PLISMUN19

18th–20th January 2019

Economic and Social Council

Study Guide

Vojtěch Vít Greger

Josef Štěřovský

Letter from the Presidency of ECOSOC

Honourable representatives,

We are honoured to welcome you to the Economic and Social Council of the Park Lane International School Model United Nations 2019. We are grateful that you have decided to apply to the Economic and Social Council and experience with us the surely amazing debates we are going to have.

As one great MUN Chair once said, "the art of diplomacy isn't easy, and even though the Model United Nations conference you are about to attend is merely a simulation of what a real diplomat's work looks like, by no means does it imply that your task is to be treated with lesser respect or preparation". Indeed, by becoming part of this conference and this committee, you have committed yourselves to three days of hard work, whose results may either help make the world a better place, or doom it forever. Whichever path our committee takes, we are sure that all of us are going to enjoy it tremendously.

As your chairs, we are going to do everything in our power to make your MUN experience as enjoyable as possible, by providing answers to all of your questions, giving you our guidance, and keeping the debates in our committee as smooth as possible. In return, we ask you only to be your very best, to present your arguments thoughtfully, to stand tall and proud, and speak your mind clearly for everyone to hear. Whether you will find friends or enemies in the other delegates, we are sure that if you follow these simple rules, your presence will be a great contribution to our committee and to the conference as a whole.

We hope that the study guide we have prepared for you will be useful in directing you to the various aspects of our topic and helping you formulate your policy on this complex issue, and we look forward to meeting each and every one of you at PLISMUN 2019!

With love,

Vojtěch Vít Greger,

President of the Economic and Social Council

Josef Štěřovský,

Vice-President of the Economic and Social Council

Introduction to the committee

The Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) was established in 1945 as one of the six main organs of the United Nations. Currently, ECOSOC is mainly tasked with promoting the idea of "sustainable development" through advancing its key components in the social, economic, and environmental dimensions. **It primarily deals with issues such as helping economic development, providing humanitarian aid, or environmental conservation as restoration,** for example the restoration to regenerate the Lake Chad Basin region. **For the duration of PLISMUN 2019, ECOSOC will set its sights on the issues of the social sphere and seek to create a lasting solution to religious strife in the world, as well as promote religious tolerance.**

Similarly to the Security Council, ECOSOC has the power to create new UN organisations and subcommittees to help coordinate its work and carry out the steps laid out in its resolutions. In tackling the issue of promoting secularism and religious tolerance, this power of ECOSOC will surely be of great use to the members of the Council.

The Presidency of the Economic and Social Council has taken great care to choose the most relevant delegations from all corners of the world and representing many different sides of the debate for participation in its upcoming session, and we trust that each of the present countries will contribute to the final solution according to its best ability.

The following countries will be present for the Economic and Social Council's session at PLISMUN 2019: *People's Republic of Bangladesh, Republic of Chad, People's Republic of China, French Republic, Federal Republic of Germany, Republic of Indonesia, Republic of India, Islamic Republic of Iran, Republic of Ireland, State of Israel, Republic of the Union of Myanmar, Islamic Republic of Pakistan, Republic of Poland, Russian Federation, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Republic of Serbia, Kingdom of Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain, United States of America.*

As delegates of the Economic and Social Council, it is expected of you to submit position papers, which serve as brief summaries of your assigned country's view on the topic in question and of possible solutions that your country would like to see implemented. Position papers are usually up to two pages long, although if you are willing to go past the limit and show us that you are truly dedicated to researching the topic and your country's position on it, we strongly encourage you to write something even longer. **We expect position papers to be submitted by the 6th of January,** whereafter we will read each of them and send you any feedback or additional questions we may have. **Be aware that failure to submit a position paper on time will result in an MUN "punishment",** which may range from dancing to One Direction to re-enacting scenes from literary and cinematic masterpieces such as Twilight or Fifty Shades of Grey.

