuncture as superior."

"Anti-vaxxers," as they are commonly referred to by the media, have even been taken to task in the American legal system. One case that went all the way to the Supreme Court upheld a New York school board's policy that provides for the exclusion and separation of unvaccinated children in the case of an outbreak. Legally speaking, this ruling establishes a modern precedent to the superiority of modern medicine in the American culture and legal spheres, giving less and less credibility to those who advocate a different approach.

Court cases and general public revolt notwithstanding, the question of whether or not one person could be held liable in a court of law for practicing homeopathy becomes a question of medical malpractice and cultural context. One pertinent example that highlights the complexities of this argument is that of Dr. Mehmet Oz, a famous television personality and doctor. His endorsement of the controversial Garcinia Cambogia as a weight-loss supplement has put him in the legal crosshairs due to its proven ineffectiveness as a

homeopathic solution to weight problems. Regardless, Dr. Oz, who has been sued and asked to step down from his teaching post at Columbia University, has not yet been successfully prosecuted. When asked to remove him from its faculty, Columbia University responded by noting that his support of homeopathic remedies was an exercise in freedom of speech, and not grounds for removal. Decisions such as these show just how blurred the line can be between medical malpractice and free speech.

Today's Case

The International Criminal Court, or ICC for short, has opened a case against Yahya Jammeh for crimes against humanity under Article 7 of its governing doctrine: the Rome Statute. Article 7 defines crimes against humanity as "any act [such as] murder, extermination, enslavement, etc. directed against any civilian population with knowledge of the attack." The Court contests that Jammeh's direct negligence of common medical practice, coupled with his permeating influence in his country, has resulted in the maltreatment and death of an indeterminable number of Gambians.

The doubts surrounding Jammeh's medicinal practices are what make him difficult to pin down in court. Deaths are difficult to link directly to his practice, particularly in the case of an oft-terminal illness like HIV/AIDS. Prosecuting Jammeh will mean proving a direct correlation between his abuse of power and one of the tenants of Article 7 of the Rome Statute. The prosecution will need to adequately analyze alternative outcomes for patients if Jammeh had not treated them, and prove that the resources present in Gambia are adequate

---

15 Konstantinides, Annetta. "Dr. Oz sued for weight loss supplement he claimed was a 'revolutionary fat buster with no exercise, no diet, no effort,' February 3rd, 2016. http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3430075/Dr-Oz-sued-weight-loss-supplement-Garcinia-Cambogia.html

enough to treat an HIV/AIDS epidemic. The prosecution, as in any case, should also carefully look to consider to what extent they are willing to try President Jammeh. An assessment must be made on whether or not the prosecution considers this a human rights violation or a case of severe medical malpractice, like that of Dr. Oz. The trial will take a different shape regardless, and a more serious charge will carry a graver sentence, but strategy will be key.

The prosecution in today's case will also have to decide whether or not to open up the case and try Jammeh for the various human rights issues that have been brought up since he took control. Doing so could give the prosecution a more compelling case, but also requires significantly more ground to cover, and could easily become a textbook case of prosecuting overreach. Alternatively, focusing the case on Jammeh's dubious medical practices will allow for a more targeted approach, but will narrow the amount of relevant evidence that could convict Jammeh of human right's violations.

The defense will likely rely on the lack of evidence brought forward by the prosecution, as well as a fundamental explanation to the court about cultural norms in West Africa and the role that homeopathic remedies play in the country's medical history. International precedent will also be a key tool in defending Yahya Jammeh, as there has never been a case quite like this one. Furthermore, the ICC's role in imposing Western ways and customs onto an African leader in a court of law should be evaluated as well. President Jammeh would never be tried in his own country or those that surround Gambia, so the defense must question if this makes his trial in the ICC a fair one.

Delegates should seek to exploit the nuances in this case by conducting further research on the topic in order to arrive at a cohesive and concise argument for their case. A creative use of witness testimony as well as a working knowledge of trial law—primarily
objections and objection responses—will prove key as delegates find the aspects of the situation that suit their arguments best. Furthermore, international precedent is always inherently valuable in assessing the culpability of individuals in similar situations.

**Questions**

Are President Jammeh’s actions deliberately harmful?

Does he have some kind of ulterior motives that his medicinal practices help him pursue?

What role does homeopathic medicine play in Gambian (and West African) culture?

Should Jammeh be held legally accountable by the Western world for practicing homeopathic medicine?

