

## CRY HAVOC: VENEZUELA INVADES COLUMBIA



*Chavez calls his people to war and mobilizes his army, promising retribution for the death of Venezuelan citizens implicated with FARC*

SARAH FLOWERS

A great blow has been dealt to world politics via the explosion of a helicopter near the border between Venezuela and Colombia. Thirteen Venezuelan officers were killed in the blast and fifteen more were seriously injured, making this event into an international crisis due to the arrest of four Colombian nationalists who are believed to have fired the rocket that shot the helicopter down. The arrests add more tension to the region, which became polarized in March of last year due to the execution of Raul Reyes, the international spokesman for FARC. The guerilla group—FARC is a Spanish acronym for Revolutionary Armed Forces for Colombia—has been in direct conflict with the Colombian government since the 1960s. Along with the four arrests, numerous weapon caches were discovered in the attacked territory. It is currently believed that the four men were involved in an attempt to overthrow President Hugo Chavez, who is often mocked with the

name “America’s puppet”, due to Venezuela’s close ties to the United States.

President Chavez is already up in arms about the crisis, warning Colombian officials against making any hostile movements towards his country. The Venezuelan Chief of General Staff—despite not announcing how far his nation plans to advance—stated that the Colombian assault was an “...act of aggression by Colombian agents in our country...we cannot stand by idly as they try to destabilize our country”. President Chavez has also demanded restitution from both the American and Colombian governments, and—at press time—had not ordered a siege on Colombia (attacks are thought to be aiming at the capital city of Bogotá), despite the 150,000 troops that were sent into the country following the attack and subsequent arrests.

On the other side of the border, the Colombian president, Alvaro Uribe, is denying that his nation had anything to do with

the attacks on Venezuela. President Uribe calls the attack “...Disastrous for Colombia...no way to discuss anything diplomatically. It’s really a terrible situation. Our men were not involved in a coup inside Venezuela. Those are lies and falsehoods no doubt construed by our mortal enemies...The reason they were present was to continue our nation’s legitimate campaign against the FARC – a narcotic-smuggling terrorist organization.”

Members of the international community are up in arms over the conflict brewing in South America, and tensions were running particularly high in the Security Council. While many delegations voted to move to the crisis at hand, others balked in favor of continuing the debate on self-determination. The delegation of Burkina-Faso made the remark that they were “not even sure where South America is, so we believe that self-determination is much more important”. At press time, the delegates had yet to vote on which topic to discuss, leaving all eyes on the Security Council and the crisis escalating in South America.

### IN THIS ISSUE

- |     |   |
|-----|---|
| 2-3 | National Interests                      |
| 4   | Terrorism!                              |
| 5   | Staff Interviews: The Secretary-General |
| 6   | Conference News                         |
| 7   | Economic Crisis                         |
| 8   | Special Report                          |

## COUNTERPOINT: THE BORSCHT IS IN THE FIRE—A COMMUNIST RESPONSE TO CLIMATE CHANGE

COMRADE SAM JEFFERY

Comrades! It has fallen to me to expose a grave fallacy that has been presented to your trusting minds. Many of you may recall an article entitled “Coping with Climate Change and Protecting our Jobs”, written by the unabashedly capitalist Erin Reddekopp. Her words seek to blame government regulations laid in place to strengthen industry and homeland, claiming that those regulations do nothing to prevent the climate change that is so devastating to comrades and capitalist pigs alike.

The United Nations is a friend of the communist, and it is this writer’s hope that the reader can see parallels between such an organization of the world’s peoples and the union of comrades under the hammer and sickle. Ideals aside, the UN’s scientific panel claimed only that human activity has “very likely” caused this global warming phenomena. This comrade must ask: are you willing to lay your family and countryman’s lives on that bet? The evidence is not irrefutable. The evidence is not final. The phrasing of the panel’s “results” were nothing more than strong suggestion, akin to your mama saying that it was “very likely” a few bad

beets spoiled her borscht.