Committee dynamics

Although our committee will function in accordance with the PLISMUN 2019 Rules of Procedure, we will be pursuing a different debating style, inspired by the Model United Nations conference of Harvard University. This type of debate may already be familiar

to some of you, but for those who have not encountered it yet, a concise explanation of the pillars of this system will be described to ensure that everyone understands what the committee's sessions will entail before we start.

After introductions, our committee will begin with a reading of short **opening statements**, wherein each delegate will shortly summarise the policy of their country and their aims with regard to the topic, after which other delegates will be able to ask questions regarding their speeches. **Opening statements** should be quick summaries of the delegate's position paper (the delegate should **NOT** simply read their position paper to the committee) and be around 2–3 minutes long.

When we have finished, we will move into a **general speakers' list**, where any delegate will be able to make a speech about the topic or about the contents of other delegates' speeches. When points of contention are found, we will move into **moderated caucuses**, which will always have a more specific topic. In the **moderated caucuses**, delegates will quickly summarise their views and propose solutions to the given issue.

When basic consensus is reached or enough delegates agree on a certain point, we will move into an **unmoderated caucus** (also called a **lobbying session**). In this module, delegates will seek to put their country's policies and the ideas expressed earlier into writing. Usually, a **lobbying session** will produce a **working paper**, a rough draft containing a few clauses which can then be debated on by the committee. Unlike **resolutions**, **working papers** are more flexible and can be changed without **amendments**, which allows for greater and more streamlined debate.

Once the committee has produced a **working paper** that is both suitable in format and supported by a sufficient amount of the delegates, a **draft resolution** will be introduced. Delegates who have reservations to its contents will be able to submit **amendments** changing the content of the resolution, which the committee will then vote on. Once all **amendments** have been debated and voted upon, the committee will discuss the **draft resolution** as a whole and vote on it. If it passes, the committee will have passed a **resolution** and achieved its purpose.

If you have further questions about any part of the procedure, you may either follow a link to the Harvard MUN delegate guide, which offers more in-depth explanations of how caucuses, working papers, and resolutions work in this format of debate, or you may contact us directly with your questions. We are however very confident that you will catch onto this form of debate easily even if you haven't encountered, and that it will pose no problem to you in our committee's sessions. In any case, the link to the Harvard delegate preparation guide is here:

http://www.harvardmun.org/assets/pdfs/HMUN-2017-Guide-to-Delegate-Preparation.pdf

Promoting secularisation of governments in developing countries and revising the measures for the integration of religious minorities

Secularisation

The development of the principle of secularisation

> *[19] Shew me the coin of the tribute. And they offered him a penny. [20] And Jesus saith to them: Whose image and inscription is this? [21] They say to him: Caesar's. Then he saith to them: Render therefore to Caesar the things that are Caesar's; and to God, the things that are God's.*
>
> *— Matthew 22:19–21, New Testament, Douay–Rheims Catholic Bible*

The quotation above is now almost 2,000 years old, yet even today, it remains a point of contention. The advocates of secular thought claim that by extension, Jesus directly calls for non-intervention in the matters of state by religious authorities and that Christians should not oppose the current state of affairs, where most states do not base their laws and policy on religious moral principles.

The principle of secularisation, in the context of European history, arose as a direct result of the organisation of society in the early Middle Ages. Around the 11th century, bishops, heads of religious dioceses all over Europe, held not only power in the context of the Church, but owned actual land in the same way that noblemen did, something that the nobility, the chief rivals of the Church in the battle for influence, greatly resented. In these times, secularisation referred to the seizure of church property and its subsequent acquisition by the nobility. Although this concept was then widely different from how we know it today, the desire of nobles to prevent the Church from wielding stately power laid the groundwork for the development of this principle into its current form.