Who are the victims of Jammeh’s actions and how can one be held accountable in court for failing to heal someone with an illness that has no cure?

See? Indenting is lots of fun! Notice how we didn’t skip a line between paragraphs?

That’s what you should do! Don’t forget to double space. Woooo.
Introduction

Behind locked, oak doors deep in the bowels of a snow-blanketed Kremlin in February of 2014, Vladimir Putin and his top advisors work tirelessly through the night, strategizing and plotting their next move. The apple of Putin's eye had become Crimea. A hotly contested, former member of the Soviet Union, Crimea has been a country torn between Western political idealism and its ways of old. With a largely Russian population coupled with a plethora of natural resources, the Crimean Peninsula of Ukraine became, in a night, the most important annexation of the 21st century.

Though the Russian government's antics have largely fallen out of the public eye—paling in comparison to the rise of ISIS—the 2014 annexation of Crimea marked a colossal shift in post-Soviet Union politics. At the helm of this unprecedented political action is the tempestuous, ex-KGB, Russian President: Vladimir Putin. Claiming the annexation a victory for the Russian people, Putin's actions sent a loud and clear message to the world: Russia, and anything else that he wants, is his. In a modern political landscape where international boundaries are firm and land acquisition is more of an imperialism vocabulary word than a policy, Putin's annexation of Crimea could lead to a cascade of retrogressive ramifications for international politics.

---

History

The seeds of Russia's recent aggression were planted long ago, in the heyday of the Soviet Union. Before splitting into 15 distinct countries in 1991, the Soviet Union was the most massive country in the world in terms of landmass. The fiercely independent nation cultivated a sense of national identity, responsibility, and belonging that permeated mountains, ethnicity, and cultural boundaries. Though the massive size of the USSR contributed to a diverse population, the unique political glue of the Soviet system held the varying regions together. With small Soviets that governed each semi-independent region all reporting back to the Supreme Soviet in Moscow, the Soviet Union became a well condensed and strictly managed manifestation of Communism in the East. Despite the varying political distinctions put in place, power was truly concentrated within a small set of Communist party elites, called the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet. This Presidium carried the daily duties of the Communist government on its shoulders, as the rest of the Supreme

---

Soviet met only sparingly. The result became a highly centralized power given to a shockingly small group of Communist party representatives.\textsuperscript{19}

In 1954, this tightknit group of political actors, spearheaded by Nikita Khrushchev gave a seemingly insignificant gift to the Ukrainian Soviet by transferring all control and rights to the Crimean peninsula over to it. Of course, in 1954, the Soviet Union was at the height of its power, and all Soviets reported to the Supreme Soviet in Moscow anyway, so surely this gift would have no real ramifications, Khurshchev must have discerned. In the meantime, the gift of the Crimean Peninsula served as a reminder of the Supreme Soviet's commitment to its satellites—a political move that was crucial to maintaining stability in the midst of the Cold War. After all, the Ukraine was the largest republic outside of the RSFSR (Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic).\textsuperscript{20}

While Kruchev's "gift" might have been a strategic way to strengthen the ties of the Soviet Union, its functionality was predicated in the survival of the Union itself. Little could he have known that just a few short decades later the political landscape in the East would have changed momentously. The dissolution of the USSR came in 1991 as what had once been the largest country in the world dissolved into fifteen. The Cold War had an official capstone and tensions in the West towards Communism had eased tremendously. This political development, of course, had a much more complicated effect on the former USSR. The same nationalist movements that led to the political fissures within the Union had complicated its fracture. Though the geographic boundaries between the former satellites did not change, the political systems under which they were governed evolved rapidly. Though the "republics" were still tied together economically, there was no longer any governing body

\textsuperscript{19} Ibid.
that bound them to each other.\textsuperscript{21} This meant that the Crimean Peninsula, situated now within the borders of Ukraine, was no longer the property of Russia as a whole, but rather its independent satellite.

\textbf{Current Situation}

The Crimean Peninsula has since rested squarely in the hands of Ukraine, though not without controversy. In the midst of the fall of the Soviet Union, Ukraine held its own vote for independence and the Crimean Peninsula, though still favoring independence from Russia, did so by the lowest margin of all of the regions in Ukraine—a mere 54\%. This is due, undoubtedly to the demographics of Crimea. With the largest population of ethnic Russians in the Ukraine and a significant Russian naval presence in its ports, Crimea often plays the role of a child pulled between divorced parents.\textsuperscript{22} Legally, it belongs to Ukraine, but ethnically it is more Russian than some of Russia's own territories.