I say that if business groups have finally come to their senses and asked for government intervention (and through that, regulation) then let them. It is only through strict government control that society can begin to become productive. Emergency measures must be put into place, effective immediately. Rampant capitalism has clearly been the primary cause of global warming, not humankind itself. Left unchecked, the greed and egotism that embodies the free market led to profits becoming more important than the health of the people.

Why should the salaries of a few come out of the pockets of all humankind? How can the economy suffer if big business places itself under the control and protection of the State? Comrades, the time has come to demand that the good of the whole comes before the individual. Demand that the government be allowed to right the wrongs capitalism has wrought. The businesses have nothing to lose but their emissions. Delegates of the UN,

unite!

PHOTO CREDIT: KATRINA KULLY-MARTENS

## THE WORLD’S SADDEST BIRTHDAY PARTY

ERIN REDDEKOPP, COLUMNIST

The fifteenth birthday of the North American Free Trade Agreement came and went without any major celebrations and fanfare in Mexico and Washington. Its January 1st birthday was not trumped by hangovers and exhaustion from all night parties; instead, it was plagued by complications and failure.

President Barack Obama’s victorious platform included harsh criticisms of NAFTA and similar trade agreements. His Congress is full of members that have continued to shift away from similar free-trade policies.

Obama plans a “time-out” on trade agreements in order to thoroughly review US trade policy. His focus needs to be on how the agreements have brought limited benefits for people in the US and the desperate situation it has created in Mexico. In Washington, many people assume NAFTA was a victory for Mexico: the Mexican government got increased exports to the US, much of it in manufacturing, and foreign direct investment jumped to four times pre-NAFTA levels. With inflation down and productivity up, the Mexican economy was expected to boom. But it wasn’t meant to be. The economy grew slowly—an annual rate of 1.6% per capita, which was even low by developing country standards. China, India and Brazil all vaulted ahead of Mexico, following a much less orthodox set of policies that would be illegal for Mexico under NAFTA.

Slow growth meant limited job creation, all the more so with US exports displacing “inefficient” domestic producers. Estimates vary, but Mexico probably gained about 600,000 jobs in the manufacturing sector since NAFTA took effect. However, the country lost at least two million in agriculture, as cheap imports of corn and other commodities flooded the newly liberalized market.

*please see NAFTA continued on page 3*

NAFTA

continued from page 2

Instead of prosperity Mexico saw a net loss of employment while the country's baby boom resulted in one million young people entering the work force each year. Mexico's situation becomes increasingly dire every year. An estimated half-million Mexicans run the perilous and militarized crossing to the US each year. This is double the migration rate before NAFTA.

Many Mexicans are calling for their own government to renegotiate the agreement. Exploitation of cheap labour is a daily challenge. NAFTA allows America to import inexpensive good due to Mexico's low wages and cheap resources. In order to keep trade rates high, wages must continue to be approximately six times less than American wages.

It is impossible to deny that Mexico received preferential access to the coveted US market and huge inflows of American capital. But those who care about economic development ask for—and were promised—more. They ask that economic and trade policies benefit the population at large.

This has important implications for US trade policy, and for any developing country seeking to sign a trade agreement with the US. NAFTA is the template for such agreements. If Mexico, with a 2,000-mile border with the US, a strong history of bilateral trade, and trade preferences that meant something during what turned out to be the longest economic expansion in US history, didn't prosper from its trade agreement, other developing countries are not likely to either.



REUTERS/ANDREW WINNING  
NAFTA equals death, say Mexican farmers: campesinos stand at a barrier as riot police stand guard during a protest outside the U.S. embassy in Mexico City

# WILL BURMA'S DAY OF RECKONING COME?

DYLAN HANDY

This is a city constructed out of fear. Naypyidaw reportedly was created by Burma's brutal dictators on the advice of astrologers and built in part by forced labor. Worried that they might be vulnerable to attack in Rangoon, a port city, they abruptly moved the government 250 miles to the north three years ago and modestly named the new capital "Abode of Kings".

