Dearest Advocates and Judges,

Welcome to the first session of CIAMUN. Our names are Lady Payan Cepeda and Zoubida Dadach, and as your Presidents, we are delighted that you have chosen to be part of our committee. ICJ is one of the toughest committees, so we will be expecting a lot of preparation from your side so we can hold a strong and ideal conference. We are deeply honored to be chairing this debate and will give our best to you, so we expect the same in return.

MUN brings a stressful ambiance with it, it is also extremely intriguing. You may be intimidated by the others, have stage fright or be afraid of saying something wrong. However, we know that this experience will give you confidence as a delegate and as a person, we do expect advocates, judges and witnesses alike to participate no matter what, in order to make use of all of MUN's aspects, including getting rid of the anxiety of public speaking and gaining confidence. Sometimes it just takes a leap of faith to get completely wound up into the debate, but only for those who are willing to take it!

The two cases we have chosen, cover a wide range of international issues. The recent disputes of armed activities in countries has been brought to our attention, and the need to discuss, together as youth is important so we can find solutions to the issue. The second case is about Russia’s constant power over Ukraine, and Ukraine’s attempt to finally escape Russia’s iron grip. We truly find this a very controversial topic which will have huge room for debate.

We are counting on excellent debating from your part and a clear understanding of the cases. The more you prepare the better as ICJ is not like other committees, but it's one where even the most experienced individuals might struggle if no background research is done. This will be an amazing opportunity for you to expand on your research skills and show us your judicial knowledge and reasoning. Our committee will give you a life experience you will never forget.
What is ICJ?
The International Court of Justice, sometimes called the World Court, is the principal judicial organ of the United Nations. The ICJ settles disputes between states and gives advisory opinions on international legal issues referred to it by the UN. The goal of the ICJ is to maintain world peace and to resolve international disagreements before they escalate. States and parties can file cases with the International Court of Justice in order to settle conflict.

How does ICJ work?
ICJ is quite different from other committees in MUN. The ICJ committee at CIAMUN has a team of 8 judges and a double delegation of 4 countries along with two Presidents. We will start with a pledge for the advocates and judges, then we will proceed to the opening speeches, followed by memorials, evidence packets, witnesses, rebuttals, closing statements and final deliberations in that order.

Judges:
Unlike delegates in traditional committees, judges do not speak from a specific country’s perspective, but rather from their own morals. A judge has several responsibilities. They are responsible for reading memorials, and hearing arguments on each of the cases. They will then deliberate to analyze and discuss the cases and arguments in order to determine the appropriate applications of international law in each case. They will also take witnesses’ statements under Minimum, Medium and Maximum Consideration. All judgements made should be in accordance with international law and do not conflict with the state law of the judge and is consistent with it (a copy of both state law and international law is advised to be at hand in the conference in case they needed to support their argument using a certain clause).

Judges are rather encouraged to word their opinions and communicate with other judges as well as comment on the arguments of the advocates to reach the finest judgement at the end of the conference. Judges are allowed to ask questions at the end of opening statements, after direct examinations are done and at the end of evidences. If a judge wishes to speak to another member in the court (Example: The President), she/he should send a written note to the court, stating which member of the court the note should be delivered to and what issue she/he wishes to address or comment on. Judges are also responsible for writing opinions for each case during session. Please familiarize yourself with the common international law. A well-prepared Justice is well with ICJ procedures, and able to write a legal opinion.

Note: Judges are not allowed to make prior research on any of the cases. Their verdicts are given based on the information provided by the advocates (evidence packets, witnesses)

Advocates:
Note: Advocates are required to read the entire handbook in order to understand CIAMUN ICJ procedure and meet the requirements of their positions.
Advocates can be seen as the delegates in an ICJ committee and have a very stimulating role in the conference. Advocates must represent a country and argue their case before the ICJ. Each advocate team has to convince the panel of judges to vote for or against the case. During the procedure, advocates must call upon the memorandum, witnesses and evidence that they have provided. Preparing for this role can be time consuming, as it not only involves dedicated research and writing, but it also requires an opening speech before the Court. Appropriate preparation is essential to a rewarding and successful simulation of the ICJ. It is important that all advocates properly prepare and submit memorials and stipulations on time. In addition, please use the lead up time to Conference wisely by drafting and practicing your opening speech. Please come to the conference ready to argue your case before the court.

