



The Fall of Rome

**Agenda: “Succession and Governance in the Aftermath of Julius Caesar’s
Assassination”**

Caesar is dead, Rome must choose its future.

Index

1. Letter from the Director
2. Letter from the Assistant Director
3. Background To The Assassination
4. Timeline
5. The Power Vacuum
6. Debate Focus
7. Delegate Matrix
8. Recommended Reading
9. Questions A Resolution Must Answer
10. Glossary

Letter from the Director

Dear Delegates,

Welcome! My name is Ishaan Kejriwal, and it is my pleasure to introduce you to BDMUN! I have the privilege of chairing an exciting and fascinating committee - The Fall of Rome. This is a committee that I am truly passionate about, and I hope that you all begin to share my enthusiasm as our time together begins.

My goal is to stimulate interesting debate, compelling questions, and unforgettable gestures that will undoubtedly make our committee one to remember. Apart from MUN, my passions lie in photography, football and music. Trying to balance guitar lessons with photo expeditions, I always seem to make time for MUN - solely because of how much I learn and develop as debater with every new conference. As your director, I expect you all to be well-informed on the agenda of this committee, as well on our country's stance. Also, remember that the most crucial element of your preparation for this conference is research! As you must have been told on multiple occasions, no amount of research is ever enough.

Additionally, I urge you to carefully examine this study guide. Especially for a historical committee, it contains essential information that will help you understand the topic comprehensively, and give you an idea of what should be discussed in committee. I hope to witness courageous actions, bold statements, and most importantly - creative and innovative

solutions. Remember delegates, it is collaboration that allows us to combine diverse perspectives and create effective solutions.

For me, MUN goes above and beyond debate and diplomacy. Not only is it a unique opportunity to put yourself in the shoes of another nation and formulate your distinctive thoughts and ideas, but it fosters critical thinking, leadership skills, and collaboration that I often find absent in common educational places like our classrooms. The one thing I can assure you, is that you will leave this committee as a more knowledgeable, experienced, and confident person - regardless of your country or its stance. I cannot wait to see the best debater within all of you come to life during our committee sessions, but for now I would like to leave you with a quote that accurately exemplifies my definition of a leader- *“Remember that true leadership lies in our ability to turn dialogue into action and vision into reality.”*

Ishaan Kejriwal

Director of FoR

ishaan.1213067@bdsint-students.org

Letter from the Assistant Director

Dear Delegates,

I am thrilled to welcome you all to the Fall of Rome committee! I would like to begin with a quote by Daniele Vare: *“Diplomacy is the art of letting someone else have your way.”*

As your Assistant Director, I promise to make this MUN experience both productive and memorable for all you delegates. Previously, I had always imagined MUN to be all about making speeches and arguing in suits, but little did I know, my first experience would sweep me up in intense alliances, frantic questioning, and thinking quickly on my feet. I hope to make this experience as enjoyable for you as my first and following experiences were for me.

Since debating has almost always come naturally to me, MUN quickly turned into a passion of mine and I've loved it ever since. I have always enjoyed the entire process - from the research and the rivalries to the crises and the unexpected plot twists. Beyond MUN, I'm interested in psychology and the way the brain works. I'm also a sports enthusiast with a keen love for tennis, football, and running. I like to look at MUN as the ultimate mental sport, something that challenges my mind similarly to how sports do - from anticipating your opponents' moves and adapting quickly to working together with those on your team or your side.

My expectations for the committee are high but quite simple: show up prepared, bring your creativity, collaborate with your delegates, and participate in discussions. For all you delegates, I hope you take this as an opportunity to discover your diplomatic potential and bring about fruitful debate. Lastly, remember that while MUN can be extremely intense, it's also an experience to enjoy. Don't be afraid to add some humour and connect with your friends or make new ones, but please also maintain propriety at all points of time.

I hope to make this committee a place for powerful discussions, unique revelations, and shared laughs. May the best delegate win, but may the boldest ideas and most unexpected alliances make it a truly memorable conference to remember!

Ananya Dalal

Assistant Director of FoR

ananya.1213059@bdsint-students.org

Background to the Assassination

1. Brief Background

On the Ides (around the middle) of March, 44 BCE, Gaius Julius Caesar, the Dictator of Rome, was assassinated by a group of senators led by Marcus Junius Brutus and Gaius Cassius Longinus. The conspirators justified their act as a defense of the Republic, fearing Caesar's growing power and his appointment as *dictator perpetuo* (dictator for life). However, instead of restoring the Republic, the assassination plunged Rome into chaos. Power vacuums emerged, alliances fractured, and Rome found itself torn between two ideals: republican liberty and

military dominance. The city now stands at a crossroads - between the ambitions of men ranging from Mark Antony and Octavian to the remnants of the Senate - as the fate of Rome itself hangs in the balance.