Few reach this remote city: permission is required to come by plane, and a new superhighway was built primarily for government officials. Most travel the six-plus hours from Rangoon over a bumpy two-lane road shared by plodding ox carts and bicycle riders. Much of rural Burma still functions without electricity; families get by as they have for centuries, with hand pumps for water and cooking fires. Only the teashops in villages have TVs, which run on generators. People watch soccer and maybe the news on al-Jazeera, then walk home in the dark.

On one level there is a plastic veneer of modern life. Local TV channels show smiling young models singing about shampoo, and billboards advertise laptops. There's even a Starbucks-style coffee house in Rangoon.

Yet on another level there is rampant poverty, disease and sex trafficking. People in famine-stricken areas pay a nickel for rats to eat. In the northern no-man's land, miners are paid with opium and pass along HIV via group needles. In the largely Christian Karen villages that the junta is systematically destroying, the women are raped and children are forced into the military as human mine detectors.

Here in Naypyidaw, ruling general Than Shwe recently claimed he was so busy accepting the credentials of some new ambassadors that he did not have time to meet with U.N. special envoy Ibrahim Gambari about democratic reforms. Gambari left after being rebuked by Prime Minister Gen. Thein Sein, who demanded the lifting of international economic sanctions on Burma and called them a "human rights violation". U.N. Secretary General Ban Ki-moon put a diplomatic spin on events, saying Gambari had "good discus-



WIKIPEDIA

Burma's people: still ignored by the world  
sions there even though one may not be totally satisfied".

Gambari is supposed to brief the Security Council on Friday. Members should be told what the generals did as soon as he left: closed more churches in Rangoon, refused to let lawyers visit some of the country's more than 2,100 political prisoners, and extended the arrest of an 82-year-old opposition leader.

Naypyidaw symbolizes the stalemate over Burma: the generals in their labyrinth have created a surreal reality and defy world opinion. The international community lets them get away with it by failing to produce an effective, moral, organized response.

It is up to the Obama foreign policy team to put more backbone in the U.N. efforts. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's remarks yesterday about sanctions drew new attention to the issue. The Obama team has the chance to calibrate financial sanctions so they squeeze the generals and their money-laundering cronies. It can insist that verifiable benchmarks of real progress, such as the release of political prisoners, be met before development favors are done for the junta. And it can remind the world that the election scheduled for 2010 shouldn't fool anyone. It is being engineered to ensure the generals' hold on power, meaning business will continue as usual in Naypyidaw.

# THE GUANTANAMO BAY CRUNCH



UNN NEWS

*How do you solve a problem like the Gitmo?*

SAMUEL SHAPIRO

Guantanamo Bay: that famous US prison facility known by much of the world for its inconceivably revolting “c\*ckmeat sandwiches” given by Big Bob—Harold and Kumar have no idea just how lucky they are to have escaped in time. But sandwiches aside, other terrorists and prisoners of war situated in this widely criticized prison are unfortunately not as lucky. The American government uses an ad hoc approach to dealing with the legal rights of captured terrorists. This means that they are prosecuted by means of a purely improvised and unstructured judicial system, and can usually end up serving years in the prison without trial. Meanwhile, they are subjected to abuse and torture by US forces that are supposed to ensure their well-being during their stay in Guantanamo Bay.

There are many problems inherent in the theoretical closure of Guantanamo Bay. These do not just include the political aspects, which involve complex procedures and information revelation. The future fates of apprehended terrorists once they are tried and released must also be considered.