Even in the times of the greatest struggle between the Church and the nobility, the primary source of power of the Church—its influence over the people—was never directly targeted. Over the course of time, however, with the development of new worldviews and the overcoming of new frontiers, religion's role in society began to wane and a new set of ideas entered the scene—the ideas of the Enlightenment. The centrepiece of this movement was the belief that spiritual matters should not interfere with matters of state, and that a state, in order to best serve its citizens, ought to allow all religions and tolerate their practice, while detaching itself from the promotion of any given one.

The new thinkers of this era no longer saw the influence of the Church on society as an incontestable fact. In the Enlightenment model of society, the interests of the individuals should not be curtailed by anything, especially not an institution such as the Church. When the ideology of Enlightenment finally came to power with the advent of the French Revolution, the power of the clergy in France suffered greatly. The leaders of the revolution recognised that the new model of the State was directly competing with the Church for influence over the people and chose to fight this war rather aggressively with the seizure of Church property and other nefarious means. When the French Revolution ended, amends were made to the clergy,

but in the eyes of those who still supported the revolution's principles, the primacy of the Church in society had been permanently damaged. In this era, however, the greatest promoter of secularism was not revolutionary France, in fact, it was no country on the European continent. At the end of the 18th century and long into the 19th, the most fervent promoter of secularism and the separation of Church and State was the United States. Which had arguably contributed to its cause greatly at the time. It is only recently, namely in the second half of the 20th century, that the U.S. lost the position as the spearhead of the secular movement to the states of Western Europe.

The process through which Western Europe superseded the United States at the forefront of the fight for secularism began after the First World War and accelerated after the second. A new wave of calls for secularisation came in the 20th century, mainly as a result of the rise of the totalitarian regimes in Germany and Russia. These regimes' ideologies either saw religion as a tool of the State to be controlled by the State, or as an undesirable aspect of society in need of wiping out. In the freer West, the influence of religion was shaken by the destruction of the two World Wars and the great evils attached to them. In addition to this, new pressure groups, such as feminists, who demanded that the state allow institutions such as abortions, thus putting themselves at odds with the Church, appeared and began working to destroy the remnants of the Church's influence on laws and the State as a whole. Eventually, due to the pressure of these groups, the Church lost its battle to keep its moral teachings enshrined in the law and the modern concept of the separation of Church and State gained its contemporary form.

Today, the idea of secularism is spreading out of Europe to other countries, its implementation spearheaded by the United Nations, human rights groups, and other non-governmental organisations. But even if secularisation is becoming a non-European issue, to understand it and to implement it properly, we need to first understand the European model of secularism, which arguably provides the best balance between the freedom of expression and secular values.

The European model

In most European states, the most radical part of the secularisation process occurred in the last century. In the states of the Eastern Bloc, it was a forceful transformation driven by adherence to the strictly materialist Marxist–Leninist doctrine, which condemned religion as the "opiate of the masses", a false pretence used to supplant adherence to the Church, which the communists could not control and often were at odds at with, with adherence to the State, a tool fully owned and operated by the communists. In this model, the plan was of course not only to drive religion away out of the government, but to drive it out of society altogether. Clergy was persecuted, tortured, and jailed, while other members of religious groups were persecuted against at work and often intimidated in different ways. The communist model of a secular society died with the fall of the Iron Curtain and even communist states that had never been part of the Eastern Bloc in the first place began softening their policies towards religion. Today in communist China, the Catholic Church is allowed to exist and operate, albeit under strict supervision of the government, and even North Korea has recently announced that it will open its doors to Christian missionaries in some capacity.

If secularisation in Eastern Europe was a forceful, top-down process, it turned out to be the very opposite in Western Europe, where the ousting of religion from its role in society was a more democratic, bottom-up transition. The politicians who began to cut the cords that tied the State with the Church were elected—and encouraged—by a sizeable part of the public. The results of this gradual separation seem, from our point of view, to have been more effective. While the states of the Eastern Bloc have now returned to the model of co-operation between the State and the Church, most notably in Poland and Russia, the state apparatus of the West seems to be keeping a fair distance from religious influences and continues to drift further away with each passing year. In the east, abortions and homosexual marriage are firmly fought against. In the west, both institutions are fairly prevalent and serve as testaments to the secular nature of each state.