**Pledge:**
After the President opens the session, Judges and Advocates take the Pledge. A solemn declaration shall be made by each Judge individually: “I, Judge “Surname”, solemnly declare that I will perform my duties and exercise my powers as a Judge honourably, faithfully, impartially and conscientiously.”

The Advocates shall declare: “I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that I will speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth”. Please do learn it and have a copy of the pledge with you.

**Modes of Address**
A judge should be referred as “Judge Surname” or “Your Honor” or simply “Judge”. Presidents are to be referred as “Mr./Madame President” or “President”. While addressing advocates, the advocate may be called as “Advocate” however, “Counsel” is preferred; when a specific party is mentioned, it may only be called by country name or “Applicants/Respondents”. Any questions or objection should be raised directly to the Presidents as there is no direct Conversation will be authorized between parties when court is in session. Any witness appearing before the Court is to be addressed by their appropriate title and surname. Witnesses appearing before the Court may use first-person modes of address.

**Opening Speeches:**
Opening speeches are brief speeches which can be considered as the restatement of the memorial. The parties intend to show what they will try to prove during the trial. The time allocated for each party is set by the President. The Applicant shall have the first opening statement and after the Applicant completes the opening statement, the Respondent shall proceed. The time allocated for the opening statements shall be equally divided between both of the Advocates representing one party. Objections are not allowed during opening speeches but questions from the judges are allowed. The judges will also be giving opening speeches about their deliberations and impartiality.
Memorials

Prior to the courts session, each team of advocates should prepare a memorial that shows the position and the views of their country on the case. Each team is required to prepare a memorandum showing their country’s stance and perspective on the case. The memorandum contains a complete list of their country’s concerns with the defense, events and facts between the two countries considering the case, and anything else that would give the judges a more insightful view of their side of the case. The memorandum should be around (900-1150 words)

The format that a memorandum should follow (however, this can be slightly altered to an advocate’s needs):

Memorandum of (Country’s Name) International Court of Justice
Submitted by: Advocates (Surnames)
On behalf of: (the government of the country the advocates are representing)
Date: (Current Date)

1. Statement of Jurisdiction: A brief introduction on what the case is about, including how the case developed to become a dispute and how it got to be heard and handled in the ICJ.

2. Statement of Law: Advocates must present to the judges and opposing parties the relevant laws and treaties which your party will rely greatly upon, as well as further clarification on how these laws or treaties help your case. Judges do not take this as evidence as it is merely a way to let judges know how you think these treaties and laws will help you throughout the exposition of the case, this would help judges understand these large documents easier.

3. Statement of Facts: Advocates must provide some of the details on what the case is and provide a few points on previous attempts to resolve the issue. Advocates may get some of this information from the background guide provided and reliable sources. It is important to remember to highlight what supports your arguments in this section.

4. Arguments: Advocates list their points of argument on why they believe the law is on their side and that they are right. Try accompanying every argument with a treaty of law or legal principles to back up your point. This is where advocates list their major arguments so that the judges can look back at your memorandum and achieve the point the advocate is trying to make, however having a remaining major argument that the advocate does not put in this section can also be useful, as the advocate may use it as a “secret weapon” during the committee session.

5. Summary and Prayer for Relief: In the last section, advocates list what they wish the court to rule. After the judges discuss and contemplate both Summaries and Prayers for Relief, they will choose the two they favor more. Judges cannot stray away from these Prayers of Relief to give a bit of everything to both parties and must give a clear conclusion. Therefore, writing a more neutral Summary and Prayer for Relief instead of a rigid, unflexible and biased one can be strategically advantageous for advocates, so that if the judges disagree, they lean more towards the more peaceful one.
Stipulations:
The list of stipulations is a piece of written evidence that has been agreed on by both parties and its purpose is to help advance the case quickly by avoiding disagreement on basic aspects of the case, such as definition of terms or history of events. Before the conference itself, both parties should work together to produce a final list of stipulations. Stipulations are written in bullet form and should contain definitions of key terms, important historical events, activities by both parties and relevant treaties and special agreements.