Barack Obama, the new and improved 44th president of the US of A, signed an

Executive Order vowing to close down Guantanamo Detention Camp within the year. While his promise rings with hope for many, actions speak louder than words, and carrying out these actions will prove more difficult than one might initially assume. As part of the release process, all detainees must first have their information reviewed. Only then are their transfer and prosecution arranged. Already the US government faces a major setback, for many of the detainees are missing comprehensive files. Assembling the evidence for the review of each individual case could take weeks, if not months. Then the prosecution and judgment must take place, which will also require time. At an estimated 250 prisoners currently held in the Guantanamo Bay facility, one can see how a one-year time limit poses somewhat of a problem. And, to top all of this off, many conservative US government officials opposed to closing the infamous prison could purposefully cause delays in the closure procedures (as seen done quite effectively in the previous Bush government).

The other major problem concerns the fate of prisoners found not guilty and released back into their previous cultural and

religious setting. Terrorist groups usually consist of committed members ready to execute so-called acts of terrorism, often-times in the name of their religion or other beliefs. Therefore, when such extremists are found innocent, the consequences following their release could potentially be disastrous. This extends from something as simple as rejection from their own family to extradition by their native homeland and/or being tortured for not abiding by or crossing the line of certain religious values. This psychological (and perhaps physical) aspect following the liberation of detainees from prison is rarely taken into account.

One of the most well-known detainees at Guantanamo is the Canadian Omar Khadr. He was captured in Afghanistan by American forces for allegedly throwing a grenade and killing an American soldier. While no evidence is conclusive, he has been held captive without a proper trial for over six years. To complicate matters, the Canadian government is playing innocent, pretending that they are happily ready to receive Khadr, while at the same time nodding in agreement at any proposition stating that it is not up to Canada to decide Khadr’s fate. Such irresponsible behaviour on the part of an entire government must be extended and considered with regards to other countries from which the rest of Guantanamo Bay prisoners originally come.

With a new and active US government, the issue of Guantanamo will likely (and hopefully) be resolved. However, it is not as simple as closing one facility—methods of detaining and prosecuting future terrorists and child soldiers (such as Khadr) must be implemented. For knocking on one door will not solve the problems behind all the others which we, in our own denial, fail to open.

**DELEGATES:  
IF YOU HAVE NOT TALKED  
TO YOUR TRADE PARTNERS,  
YOU ARE NEGLECTING  
YOUR ALLIES.**

# PASTRIES, POLITICS, AND THE SECRETARY-GENERAL: GETTING TO KNOW SECRETARY-GENERAL AMY SANDERSON

SARAH FLOWERS, COLUMNIST

Secretary-General Amy Sanderson—who was apparently a shoo-in for her position due to a lack of competition—is an extraordinarily busy individual on a daily basis. Attempting to have a seated interview with her on the eve of HSMUN proves to be impossible, and instead I opt to follow her between rooms, asking questions while she accomplishes a variety of tasks such as getting a portrait taken and removing “close to a million” files off of the desktop of her personal computer. Despite distractions, the Secretary-General managed to answer ten questions about the UN, herself, and a slew of random—albeit relevant—subjects.

## 1. What do you hope to see at HSMUN 2009?

I hope to see the highest level of decorum throughout the conference. The banquet will prove to be a super affair.

## 2. In your biography, it mentions that you believe that Barack Obama’s presidency threatens the future of the world. How do you think that America’s 44th president is a global threat?

Barack Obama has given the public a hope overload—the whole “yes we can” attitude has dangerous ramifications.

## 3. Who is your favorite dictator?

I like the benevolent dictator of Singapore, although I don’t know his name.



WIKIPEDIA

*A hero's hero: Amy Sanderson supports Jed Bartlet for president*



SAM BROOKS

*No time to lament the failure of her latest macaroon making attempt: Secretary-General Amy Sanderson is hard at work*

## 4. If you weren’t the Secretary-General, who or what would you be?

A pastry chef—I would like to go to NAIT and study. However, I can’t make macarons, which could be problematic.

## 5. What is your current favorite political situation (e.g. Darfur, the Gaza Strip crisis)?

I enjoy Latin American politics, which are so under-watched by so many Canadians.