\textsuperscript{21} "Fall of the Soviet Union." http://www.coldwar.org/articles/90s/fall_of_the_soviet_union.asp
\textsuperscript{22} Taylor, Adam. "To understand Crimea, take a look back at its complicated history." February 27th, 2014.
Aside from being ethnically connected to Russia, Crimea's political ties to its former governing body are strategic as well. In the port city of Sevastopol lays a strategic access point to the Black Sea. The port served as a key tactical position in the 2008 war with Georgia as well as the Libya crisis. The port at Sevastopol serves as Russia's largest naval port abroad and, thanks to a 2010 contract between Russia and Ukraine, will continue to do so with unrestricted access until at least 2042. On top of military importance, the Peninsula even boasts an impressive array of natural resources: particularly offshore oil and gas. Russia, whose principal economic export is energy, undoubtedly has a vested interest in a tract of land as multifaceted as Crimea.

All of these factors undoubtedly contributed to Vladimir Putin's decision to seize Crimea in 2014. On February 26th, just a day before the beginning of the Crimean seizure, its parliament held a referendum in order to determine the future of its relationship and ties to Ukraine. Options on the table ranged from independence to allegiance to rejoining Russia, though it quickly became clear that there was one option already in the works before any meeting took place. Just outside, thousands of pro-Russian demonstrators met Ukrainian supporters with hostility and animosity. The timing was too good to be true for the pro-Russian faction.

http://in.reuters.com/article/ukraine-crisis-russia-aksyonov-idINL6N0M93AH20140313
To understand how exactly the renegade vote that turned Crimean politics on its head took place, one must first view the night of February 26th in context with the contrast in atmospheres between the Ukrainian national parliament in Kiev and the Crimean regional parliament. Though the Crimean parliament's insistence on independence from Russian influence was clear, the national politicians in Kiev had already come under fire by political activists who were infuriated by their government's sympathy for Russia. A political analyst by the name of Sergei Markov notes that, in the days leading up to the vote in Crimea, the sweeping, pro-Russian sentiment that flooded the Ukrainian political space culminated in a tenuous period of protests between the largely pro-Ukrainian protestors near the capital. These protests ultimately led to the ouster of President Yanukovych, causing him to flee the country just days before the controversial secession vote was to be held in Crimea. With its biggest supporter in Ukraine thrown out by the will of the people, the Kremlin knew that it would have to seize control of the Crimea by force—whether it be political, physical, or maybe even both.\footnote{Ibid.} After less than a week of national instability, a vote was to be held in Crimea in regards to the state of national sovereignty and the peninsula's relationship with Russia moving forward. That vote, slated for February 25th, never took place. With not nearly enough lawmakers in attendance to warrant a vote, it seemed as though the uprising and political discontent in central Ukraine was beginning to have an impact in the much more pro-Russia Crimea.

Late that night, a group of renegade soldiers, unmarked Russian militants to be exact, stormed and isolated the parliament in order to hold the vote that had never yet made it to the floor. Those lawmakers who had advocated for Ukrainian loyalty, including Crimea's prime minister, were barred from the session and forced to watch as the felt that their region
was being held hostage by a renegade vote. Despite his pro-Ukraine party controlling a majority of the seats in the legislature, it was announced that night that 53 lawmakers had voted to oust the minister with the pro-Russian Sergey Aksyonov, and an astounding 61 had voted to hold a new referendum on sovereignty. Despite the fact that the Kremlin insists the vote was legal, no independent media organizations or journalists were allowed to enter during the secretive votes. Lawmakers have gone on record stating that their vote, despite their absence, was counted.27

Crimea was officially readmitted as a Russian territory on March 18th 2014, less than a month after the seizing of the Crimean parliament. While initially denying involvement in the action, Putin later went on record stating that he had officially set the wheels in motion in order to begin "returning Crimea" to Russia. Troops arrived on the ground just days before the parliamentary convention and, in a blink of an eye, Putin had acquired the most important tract of land in Eastern Europe.