During their research, each advocate team should first compile a list of draft stipulations individually. Advocates should attempt to correct, combine, and rephrase the stipulations where appropriate in order to search for common ground. The final stipulations have to be around 3-4 pages long, should be compiled after two to three exchanges between the councils. The final list of stipulations, once agreed upon by all four advocates, should be sent to the Presidents electronically (via given email).

Advocates are not required to make copies of stipulations for the court. It is important to keep in mind that the final list of stipulations is considered evidence and is not debatable in court, so please make sure that all stipulations are approved and thoroughly checked by both parties before a final copy of the document is printed and sent to all judges to be checked.

Evidence Packets
Evidence Packets have an extremely vital role in the ICJ committee, as they are the only proof you can use to support your opinion. Using evidence makes your case appear more reliable and will encourage the judges to vote for your party. All your points and arguments have to be presented to the judges through your evidence.

Evidence can include web pages, pages from books, newspapers, magazines or journals, treaties, UN declaration, as well as any other official documents.

There are also no minimum or maximum pieces of evidence that an advocate may admit, however we would recommend you present at least five pieces of evidence, so you can support your case well. When presenting their evidence to the court, advocates will have to provide the name of the document, the date of publication, the source (website URL), and the author. For large documents, such as declarations and treaties, advocates are expected to highlight the important clauses, sentences, statistics and other information. However, non-highlighted information can also be used as evidence. During their research, advocates may come across extremely large documents, where they will only need to print out the important pages of the documents, which shall include the cover page, index, first page, last page, and any other required pages as evidence.

Each advocate team should have three copies of their evidence prepared - one to give to the Judges and Presidents, one to the opposing advocate team and one to keep for yourself.
However, when taking printing evidence from websites or any other online source, advocates must print out the document as it is. **Evidence which has been copied into a Word Document or has been edited or altered from its original formatting by any sort of software or medium will not be accepted by the International Court of Justice.** Judges will evaluate evidence on bias, relevance, lack of information or reliability, accuracy and date of publication. After the judges evaluate the evidence, it can be weighed as that of low importance if it does not meet the criteria we have stated above or of high importance. In addition to this, the Presidency has the supreme power to eliminate evidence, if they feel it is not substantial and shall not be questioned. If a piece of evidence is not admitted that piece of evidence cannot be used to support your arguments.

**Witnesses:**
Witnesses are the representatives of their side of the case chosen by the advocates to give testimonials to the court. Dissimilar to advocates, anything that witnesses say during testimonial is counted as evidence by the court, so it is important that witnesses understand what they are saying. It is up to the advocates to prepare the witnesses with the information they will need to represent their nation and its policy on the case at hand, including any specifics about treaties, statistics, stipulations, and other facts of the case. If a witness is asked a question that they do not know the answer to, they are asked to answer honestly. Each council will be allowed two or three witnesses of their choosing for their case.

Each witness has nearly an hour in the ICJ room where they will be questioned by the advocates. The advocates that chose the witness will begin with “direct examination” where they will ask non-leading questions of the witness to get across one point. After this, the opposing council will be allowed to “cross-examine” the witness, where they are allowed to ask leading questions of the witness, within the scope of the previous cross examination. After this, the first council is allowed to re-direct examine the witness to address new points, followed by re-cross and this will repeat until the hour has come to an end. The opposing counsel can only object of the following grounds and we expect all advocates and judges alike to know and understand these different types of objections and when they are used:

1) **Lacks Personal Knowledge/Speculation:**
Speculation is the act or practice of theorizing about matters over which there is no certain knowledge. This objection shall be raised if a Witness tries to predict the result of an answer or possible outcome of an event. In case of speculation the other party has the right to object. The final decision on the objection shall be made by the Presidents and this decision shall not be subject to appeal.

2) **Relevance of Answer/Question:** All assertions by the parties shall be relevant to the case at hand. If the assertion made is irrelevant to the case the other party shall have the right to object. The final decision on the objection shall be made by the Presidents and this decision shall not be subject to appeal.