## 6. In 2007, Barbara Walters named the President of Venezuela, Hugo Chavez, one of her “10 Most Fascinating People”. What do you think of President Chavez?

I believe that the United States has every right to fear President Chavez as he is a force in Latin American politics.

## 7. If you had to sanction an official United Nations dessert, what would it be?

It would be a multi-layered pudding concoction, as I think pudding is a universal dish and there are so many different types.

## 8. What have been your responsibilities? Which job has been the most demanding?

My responsibility has been to oversee the conference from April to now. The biggest job has been to be a liaison between University and organization. It has been a hassle, but a good hassle.

## 9. It appears that the media focuses more on the wardrobe choices of the First Lady more than the politics. How do you feel about this? Also, who do you think is the most stylish First Lady—Michelle Obama, Carla Bruni, etc.—or other female political figure?

Michaëlle Jean is quite stylish, but I’m a big fan of the Queen.

## 10. Tell me about this Mr. Bartlet you are backing (for a democratic coup) in 2012. Who is he and why do you support him?

Mr Bartlet? Heck yes! He’s been the President on the West Wing for the last eight years. He’s a Liberal Democrat and I firmly support his views and philosophical approaches to government. Basically, he’s my hero.

## BRING IT ON: IN IT TO WIN

SAM JEFFERY

Is war abrew? To say that the general assembly focussing on SPECPOL (Special Political and Decolonization) is off to an exciting start would be a bit of an understatement. Last night SPECPOL was clearly divided on the issue of the responsibility to protect, with strong statements both for and against from the major powers. Brazil launched immediately into vicious attacks on the United States, provoking the superpower despite what some would call a vast difference in the two

state's influences.

But the real drama came during the first of what may become many unmoderated caucuses. Brazil, asked about their strong offensive tactics, was unapologetic. "We want to declare war on the US," says the delegation from Brazil, Jacob Jedeon Israel Shanks. USA delegate Sarah Hanafi, upon hearing this apparent threat, had only one response: "Bring it on."

With such a discrepancy of arms between the two states (the USA's vast arsenal of

nuclear warheads comes to mind, juxtaposed with Brazil's vast herds of cows) one can only hope that the threat is the result of over-strong feelings on both sides in regards to the issues at hand. Here's hoping that the tension in SPECPOL will be broken by compromise and agreement on all sides, rather than just the musical chimes of the Russian Federation's cellphone.

## THE SELF-DETERMINATION OF TERRORISTS AND TOBLERONE BARS

SARAH FLOWERS

Prior to the announcement of the crisis, the Security Council spent the morning locked in a lengthy moderated caucus over the definition of self-determination and



**SAM BROOKS**  
The Security Council stands at attention in order to discuss which peoples deserve nation-status and which do not—and what to do about that.

which peoples are entitled to this right. Delegates clashed on both issues, with Uganda standing apart from other nations, such as the alliance of Costa Rica, Croatia, and the United States. The African nation, which questioned the right of all peoples to self-determination, used examples such as various terrorist groups. Uganda questioned the definition being quoted by several other delegations by stating, "Terrorist groups want self-determination. Everyone wants self-determination. Does this mean that we should give self-determination to al-Qaeda?" Other nations clashed with the seemingly radical views of Uganda, who used the Wikipedia definition of self-determination, which declares, "Self-determination is defined

as free choice of one's own acts without external compulsion, and especially as the freedom of the people of a given territory to determine their own political status or independence from their current state. In other words, it is the right of the people of a certain nation to decide how they want to be governed without the influence of any other country". This was deemed unacceptable by the dais staff, as Wikipedia is not considered to be a credited source. However, this did not hinder the delegates, who also presented the dais staff with Toblerone chocolate bars, expressing the delegation's desire to "put forward a motion to bribe the dais staff!"