**International Precedent**

This is neither the first case of international annexation, nor the only controversial one. In 1975 Indonesia invaded, occupied, and annexed what is now known as the country of East Timor. First colonized by the Portuguese in the 1500's, *Timor Leste* spent half a millennium as a colony, only to serve as a battleground during a time of political tension for the Portuguese in the 1970's. Portugal's internal unrest led to it losing interest in the island and, just a few days after the Portuguese had officially left, the Indonesian military which controlled West Timor struck hard and fast, taking control of the former Portuguese colony. 24 years of famine, death, and human rights violations categorized the next quarter-century for the East Timorese people. Finally, in 2002, a peaceful secession process took place.

27 Ibid.
backed by the United Nations. Most notably of all, however, is that not a single person was ever prosecuted for the unlawful occupation of East Timor.²⁸

What can be drawn from this example and the dozens like it over the course of the past few centuries is that annexation can often be a crime that goes unpunished. The very nature of annexation is that massive, ambiguously led entities are absorbing others, leaving the legal culprit hard to pin down to just one person. Due to this ambiguity, leaders like Putin have been able to act just as he did with near-immunity for centuries, but in a world where all land is claimed and treaties traverse the international political landscape, Putin may be in a precarious position. If this event would have happened 100 years ago (ignoring the change in national borders), Ukraine would have been forced to sit idly by as the more powerful Russia took what it wanted, powerless to fight back, or suicidal if it did. In fact, The International Criminal Committee was formed to right these wrongs and muscle itself into a realm of international litigation that has sat by and allowed the atrocities committed against people like those of the East Timorese continue for centuries. The only question that remains is whether or not Putin will be one of the first to take the fall for what national leaders have been doing for centuries.

**Today’s Case**

The International Criminal Court (ICC), has opened a case against Vladimir Putin for crimes of aggression under Article 8 of its governing doctrine: the Rome Statute. Article 8 defines crimes of 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."^{29} The Court argues that, in his annexation of Crimea, Putin violated the sovereignty of the Ukrainian state by reclaiming the land in the form of a false election that was conspired and acted on by Russian insiders. Putin, being the principal orchestrator of this movement, is being tried as the sole party responsible in this case.

Though Vladimir Putin may very well have been behind the Crimean vote to join Russia, his culpability in the International Criminal Court is questionable. It is widely accepted that he has put thousands of troops onto the ground in Ukraine since the beginning of the Crimean annexation, but the question of whether or not "armed force" was used in order to annex Crimea itself remains a difficult one to answer. Officially, no lives were lost on the night that the vote was held to "liberate" Crimea. Adding to the intrigue, the heavily Russian population in Eastern Ukraine undoubtedly contributed to the uprising, bringing doubts as to whether or not Putin orchestrated the annexation or simply nudged the first domino in a long line that led to Crimean independence from Ukraine.

The prosecution will need to create a direct link between Putin and the seizing of the Crimea, absolving local politicians of culpability. It will also need to make a compelling argument that the Crimea is not, in fact, Russia's to begin with, as Putin would surely contest, and that, rather, it belonged to the Ukraine. Above all, the prosecution will also need to relate the events that transpired on the night that the Crimean parliament was taken directly to one of the pillars of the Rome Statute.

The defense's case will likely be founded on a lack of evidence to truly implicate Putin himself, as well as a rejection of Crimean sovereignty as a whole. Furthermore, the

high density of Russian nationals in Crimea as well as the peninsula's largely pro-Russian movements will undoubtedly prove to be factors in Putin's defense. Concrete statistics about the lack of lives lost in the seizing of Crimea could be beneficial as well, if such statistics exist.

Delegates should seek to exploit the nuances in this case by conducting further research on the topic in order to arrive at a cohesive and concise argument for their case. A creative use of witness testimony as well as a working knowledge of trial law—primarily objections and objection responses—will prove key as delegates find the aspects of the situation that suit their arguments best. Furthermore, international precedent is always inherently valuable in assessing the culpability of individuals in similar situations.

Questions

Was the annexation of Crimea really Putin's at all? Or is an international "bad guy" simply taking the blame?

Was Crimea even rightfully the property of Ukraine to begin with? Or was Krushev's gift an improper one?

Was force used in order to take Crimea or, in other words, can Putin even be charged under the regulations of the Rome Statute?

Would Putin be paying justly if he were prosecuted or is this case more about making an example out of him and marking a shift in international politics?

Does the overwhelming absence of charges levied against those leaders who have instigated similar annexations in recent years corroborate claims to Putin’s innocence or simply show a lack of international litigation?

If Putin were to be convicted, by what means would the Court be able to assert its authority?

How does Putin's current international political power affect his capacity to govern?