2. Detailed Background

a. **The Rise of Julius Caesar**

By the mid-first century BCE, the Roman Republic was already weakening under the weight of corruption, civil wars, and growing inequality. Amid this turmoil rose Julius Caesar, a brilliant general and politician whose military campaigns in Gaul brought immense wealth and fame. His alliance with Pompey the Great and Marcus Licinius Crassus in the First Triumvirate (60 BCE) helped him secure political dominance, but the death of Crassus and the rivalry with Pompey shattered the alliance. Caesar's subsequent crossing of the Rubicon River in 49 BCE was a declaration of civil war against Pompey and the Senate, marking the beginning of Rome's descent from republic to *autocracy* (a system where one person has complete power).

b. **Civil War and Dictatorship**

After defeating Pompey's forces and pursuing him to Egypt (where Pompey was then murdered), Caesar returned to Rome as the unrivaled ruler. He introduced sweeping reforms: reorganizing provincial governance, granting citizenship to loyal foreigners, and expanding the Senate to 900 members (many of whom were his supporters).

However, these changes, coupled with his unprecedented accumulation of power, alarmed traditionalists. His acceptance of the title *dictator perpetuo* (dictator for life) in February 44 BCE was the final blow to the illusion of a functioning republic. Although he was already given the title of dictator in 46 BCE as an emergency measure for 10 years, this “emergency measure” was eventually extended for the duration of his lifetime. Therefore, to many senators, Caesar appeared poised to go on to crown himself king. The title “king” was one that Romans abhorred since the expulsion of their last monarch, Tarquin the Proud.

c. The Conspiracy against Caesar

A faction of around 60 senators (including Caesar’s close allies and protégés) conspired to end his rule behind his back. Marcus Junius Brutus, revered for his lineage tracing back to the founder of the Republic, and Gaius Cassius Longinus, a seasoned general, became the major ringleaders. Their justification rested on the claim of restoring liberty and the authority of the Senate. The plot was carried out on March 15, 44 BCE, during a Senate meeting at the Theatre of Pompey. Caesar was stabbed 23 times by the conspirators. Later accounts depict his last words to be “Et tu, Brute?” (You too, Brute?).

3. Role of the Committee

This pivotal moment (with power divided and Rome standing fractured, uncertain, and dangerously malleable), is where the committee will formally commence. The fate of the

Republic now rests on fragile alliances, volatile loyalties, and the choices that each faction will make in the days to come. The marble halls of the Republic echo with whispers of ambition and fear, and the delegates of this committee (Fall of Rome) must decide whether they will restore the Republic's dying ideals, or usher in a new era of empire. History now stands at the brink of transformation, and every decision will shape the destiny of Rome.

Timeline

1. The Roman Kingdom

The Roman Kingdom, and later Republic, began in 509 BCE when the last king, Tarquinius Superbus, was overthrown after the outrage caused by the rape of Lucretia. This moment established the Roman Republic, a system designed to prevent one man from holding too much power by balancing authority between elected magistrates (like consuls), the Senate (dominated by patricians), and popular assemblies.

Over the next few centuries, Rome expanded from a small city-state into a Mediterranean power, defeating its rival city-state Carthage in the Punic Wars, conquering Greece, and extending its influence into a region known as Asia Minor. However, Rome's growth created deep social and political strains: inequality between patricians and plebeians, reliance on slave labor, and the rise

of ambitious generals with private armies (such as Marius and Sulla) who undermined Republican traditions.

By the time of Julius Caesar's reign, the Republic was already largely weakened, and his dictatorship (and assassination in 44 BCE) marked a crucial point of transformation for Rome.

a. 509 BCE - Creation of the Roman Republic

The last king of Rome, Lucius Tarquinius Superbus, was overthrown after the rape of Lucretia, a noblewoman whose suicide incited outrage. The Republic was established with two elected consuls to serve one-year terms, introducing a system that limited any single individual's power. The Senate (central political institution in Rome) gained increased authority, although it remained dominated by the patrician (aristocratic) class. The transition marked the end of monarchical rule and the beginning of a republican government characterized by elected officials and a system of checks and balances.

b. 264 to 146 BCE - Expansion of the Republic

Rome focused on expanding its territory in this vast period of time. It engaged in the Punic Wars against Carthage, leading to the acquisition of territories across the Mediterranean. Carthage was a powerful North African trading empire and Rome's greatest rival in the Punic Wars. It stood as such a threat due to the shared economic rivalry, its military strength, and its prestige and dominance. Its geographic proximity to Rome only worsened tensions.