The (Western) European model is rooted in the ideas of the Enlightenment. The State recognises religious organisations and grants them the right to exist and operate, often even exempting them from paying tax, but mandates that, in return, they must desist from engagement in political matters. Under this arrangement, everyone is free to practise any religion they desire, and proselytise on its behalf, but the actual religious organisations are denied a seat at the table when it comes to matters of state. While various parties claiming an affiliation to a certain religious movement, such as Angela Merkel's Christian Democratic Party in Germany, do exist in the West, they do not typically go great lengths to promote more involvement of religious groups in politics, or even to fully stand against policies in contradiction with their religious beliefs (for example, Merkel made a decision to allow a vote on homosexual marriage in Germany in June 2017).

The model as described is a firmly European construct, owing its existence not only to the social and civilisational development of European society since the Dark Ages, but to more recent events such as both world wars, and, primarily, to the voluntary resignation of the Catholic Church on actively promoting its ideals in the political arena. These very specific conditions allow Europe to maintain this fundamentally unprecedented system. Since the remainder of the world has developed differently, attempts to implement the European system outside of Europe have often been met with failure. Finding a way to persuade countries where religion plays a major role in day-to-day life to adopt secularism constitutes a true challenge for the world in the 21st century.

Besides the aforementioned challenges in persuading non-Europeans to adopt secularism, the European model is facing an internal crisis as well, as people are beginning to question whether the benefits of secularism truly are worth it. The anti-secular policies of countries such as Poland, Hungary, and Italy are suggesting that the secular, democratic ideals of Europe may be endangered from within.

Religion and the developing world

As has been said, while the first-world European nations have mastered the separation of Church and State, the situation remains different outside of (Western) Europe. Even in the United States, religious groups exert a tremendous amount of influence on the government. The situation in the developing world, then, is even more different. While the states of the Middle East are most commonly used as examples of societies wherein religious influences are

deeply entrenched, sectarian[1] states exist outside of the Middle East and even outside of the Muslim world.

India

The most notable example of a non-Muslim sectarian state is India, where the main religion is Hinduism. The influence of Hinduism on Indian society continues to drive a stake into the country's relations with Pakistan, a sectarian Muslim state formerly part of India. According to Hindu principles, Indian society is also strictly stratified into several different castes. Caste status is determined at birth, often consigning a person to a specific type of job for their entire life. In terms of social mobility, advancement is impossible, one can only ever become a member of a lower caste through marrying a member thereof. Outside of the system stand the so-called untouchables, who perform menial tasks and from a Hindu point of view, have no rights. Pogroms and attacks on untouchables are still a problem in India today, although reformers in the Indian government are taking steps to extend the state's protection to these people.

The persecution of people on the basis of their caste status has drawn much criticism from human rights agencies and the international community in India. The country is currently facing calls for reform, but due to how deeply entrenched in the system and the minds of the people Hinduism is, any move away from tradition requires great amounts of effort and time.

Israel

Besides India, there are many other sectarian states in the world, such as the State of Israel. Although geographically part of the Middle East, Israel has little in common with any of its neighbours. It is the only state with no direct ties to Islam in the region, and due to this, as well as due to the questionable process of its creation, it is in constant conflict with all of its neighbours.

Israel's sectarianism is most notable in its strict regulations of marriages. Firstly, marriages are only possible between men and women. Secondly, religious intermarriage, e.g. a Christian marrying a Jew, is not allowed. The Israeli government justifies this policy by claiming that a relaxation of these restrictions would place the nature of Israel as a Jewish state into jeopardy. Along with accusations of non-Jewish citizens essentially being treated as second-class citizens, Israel's sectarian policies have been the target of much criticism.