3) **Leading:**
Leading question is a question that suggests the answer to the person being interrogated; especially a question that may be answered by a mere “yes” or “no. In case of a leading question during the examination, the other party has the right to object. These types of questions are only allowed in cross-examination, but not during the direct examination of a witness. However, when a hostile witness is called upon, leading questions would be allowed during the direct examination. The final decision on the objection shall be made by the Presidents and this decision shall not be subject to appeal.

4) Badgering:
During the examination of the Witnesses, Advocates have the responsibility to refrain from intimidation and distressing methods. If one of the parties fails to meet this criterion, the other party shall have the right to raise an objection. The final decision on the objection shall be made by the Presidents and this decision shall not be subject to appeal.

5) Prejudicial:
All assertions of law and facts shall respect the personal integrity of the advocates, judges, witnesses and others present in the courtroom. If an assertion by one of the parties harms the personal integrity of a person, an objection may be raised by any of the persons mentioned above. The final decision on the objection shall be made by the Presidents and this decision shall not be subject to appeal.

6) Competence
This objection shall be raised when a speaker asserts a technical detail which cannot be assessed by the mentioned speaker. The objection shall only be raised by the other party. The final decision on the objection shall be made by the President and this decision shall not be subject to appeal.

7) Immaterial:
Immaterial evidence tends to prove some fact that is not proper or is lacking logical connection with the consequential facts. It is when the certain question is not about the issue in trial. The decision on the objection by the Presidents may be subject to an appeal. In the event of an appeal the final decision shall be made by the Judges’ vote.

8) Hearsay:
Hearsay is a testimony that is given by a Witness who speaks about not what she/he knows personally, but what others have said, which therefore depends on the credibility of someone other than the Witness. Such testimony is inadmissible under the rules of evidence. Questions to the Witness shall be related to the Witness’ own experience only. It must be possible for the source of the information to be examined directly during cross examination. If one of the parties to the case asks hearsay questions to a Witness, the other party has the right to raise an objection. The final decision on the objection shall be made by the Presidents and this decision shall not be subject to appeal.
As stated in the handbook, before the conference the advocates must submit the following documents, the deadlines will be provided soon:
1) Memorandum by each party
2) Witness lists by each party (the witness list must be approved by both parties)
3) Stipulations by both parties
4) Evidence list (the evidence list does not need to be approved by both parties, however opposing counsel can object during session.)

Rebuttals:
Rebuttals give advocates time to discuss and review upon the points and arguments that the opposing party has presented so far. Rebuttals will take place after witness examination. Recess will be given between rebuttals for advocates to prepare their statements for their rebuttals. Each round of rebuttals will first have the applicant rebuttal, followed by the respondent rebuttal and there will be a total of two rounds. The first round is normally intended to directly address the arguments that the opposing party has made so far and the second round is to address any points brought up by the opposing party to which they hold an argument for, as well as adding more points and elaborating ones they have made before.

Closing Statements:
This is a 20-minute session where advocates are given a chance to present a closing statement. The objective of this statement is to summarize the case as a whole and readdress and many arguments that have been put forward during witness examinations, rebuttals, opening speeches, or through evidence packets.

Final Deliberation:
After the advocates’ closing statements are presented, judges enter a discussion on the individual components of the case and assess the presented evidence. During this deliberation, only the judges and presidents are allowed to remain within the committee. Here, judges are also asked to concern the short- and long-term consequences of each judgment. After the discussion is ended, each judge will present their individual conclusions. A round of voting follows and the advocacy with the most votes wins the case. At CIAMUN, a 2/3 majority or more than half the judges are needed for a final verdict to be passed. If there is a tie, the two Presidents’ of ICJ will provide a conjoined vote which will decide the winner of the case.

Crisis:
In the possible event of a crisis brought to ICJ and asked to be settles, whatever processing are going on will be put on hold and the committee members will focus on the crisis until it has been resolved. The order in which the judges will be addressed will be decided under the Presidents’ discretion. Advocates will be able to have their relevant material on hand and any evidence or sources must pass through the Presidents if called upon. If perceived as necessary, the evidence will be shared with the house