Carthage controlled major trade routes in the western Mediterranean, especially in Spain, Sicily, and North Africa, threatening Rome's growing influence. It also had the strongest navy in the Mediterranean and relied on wealthy resources and mercenaries, while Rome relied on its disciplined citizen legions. The locations of both empires (they surrounded Sicily), amplified problems since Sicily became a flashpoint to assert dominance and have as much control over trade as possible.

Overall, there were three Punic Wars in this time period (264 to 146 BCE) that eventually culminated in the total destruction of Carthage. Rome then went on to conquer Greece, Macedonia, and Asia Minor. In this time, the Latifundia system developed, where elite landowners used slave labor to run massive agricultural estates, further displacing small farmers. The Gracchi brothers (Tiberius and Gaius) were two politically significant men at the time and they tried to implement land reforms. Consequently, they were both killed, setting a precedent for political violence in Rome.

This Roman expansion brought immense wealth but also exacerbated social inequalities, as the influx of slaves and wealth concentrated power among the elite and marginalized the plebeians (commoners).

c. 107 to 86 BCE - Rise of Generals (Marius and Sulla)

This period of time in Rome was renowned for the rise of the generals Gaius Marius and Lucius Cornelius Sulla. Marius was a Roman general and consul who was elected seven times.

He was famous for his military reforms, especially that in which he allowed the *capite censi* (landless citizens) to enlist. This enabled the creation of professional armies that were loyal to their generals, rather than the Senate or the Republic itself. This broke the old citizen-soldier tradition.

Sulla, on the other hand, was a patrician general and politician who became dictator. He escalated the crisis of the power struggle between generals and the Senate by marching on Rome twice and initiating a civil war. This violated tradition but Sulla consequently ruled as a dictator nevertheless. He expanded the Senate's size but also showed that political power could be seized through military force.

The changing dynamics indicated through the rise of power of both these generals was a turning point. The Republic's balance of power was undermined, as generals realized they could control politics with armies. This set the stage for later leaders like Caesar to do the same.

d. 60 BCE - First Triumvirate

- *Julius Caesar*: rising politician and general, very popular amidst the Roman people.

- *Pompey Magnus*: was a celebrated general, known most famously for his military victories in the East and for his skill and bravery in clearing pirates from the Mediterranean.
- *Marcus Licinius Crassus*: wealthiest man in Rome, crushed a slave revolt called Spartacus.

Together, they formed an unofficial alliance to bypass Senate authority and push through their own motives and agendas. Caesar gained command in Gaul, Pompey secured land for veterans, and Crassus pursued wealth and influence. The Triumvirate revealed the Senate's weakness. Instead of guiding Rome, powerful individuals worked around it, consolidating power in private hands. This showed that the Republic's institutions were no longer strong enough to check ambitious men.

e. 49 to 45 BCE - Caesar's Civil War

After Crassus' death in 53 BCE, tensions began growing between Pompey (who was now aligned with the Senate) and Caesar. Around this time, Caesar's military successes made him extremely powerful and popular. When the Senate ordered Caesar to disband his army and return to Rome in early 49 BCE, he famously crossed the Rubicon (a small river in northern Italy separating Caesar's province with Italy proper, which was governed by the Republic). This sparked civil war since the law forbade a general to bring troops into Italy. Caesar defeated Pompey in battle and Pompey fled to Egypt, where he was assassinated, leaving Caesar as Rome's dominant leader.

This directly led to the collapse of the Republic and the rise of Caesar as the dominant leader. The civil war destroyed the illusion of the Senate's control. Victory depended not on laws or elections, but on which general commanded more soldiers. The Republic became unstable, with Caesar showing that individual power could outweigh the state itself.

f. 46 to 44 BCE - Caesar as Dictator

Julius Caesar was appointed dictator multiple times, culminating in being named dictator perpetuo (dictator for life) in 44 BCE. Caesar implemented sweeping reforms, including the expansion of the Senate to 900 members (stacking it with those loyal to him), land redistribution, calendar reform, housing and settling for veterans, and centralization of power. He induced judicial reforms, census and tax reforms, debt relief, and a more lenient system of granting citizenship.