Muslim states

In the Muslim world, the examples of sectarianism are most blatant. Although some states have instituted democratic political systems, there is no clear separation of Church and State present even in the most democratic countries. Imams continue to exercise great influence in political debates. As they are not restricted from involving politics in their rhetoric—any attempt to institute such a ban would after all be quickly condemned and buried due to their influence—it is much easier for the imams to effectively voice their opposition to any potential

[1] a term typically used to describe, in the relevant context, a state where one religion's ideals are enshrined in law and either openly promoted or forcefully imposed by the government.

attempts of the government to secularise than in Europe, where the silence of Christian priests is bought with the tax-exempt status of their parishes.

The reasons for why Islam remains so influential in the Muslim countries are manifold. One of the most often cited reasons is the reliance of the populace on religious schools, which are more often than not financed by the government of Saudi Arabia. It is no secret that these schools tend to place a great emphasis on adherence to Islam, instilling this belief into their pupils. Besides that, these schools have often been accused of propagating Wahhabism, an especially radical denomination of Islam predominant in Saudi Arabia, whose adherents include prominent members of Al-Qaīda and other terrorist groups.

Another, less-commonly accepted explanation for the continued domination of Muslim states' politics by Islam is the claim that Muslim societies are less advanced than European society, and therefore they have simply not had the time to develop to the point where secularism is a viable option. This explanation, commonly used by European opponents of Islam and Islamic immigration, may seem rather shallow, however it should be taken into account that Muslim countries, whether those formerly belonging to the Ottoman Empire or others around the world, have not often gone through the immense philosophical, social, and political developments that Europe has experienced since the Dark Ages, and therefore, this explanation should not be condemned too easily.

The third explanation is also very interesting, although it only goes to explain the phenomenon as far as the Middle East is concerned. It claims that the close-knit relationship between Middle Eastern societies and Islam is a natural reaction of the people who have felt threatened or oppressed by the Western powers since the fall of the Ottoman Empire, when nations such as Britain and France first began exerting influence in the world. Although the place of those two states had since been taken by the United States and Israel, this explanation does remain rather credible.

Whichever explanation we choose to believe, the fact that the level of Islamic countries' sectarianism is unmatched in the world is undeniable. From the fact that Saudi Arabia had only given women the right to drive quite recently to the fact that phenomenon of honour killings, wherein a family member kills their (typically female) relative in order to punish them for acting dishonourably (usually in a way considered promiscuous) and regain their family's honour, while acknowledged by the Pakistani government, has until recently gone without being specifically combatted, there are many reasons why the relationship of religion and state in Islamic society should be questioned and potentially revised.

Integration of religious minorities

In terms of religious minorities, the primary differentiation in the modern era should be focused on the length of the minorities' presence on the territory of the given nation's territory. Minorities that have been present for hundreds, if not thousands of years, such as Catholics in Northern Ireland, Christians in Syria, Lebanon, and Israel, or Muslims in the Balkans, are facing different sorts of issues than the minorities that have only recently arrived to the given nation, most notably, of course, Muslim immigrants in the West. Both groups face different kinds of problems and should therefore receive separate attention.

Traditional minorities

Traditional religious minorities exist all over the world. Typically present in a state as a result of ancient conquest of one religious group by another or as remnants of a religion most of the populace had since abandoned, these can sometimes exist as a virtually separate nation. Having retained their faith, they can happen to speak a different language than the majority, have different customs, and generally remain segregated from the majority. This is the case of the Rohingya Muslims in Myanmar.

In other cases, for example with Catholics in Northern Ireland, the difference between the majority and the remainder of populace is strictly religious. While the groups are virtually indistinguishable, even this arrangement can, under certain conditions, erupt into conflict.