## STRANGE CAUSES: SOCHUM OFF TO AN OFFBEAT START

SAM JEFFERY

It was a scene of dignified and quiet debate last night in the SOCHUM (Social and Humanitarian) general assembly, with the exception of a few verbose delegates. The delegate from Ireland, Josh Baller, regaled the assembly at length in his native accent, often running over the prescribed speaking time.

The assembly itself, however, appeared initially split on which of the two topics it wished to tackle first. Developed countries such as Switzerland appear passionate about the issue of human rights, with delegate Phillippe de Montigny declaring that the global food crisis cannot be solved un-

til women have equality. Less developed countries were determined to turn the debate towards the global food crisis itself, an issue that affects them more strongly than most of the western states.

No matter the topic that is decided upon, surely some states will be discontent. If women's rights take precedence, is it a strong-arm decision from the superpowers? If the global food crisis is the topic of choice, is it at the cost of ignoring a larger and more prolonged issue?

Either way, the delegations seem determined to put their own spin on the topics at hand. Women's equality the cause of

the global food crisis? Or is it the other way around? That, good delegates, is for you to decide.



Quibbling...

**SARAA MAHFOUZ**

# OBAMA AND THE PROTECTIONISTS: MORTAL ENEMIES OR ALLIES?



UNN NEWS

*Send the stimulus package to the dogs of Congress, and watch Protectionism rear its head.*

## DYLAN HANDY

Some think the New Deal rescued America from economic crisis in the 1930s. Others argue the opposite. But whatever their ideology, and whatever their credentials, most of the pundits, historians and economists who debate the Great Depression agree about one thing: whatever may have caused the crisis, protectionism, trade barriers and, yes, the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, helped to ensure that it lasted as long as it did. So uncontroversial is this view that it is virtually U.S. government policy. “To this day,” intones a State Department website, “the phrase ‘Smoot-Hawley’ remains a watchword for the perils of protectionism.”

With equal solemnity, government officials everywhere are echoing that sentiment. Last weekend, the finance ministers of the Group of Seven again swore fealty to the official anti-tariff mantra, announcing that they remain “committed to avoiding protectionist measures, which would only exacerbate the downturn.” The U.S. Treasury secretary, Tim Geithner, agreed: “All countries need to sustain a commitment to open trade and investment policies which are essential to economic growth.” So did his German colleague:

“We will have to do everything to ensure history does not repeat itself.”

Which is all very well—except that there are many ways to pursue protectionist policies, and rest assured that every single one of them is being tried by someone, somewhere, right now. New tariffs are already in force. Rumors of more tariffs pending—in Brazil, in the Philippines—are haunting the steel industry trade press, too. Still, these are minor infractions. The real story, over the next several years, will be the spread of more carefully camouflaged protectionism: measures, some legal, some not, designed to help one nation’s workers or companies at the expense of those next door.

These kinds of games are already being played stealthily in Europe, where, despite pious recitations by G-7 finance ministers—and despite the free-trade rules that are supposed to be enforced by the European Union—almost everyone is seeking to protect domestic industry. The French have not only thrown heavy subsidies at their automobile industry, they have made it crystal clear that the money is to be spent in France. “If we are to give financial assistance to the auto industry,

we don’t want to see another factory being moved to the Czech Republic,” declared President Nicolas Sarkozy, failing to note that the Czechs and the French theoretically belong to the same free-trade zone, with open borders. Meanwhile, the Slovaks, who live in the same free-trade zone, have declared that if the French try anything funny with Slovakia, they’re going to send Gaz de France packing.

Whatever the finance ministers might say, all of these measures are, of course, extremely popular, and political parties of all stripes have capitalized on them wherever possible. The U.S. Congress put its nonsensical “Buy American... as long as no trade laws are broken” clause into the stimulus bill, thus guaranteeing that every infrastructure investment will be accompanied by a flood of extra paperwork. A Spanish minister has called on his nation to “Buy Spanish”. In England the most popular strike slogan is “British jobs for British workers”. Expect more than one political leader, on more than one continent, to rise to power in the next few years riding a wave of protectionist sentiment.