All these reforms and strategies secured Caesar's reign. It ensured the support of his armies, making them personally loyal to him rather than to the Senate or the Republic. It also demonstrated Caesar's ability to impose order and centralize control, showing practical benefits of strong leadership. Moreover, it strengthened the idea of a unified Roman identity and helped expand Roman influence into new territories. Overall, Caesar's accumulation of power alarmed many senators, who feared the ultimate end of the Republic and the establishment of a complete monarchy.

g. March 15, 44 BCE - The Assassination of Julius Caesar

Caesar's growing power alarmed many, especially those in the Senate. On March 15, 44 BCE, a group of about 60 senators - including Marcus Junius Brutus (a senator with family ties to Caesar) and Gaius Cassius Longinus (a senator and former Pompeian commander) - stabbed him 23 times at the Theatre of Pompey during a Senate meeting which was held in that theatre.

Many in that room predicted what would come next, yet the fate of Rome hung in the balance. Whispers of power, loyalty, and revenge spread like wildfire, stirring uncertainty and fear, as everyone wondered who would rise, who would fall, and how this single act would reshape the destiny of Rome forever.

The Power Vacuum

The Republicans/Liberators:

The Republicans are the faction that sought to restore authority of the Senate and preserve Rome's traditional Republic system. Often termed the "Liberatores" after leading the scheme to assassinate Julius Caesar, the Republicans in this committee claim to defend the Republic from tyranny, and preserve liberty in doing so. Whether threatened by his support and power, or simply motivated by the idea of influence, the liberators' killing of Caesar, was defended by them as a step in the right direction to prevent disintegration of the Republic system. Senators felt that systems that had been in place for years had become threatened by Caesar, whether it

was the privileges of control that they enjoyed, or the absence of concentrated power that lies in a Republic, they were eager to prevent these benefits from disappearing. The establishment of a deeply-rooted aversion to monarchy had been reflected in the actions of these men, mirroring a central concept that had been in place centuries before Caesar's death, where the identity of Rome was represented by a republican value that Rome belongs to its citizens - not a ruler.

For this reason, the liberators defend their scheme as nothing more than moral, holding legitimacy in their actions to defend the Republic. Subsequent to Caesar's death, the Republicans enter the power vacuum with considerable advantages. Apart from moral legitimacy, positions in the Senate provided them with an unquestionably powerful platform to portray themselves as more than 'murderers', but come across to the population of Rome as high-ranking senators and statesmen. Appealing to republican tradition, the faction could contrast their ideas as guarding the true Roman ideal, to the Caesarians' over-reliance on one-man dominance. With Brutus and Cassius as powerful members of the Senate, Decimus commanding forces in the Cisalpine Gaul, Cicero's influence voice along with cumulative access to possible military and provincial support as well, Republicans part of the Senate, as represented by many in this committee, hold credibility beyond simple spokespeople of 'true Roman ideals', and more so a group of individuals that have acted in the favour of long-term stability in reviving a form of shared governance, backed heavily by historical and moral grounding to secure Rome's future.

However, at a point in time where Caesar has just been killed, public support for this faction is fragile, threatened by citizens who are still loyal to Caesar and his reforms. The Liberatores must be careful in balancing internal friction, where purist ideologies of some could clash with the

power seekers, who must find ways to strengthen internal cohesion. They must justify their acts to prevent being associated with ‘murders’, but more as representatives of the Republic, and most importantly translate the ideals they preach into tangible governance, to strengthen Republican reforms. A strategy that cleverly combines legitimacy, alliances, and even rhetoric, must be employed in order to demonstrate why a Republic would be preferred to one-man rule. Even though not too militarily powerful in Rome itself, a show of stability is imperative, where an ideological counterweight to Caesar's legacy must be brought forth, strengthening their position as the protectors of Rome.

The Caesarians:

The Caesarians were the closest allies and support of Julius Caesar, who were eager to protect his legacy, reforms, and ideas. After claiming loyalty to Caesar, they argued against the acts of the Libertores, framing their actions as a betrayal, and an act of treason committed by those who had provided him with the power in the first place. By holding Caesar's vision of Rome at utmost importance - characterised by a central power representing a more autocratic style of leadership - this faction aimed for stability by preserving his reforms, and preventing Rome from spiraling into chaos.