Traditional minorities can often face the problem of segregation. By retaining their own culture, language, and other hallmarks of their society, they are often too different from the majority group for cohabitation, generally do not interact with the majority, and as a result may face prejudice or persecution. Similarly, they may be used as scapegoats for nationalist leaders who, once in power, may curtail the rights of the minority to appease the majority electorate.

The problem with traditional minorities is that, unlike modern minorities, they have nowhere to go if they begin to face serious persecution in their home country, and, even if they do, the relocation of vast numbers of people whose families have lived in the same place for generations may not be simply difficult, but outright impossible. In some extreme cases, the only realistic solution may be a complete separation of the territory inhabited by a minority from its parent state, which, if the conflicts in the Balkans have been any indication, may end up doing more harm than good.

Although it is not a preferable outcome, in some cases of traditional minorities facing a hostile government of the majority, there is little to nothing that the United Nations can do. One such case are the Uyghurs, a Muslim minority in mainland China, who face relentless persecution from the government, which refuses to heed calls for a change of its policy towards them. Nevertheless, there are many solutions for the plight of traditional religious minorities, such as mediation, which the United Nations can realistically facilitate.

Modern minorities

With the streamlining of the movement of people over the world in the last century and due to immigration policies aimed at replacing lost manpower in Europe from the 1950's

onward, the world, particularly Western countries, are now faced with the issue of integrating newly arrived minorities into their societies. It is already quite difficult to integrate ethnic minorities of a similar culture, however, in the case of states such as Britain, France, or Spain, the only thing these groups have in common with their host countries is a colonial past.

For the immigrants, their arrival into a new country is usually accompanied by some form of cultural shock, which results in a desire to find something familiar, often leading to new immigrants flocking to their former faith and, together with others, forming segregated immigrant communities (this phenomenon is well-documented in cities such as Birmingham, Sheffield, or on the outskirts of Paris, where large numbers of Muslim immigrants live in what essentially amounts to ghettos). The immigrants are usually hired to work in low-paying jobs (if they find work at all), which often leaves them struggling with money and once again turning to their communities for help.

The endless cycle of desperation often experienced by these modern minorities leads to an erosion of their trust of their host government and rapid disillusionment, a dangerous process for the internal security of the given country. Disillusionment often leads the poverty-stricken immigrants to obtain wealth through illicit means, whether by joining criminal gangs, acting as dealers in drug-distributing operations, or through theft, burglary, and robbery. While this is not an issue faced solely by new immigrants and is often attributed simply to the conditions in which the given people live, recent crime statistics clearly show that new immigrants are vastly overrepresented in violent crime, signifying that the issue cannot be explained as simply as some would like to.

The goal for ECOSOC

With regards to the problem of secularisation, ECOSOC is not facing an easy task. Pro-secularisation delegates will need to find a way to persuade the delegates of the more sectarian countries to get on board with a plan for secularisation, while still maintaining a constructive plan. The sectarian countries will have to find a way to justify the downsides of their policies, whether it be their implications for gender equality or general human rights. The committee should seek to reach a compromise where sectarian countries agree to uphold basic religious freedom and basic human rights, while of course maintaining their sovereignty. A constructive plan calling for short-term improvement of conditions in countries such as Pakistan, Myanmar, or Sudan should be contained in the resolution, along with a long-term plan for gradual secularisation of currently sectarian states.

In terms of the issue of minorities, the committee should take into account the different circumstances of religious minorities and acknowledge that each group faces fundamentally different issues; the basic differentiation between modern and traditional minorities should be upheld.

In the case of traditional minorities, the states should find a way to help encourage desegregation and break down the barriers between the minorities and the other citizens. Of course, as has been said, giving effective help to traditional minorities facing genuine oppression in their home countries is rather difficult. Nevertheless, ECOSOC should do everything in its power to help groups such as the Rohingya, the Uyghurs, and the Levantine and Coptic Christians. The unique status and problems of each group should be taken into account and measures for mediation or, in worse cases, resettlement, should be mentioned in the resolution.