But this should surprise no one: after all, Smoot-Hawley was popular, too. At the time of its passage, more than a thousand economists of all ideologies signed a petition against it. Since then, historians have reckoned that it reinforced the global slump: between 1929 and 1934, world trade declined by 66 percent. Still, the politicians of the 1930s knew which way the popular winds were blowing -- and those of the present know, too. There is no need to hold any further G-7 meetings to warn against the perils of a protectionist world: we’re living in one already.



*Another Great Depression would start here* UNN NEWS

# FIGHTING FOR A FUTURE

ERIN REDDEKOPP

Trying to shake its tarnished brand name and its criticized work in Iraq, Blackwater Worldwide is renaming its family of two-dozen businesses Xe. Blackwater Lodge & Training Centre—the subsidiary that conducts much of the company's overseas operations and domestic training—has been renamed US Training Centre Inc.

The decision comes as part of an ongoing rebranding effort that grew more urgent following a September 2007 shooting in Iraq that left at least a dozen civilians dead. The new name reflects the change in company focus away from the business of providing private security.

The company is not interested in actively



UINN NEWS  
Choppers over Baghdad, but not state-owned

pursuing new private security contracts. Blackwater is shifting its focus away from such work to focus on training and providing logistics.

Blackwater will continue to provide personnel protective services for high-threat environments when needed by the US government, but its primary mission will be operating our training facilities around the world, including the flagship campus in North Carolina.

The company has operated under the Blackwater name since 1997, when chief executive Erik Prince and some of his former Navy Seal colleagues launched it in north-eastern North Carolina, naming their new endeavor for the swamp streams that run black with murky water.

The change displays how badly the Moyock, North Carolina-based company's brand was damaged by its work in Iraq. In 2004, four of its contractors were killed in an insurgent ambush in Fallujah, with their bodies burned, mutilated and strung from a bridge. The incident triggered a US siege of the restive city.

The September 2007 shooting in Baghdad's Nisoor Square added to the damage. The incident infuriated politicians both in



UINN NEWS  
Still hard at work, despite their sins

Baghdad in Washington, triggering congressional hearings and increasing calls that the company be banned from operating in Iraq.

Last month, Iraqi leaders said they would not renew Blackwater's license to operate there, citing the lingering outrage over the shooting in Nisoor Square, and the US state department said later it will not renew Blackwater's contract to protect diplomats when it expires in May.

The company made the name change largely because of changes in its focus, but acknowledged the need for the company to shake its past in Iraq.

## UNITED NATIONS NEWS

### HIGH SCHOOL MODEL UNITED NATIONS PRESS CORPS 2009

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF, USG NEWS

Nathan Pinkoski  
[npinkosk@ualberta.ca](mailto:npinkosk@ualberta.ca)

MANAGING EDITOR

Sam Brooks  
[sgbrooks@ualberta.ca](mailto:sgbrooks@ualberta.ca)

NEWS EDITOR

Emily Cliff  
[ecliff@ualberta.ca](mailto:ecliff@ualberta.ca)

COLUMNIST

Erin Reddekopp  
Sarah Flowers  
Samuel Shapiro  
Sam Jeffery  
Dylan Handy

PHOTOGRAPHY AND FILM

Lukas Kawalilak  
Natasha Tames  
Saraa Mahfouz  
Marc Charbonneau  
James Ternovoy

[www.ualberta.ca/~hsmun](http://www.ualberta.ca/~hsmun)



HSMUN • 09

*United Nations News* is the official news publication of the University of Alberta High School Model United Nations conference. Reproduction of any material appearing in *UNN* without written consent of their creator(s) is prohibited.

Opinions expressed within the pages of *UNN* are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of *UNN* or *HSMUN*.

© U of A HSMUN, 2009