The Caesarians held power and legitimacy in Rome as well, with widespread military influence, especially under Mark Antony who was subject to enormous institutional authority, as well as Lepidus as Master of Horse, giving him command of multiple troops near Rome. Furthermore, senatorial ties through figures like Piso, helped gain additional influence within the government

system as well. Caesar's reforms were relatively popular among the common people of Rome, where his ideas regarding laws like land redistribution, debt relief, and even his charisma as a leader, were all factors in gaining support. This support looms after his assassination, where it could be used to help build a pro-Caesarian case - one that establishes the autocratic form of government that he wanted. Caesar's assassination itself, has sparked anger among many, where emotional leverage can be exploited in order to portray the conspirators as bloody murderers, responsible for ending Caesar's life with little justification.

However, with differing internal views regarding pragmatic strategies versus more ambitious ones, the Caesarian's lack unity. Furthermore, it cannot be denied that their strength lies in military and popular force, but the faction must be careful in opposing and undermining established Republican law. This could pose particularly consequential to the Caesarians, if they risk seeming like they want to replace a dictator rather than replace Caesar, allowing their true intentions to be questioned. Do they want to continue Caesar's legacy as a reformer, or a dictator? Keeping in mind that Caesar has just been killed, even though access to arms and influence does not seem to be wavering, political consolidation is still a question, where Caesar's succession has not been clearly outlined to be obtained by anyone. Due to this, asserting control over Republican reforms and fighting ideologies is imperative in securing Rome for the Caesarians. Questioning the morality of the actions of the liberators is a powerful way to rally support, while also ensuring a form of succession that must grow within the Caesarians themselves.

Although the Caesarians enter the power vacuum undoubtedly powerful with access to troops, money and influence, they must be careful in preventing their strength from becoming an inherent vulnerability - where a decision to pursue consolidation through force and intimidation that could backfire is most suitable, or creation of further legitimacy by creating alliances and fighting Republican ideals acts as a better option. They have the means to do so if careful, but the Caesarians must convince Rome that it should be ruled by Caesar's legacy in preference to liberty by the Republic.

Opportunists:

The opportunists are a group unlike the others, because neither are they defined by loyalty to Caesar, nor are they devoted to representing Republican ideals, but more so by ambition and adaptability. They are not bound by following a certain set of rules or perspectives, but rather see Caesar's death as a means to motivate and elevate their own power and influence.

Figures that bring military promise, like Marcus Agrippa, and Salvidienus Rufus, are young commanders eager to seek advancement, whereas Gaius Maecanus, positions himself as a wealthy patron holding resources and influence. However, the trait that defines this faction is not what already lies under their control, but what they can seize now that Rome is essentially left without a leader.

The primary strength of the opportunists lies in flexibility, and in their role as kingmakers, whether in reference to themselves or others. Caesarians lack legitimacy in ideology, and

Republicans are weaker militarily - but opportunists have the means to supply and possibly even command both - by forging powerful alliances, negotiation, and exercising influence. Money, resources, and wealth are as vital as swords at this time, and the opportunists hold the key , where Republicans may seek help in fear of the Caesarian's tyranny, and Caesarians may seek help in fear of the Senate. For the two other factions, alliances with wealthy patrons and influential leaders can act as indispensable tools in a bid for succession.

However, the strength of freedom quickly becomes a risk, where lack of unity or differing loyalties can create a divide of desired support within the faction, and failure to act decisively, in favour of each other or not, risks the opportunists being seen as self-serving, or worse - irrelevant. The opportunists embody Rome's greatest potential, as they hold the freedom to portray themselves as the future of Rome, a generation untainted by Caesar's ideals or Republican views - where they have the greatest power to tip the scales in committee in favor of anyone - including themselves, ensuring that succession in Rome is not possible without the Opportunists.

Debate Focus

Debate in this committee will revolve around a few key topics, all of which are imperative in determining the succession and governance of Rome, as Caesar's assassination brings uncertainty and confusion.

Most obviously, succession and leadership will take central focus. At the heart of the uncertainty present, lies the question of succession. Who will control Rome? Ideologies representative of the multiple factions must be considered, whether one strong figure should continue to rule Rome, or should the Senate control the state - a question that must be answered through critical consideration and evaluation of possibly opposing ideologies, catalyzed by the actions of the opportunists, tipping odds in any direction. A single ruler could be the perfect solution to Rome's problems, but can backfire and become largely consequential, where a reflection of Caesar's concentration of power could be seen as threatening to others. In contrast, collective rule brought about by republican ideals could be the perfect way to establish a universally accepted form of government, but risks looking weak and fragile in the face of instability. The Senate itself must be questioned, whether its declining influence after Caesar's rise can be overruled by the authority it can hold as Rome's governing body. Once the heart of Rome, delegates must question if the Senate still remains capable of serving as a foundation of stable governance, or whether Rome must change its model and idea of leadership altogether. These decisions are key to ensuring succession, as well as governance, and will determine Rome's future.