With modern minorities, ECOSOC should use its powers as an economic body to create a scheme for the provision of material assistance to newly arrived immigrants and once again try to create a common framework for the swift integration of such new arrivals into their respective host countries.

If all of the following goals are included in ECOSOC's resolutions during its session at PLISMUN 2019, then the issue at hand may well be considered solved.

Guiding questions

If you are unsure how to proceed, the questions below may be helpful to finding out what your country's policy is. Most answers to the questions can be found using easily accessible sources, such as Wikipedia. Hopefully, by answering these questions, you will be able to understand your country's policy better. If you are still unsure how to proceed afterwards, do not hesitate to contact us, we will be happy to help you!

a) Does my country have an official religion?

b) What role does religion play in my country's society?

c) Is my country's government openly promoting religious values?

d) Are the laws of my country based on religious principles?

e) Are men and women treated equally in my country? If not, are they treated differently because of religious traditions?

f) Are things such as abortion or homosexual marriage legalised by my country? What is the government's stance on these issues?

g) Are people of different religions treated equally in my country?

h) Is my country involved in any religious conflicts with other countries?

i) Is my country interested in becoming more secular?

j) What steps can my country take to become more secular?

k) Are there any religious minorities in my country? Have they been in my country for a long time or have they only arrived recently?

l) How does my country treat religious minorities?

m) Does my country discriminate against its religious minorities?

n) Are there any religious conflicts going on in my country?

o) What can my country do to treat its religious minorities better?

Further reading

If you are seeking to (as you should) learn more about the topic and your assigned country's stance on it, we have prepared a few links to potentially useful sources below.

We would also like to provide some further advice on research:

Firstly, as you are surely already aware, any information you find, unless it comes directly from sources of your assigned country's government, should always be double-checked. During the course of this study guide, we had almost included what seemed to be a curiosity about the status of Saudi women in their country, which, however, ultimately could not be verified anywhere beside through the original source, and later proved to be satirical. This topic in particular is often the target of not only deliberate misinformation, but simple comedy, which, today, can be made to look very real.

Secondly, doing your research does not need to end up in you being an expert on your country's stance. It is often enough for you to read and analyse a sufficient number of articles or reports to get a general idea of what your country wants and where it stands. Provided that your conclusion is in accordance with the facts you have, it should see you through the conference safely.

Finally, if you wish to truly understand how your country would act in this hypothetical scenario, it is advisable to not only read up on the given topic, but to look over how the country's representatives have been acting generally in terms of solving similar issues and interacting with other countries. At the same time, don't base your entire presentation on the behaviour of one person (this is a formal warning that poor attempts to imitate Donald Trump will not be looked upon favourably by the Presidency), but remember instead to be yourself, and your best self at that: be polite, open-minded, and helpful to all who would extend the same courtesies to you.

Recommended links for further reading on the topic

UN links:

https://www.ohchr.org/en/hrbodies/hrc/pages/home.aspx

https://www.ohchr.org/en/issues/freedomreligion/pages/freedomreligionindex.aspx

https://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/HRC/Minority/Pages/ForumIndex.aspx

https://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/FreedomReligion/Pages/FaithForRights.aspx

https://www.un.org/ecosoc/en/about-cmm

Non-UN links:

https://www.usnews.com/news/world/articles/2017-10-25/most-of-world-lacks-real-religious-freedom-un-official-says

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Secularism

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Honor_killing

https://news.nationalgeographic.com/2016/04/160422-atheism-agnostic-secular-nones-rising-religion/

https://tricycle.org/magazine/monks-met-muslims/

https://immigrationlab.org/project/the-struggle-to-integrate-muslims-in-europe/

https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/rohingya-crisis

http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/policy-analysis/view/the-demise-of-christianity-in-the-levant

https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/jan/10/christians-egypt-unprecedented-persecution-report