The question of Caesar's reforms remains to be equally beckoning, and must be considered when exploring the immediate aftermath of his death. His policies, including debt relief, extension of citizenship, land distribution, and colonisation for veterans, among many others, unquestionably shaped Roman society. However, the way in which they were viewed, and the manner in which they will continue to be accepted or not depends on the perspectives of delegates. Some may value these reforms as bringing prosperity and stability, while others may define them as a means of erasing senatorial privilege. Caesar's legacy will be decided by this committee's decision,

whether his reforms must be kept, modified, or rolled back completely - and how this could strengthen Caesar's influence, or bring to light a new and improved form of governing.

Another imperative factor, influential to the power vacuum, is the effective military control held by delegates. In any day and age, including this one, loyalty from the military and influence over power has remained an indisputable form of establishing authority. For decades, the loyalties of Roman armies lay with their generals, drawing influence away from the Senate, a system that resulted in Caesar's own rise to power. This poses the question to committee - should legions answer to the senate in order restore tradition but risk challenging reality, or with the generals, providing security but risking the empowerment of future monarchs. Control of the legions and their dependency, will be a key factor in deciding succession, and must be addressed comprehensively.

Additionally, after Julius Caesar's death, unrest and potential turmoil has been triggered across Rome. As riots, protests, and anger from Caesar's supporters can be expected, dealing with these issues will be a key factor to consolidate control. However the means by which this unrest is dealt with, is significant in the topic of succession, because public opinion and the weight it holds could be the deciding factor between the success and failure of a possible successor. Whether it is concessions to the people, reforms that act in their favour, or displays of military force - Rome's security and the success of Caesar's successors to governance - will be determined heavily by the way the people of Rome are dealt and accommodated with, in regard to their opinions and concerns.

Finally, the question of justice must be brought up in regard to the killing of Julius Caesar himself. Is it really justice, if the liberators feel they did not commit a crime, or is it unquestionably a crime, because the Caesarian's accuse them of betrayal and treason? Punishment could only be carried out if justified, and would risk division further, but forgiveness could be seen as weak, and provide other conspirators with the motivation to commit similar acts. Delegates must be careful in balancing stability with accountability, and whether the future of Rome is one defined by reconciliation, or retribution.

Addressing these key ideas are imperative in ensuring that debate remains relevant and covers the necessary issues that are present at the moment of Caesar's death. Leadership, legitimacy of the Senate, Caesar's reforms, military control, public order, and justice, are the primary problems that need to be given attention to, among many others that play a role in establishing the succession and governance of Rome in the aftermath of Julius Caesar's assassination, determining the future of The Eternal City altogether.

Delegate Matrix

The Republicans

1. Marcus Junius Brutus

In 44 BCE, Brutus was serving as praetor urbanus (one of the highest magistracies), and became the moral face of Caesar's assassination. Claiming to defend the Republic from tyranny, Brutus

argues that the act was necessary. Even though he had previously even been a supporter of Caesar's favour, after being convinced by the conspirators, as well as his own ideals Brutus became part of the assassination. Famously, when Julius Caesar was finally struck down, on the ides of March, his last words were - "Et tu, Brute?" (You too, Brutus), symbolising the betrayal that Caesar felt, but more importantly the significance of Brutus as the figure who transformed this deed into one of profound political meaning, forever tying him to the moral justification of the assassination. From his perspectives, the assassination was not murder, but imperative in the restoration of the Republic, justified by ideological legitimacy.

Representing republican ideals, Brutus strongly believes Rome must return to systems of senatorial authority rather than shifting towards monarchy, and his most significant strengths lie in institutional weight and honourable character. However, he must attempt to convert this pragmatic idealism into tangible reforms, using principle to make the Romans believe in his views and secure the future of Rome he believes is necessary.

2. Gaius Cassius Longinus

In 44 BCE, Cassius served as praetor peregrinus, holding his position as a powerful Roman general and senator. Holding true to staunch Republican beliefs, Cassius was the strategic mastermind involved in Caesar's death, as was resentful of his dominance, having fought against him in war previously as well. Embodying political cunning and sharp intellect, Cassius organised much of the plot involving the assassination and involved Brutus to create credibility.

Cassius is the Republican's strategist, where his realist and intelligent ideas are key in formulating the strategy they will use to gain influence and power in Rome., rather than relying

simply on rhetoric. Taking the responsibility to create alliances both within and beyond the Senate, Cassius will want to consolidate power quickly, making him a crucial and irreplaceable figure in Republican strategy.

3. **Decimus Junius Brutus Albinus**

Unlike other Republicans, Decimus was one of Caesar's trusted generals, yet betrayed him out of growing resentment and personal ambition, as a result of feeling unappreciated and fearful of Caesar's growing power. Brutus and Cassius' strength lay in ideological power and strategy, but Decimus offered a power military foothold to the Republicans, as he held influence and control over legions in the Cisalpine Gaul. His decision to join the conspirators was undoubtedly shocking, but regardless, giving them powerful military support. He provided the Republicans with something of utmost importance - practical leverage where troops allow the security of provincial backing. What Decimus may lack in moral legitimacy, he makes up for in military potential to call upon.

4. **Marcus Tullius Cicero**

Cicero, was a former consul, and now a senior and influential senator. He held the title of Rome's most renowned orator, philosopher, but most importantly - defender of the Republic. Warning the people of Rome against the dangers of one-man monarchical rule, Cicero opposed Caesar's rise, and his strength lies in his rhetoric, where the command he holds of immense prestige and ability to sway opinion through speeches and writings, are his most favourable traits. Cicero is the face of the Republican's intellect, even if direct power was lacking.

Acting as the ideological backbone to the Republicans, Cicero's role is to frame Caesar's death, or rather justify it, as a patriotic and noble act committed in the favour of defending liberty, influencing the Senate to accept Republican ideals. While dependent on others for practical strength, Cicero's ability to legitimize and articulate Republican ideologies to persuade Roman elites and its common people as well, remained unmatched.

5. Servilius Casca

In 44 BCE, Casca was serving as Tribune of the Plebs, where this position gave him the authority to formally represent the common people of Rome. Responsible for the first strike against Caesar in his assassination, Casca was willing to act boldly. His tribunate allowed the creation of a vital link between the Senate and urban masses, something the Republicans could use to channel ideologies or even exploit unrest within the Plebeians after Caesar's death.

Casca provides populist leverage to the Republicans, providing influence to questions of public order and loyalty from the people - a central focus of debate in this committee. Credibility from the Plebeians is an imperative part of any faction's potential success, and even though less polished than other leaders, Casca's tribunate makes him an indispensable figure in providing widespread support to the Republican effort.

6. Marcus Favonius

Marcus Favonius, was a senator and an outspoken follower of Cato the Younger - who was often regarded as the living embodiment of stoic republican values. Aiming to continue the legacy of his mentor, Favonius showcases uncompromising legacy, moral clarity in politics, and most importantly - resistance to tyranny. Although he was not directly involved in Caesar's

assassination, he agreed with the liberators; the concentration of power held by Caesar had undoubtedly weakened the integrity of the Republic's principles. However, Favonius did not hold active magistracy - only respect and unyielding devotion to civic duty and liberty - which could suffice if used to strategically reflect his ideas.

Favonius brings a moral and ideological strength and edge to the Republicans. He can challenge others and use conviction to his strength, where he can justify that the pursuit of power must remain principled, justified within the bounds of the Republic's interests. Condemning opportunistic alliances and strengthening his identity as a moral conscience, his fiery, persuasive, and uncompromising belief that Rome's future is dependent on the preservation of its Republican values, can make Favonius an important and vital influence within the power struggle.

The Caesarians

7. Mark Antony

Mark Antony, in 44 BCE, was serving as Consul, and held the title of Julius Caesar's right-hand man and closest ally, cementing his unwavering support and powerful Caesarian views. He not only commanded loyalty from other supporters of Caesar, but even troops stationed in and around Rome. At the time of Caesar's death, Antony held power through his authority as Consul, as well as a soldier's leader, making him a powerful Caesarian in the immediate power vacuum.

He is representative of the populist, as well as military backbone of Caesar's faction, Unquestionably arguing that the conspirators were nothing more than traitors, he believes Caesar's reforms must be preserved, and divided control among the Senate and Republicans would only weaken role, contrary to the strength and solidity it would enjoy if powerful and concentrated leadership was employed. While he has not made any famous oration to the Roman people yet, he must use his charisma and connections to position the Caesarian's as a dangerous rival to the Republicans, who will try to win over public support as well. Balancing his strengths - troops, popularity, and office - is key, because vulnerabilities that may come from ambition and force can push the Opportunists in the wrong directions, and become liabilities to his consolidation of influence and power.

8. Marcus Aemilius **Lepidus**

Lepidus, who serves as Master of Horse (Caesar's deputy who has the authority to command cavalry), was a trusted lieutenant of Caesar, and controls troops just on the border of Rome. Standing true to his reputation as a loyal Caesarian, Lepidus' strength after the assassination comes from his access to military resources. Important in intimidating rivals and securing support, Lepidus may be less charismatic, but his forces offer the Caesarians a crucial advantage. By carefully leveraging troops and maintaining security, as well as providing a powerful military presence, Lepidus can demonstrate his worth to the Caesarian effort.

9. Lucius Calpurnius **Piso** Caesoninus

Piso was Caesar's father-in-law , as well as a member of the Senate, and former consul as well. He did not command legions or have access to powerful military resources, but his role as an

elder statesman, as well as distinctive family connection to Caesar, provides him with significant political and moral weight within the Senate.

Displaying a voice of seniority and respect, along with a stable sense of continuity and legitimacy among the caesarians, Piso can argue that the protection of Caesar's reforms is necessary, by appealing to order and tradition. This allows a useful connection to be drawn between powerful members of the Senate that may need convincing, and the Caesarian faction. Exhibiting gravitas and experience, Piso's family connection to Caesar, allows him to strengthen credibility and provide legitimacy. To the Caesarian faction and his own decisions as well.

10. Quintus Fufius Calenus

Calenus was a senior senator and a staunch ally of Julius Caesar in 44 BCE. He was best distinguished by his unwavering loyalty towards Caesar and his political negotiation skills. Calenus does not command armies or hold immense military power like Mark Antony or Lepidus do. Instead, his power comes from his role in the Senate and his ability to effectively shape legislative discourse. As a Caesarian, he openly denounces the conspirators as traitors and strongly defends the maintenance of Caesar's reforms, employing his personal reputation for integrity and his own well-established talent as an orator within the Senate to persuade other senators and consequently the Romans too.

Calenus is the political core of the Caesarian faction, where experience and institutional credibility are paramount. He has the potential to make decisions by gathering legislative support and justifying the Caesarian cause in Rome's governing councils. By applying his charisma and skills of persuasion and manipulation, his sway holds the potential to be crucial in ensuring the

vacuum which Caesar has left behind does not degenerate into anarchy. This places Calenus in the central role of unifying political authority for the side of the Caesarians or the Roman populace backing Caesar.

11. Lucius Antonius

Brother of Mark Antony, Lucius Antonius holds the office of Tribune of the Plebs (an elected officer responsible for representing the common people), a position that grants him a formidable and powerful voice among the plebeians (commoners). His own position is strongly Caesarian, both out of loyalty to his brother and conviction that the plotters are treacherous enemies. Unlike Antony, Lucius does not possess a physical presence that can command the obedience of soldiers, but his tribunate (rank in office) enables him to focus plebeian rage and frustration upon political activity. He can speak to the urban populace in their own voice and carry popular opinion into the seats of power.

In committee, Lucius' potential lies in his ability to frame debates in the name of the people. He holds the power to position himself as the champion of the plebeians, compelling others to battle both internally and externally with the force of popular opinion. Many may find that ignoring him risks alienating Rome's masses, while embracing him solidifies a populist advantage. His voice can serve to be disruptive, passionate, and provocative, providing the Caesarians with an advantage outside of elite circles. However, he must, most crucially, keep in mind that his dependence on the people can become a liability if other people manage to contest or undermine his legitimacy.

12. Gaius Oppius

One of Caesar's closest advisors and administrators, Gaius Oppius served as a secretary and financial manager. While not the most powerful on the battlefield, Oppius was a man of intellect and precision - instrumental in organising and running Caesar's political network. Managed financial assets, and provisional logistics, Oppius was a part of Caesar's inner circle, representing its administrative core.

In committee, Oppius provides bureaucratic expertise and his influence comes from knowledge of Rome's financial systems and reforms. He can argue for the continuation of administrative, policy, and position himself as a technocrat amongst chaotic politicians - enhancing his worth and voice in committee, by establishing a more nuanced and trustworthy role. Oppius' strength does not lie in force, but in his organization and the caution he takes, where his argument stems from the idea that the future of Rome is not solely dependents on speeches and soldiers, but on the specific reforms and form of governance that Caesar built.

The Opportunists

13. Gaius Octavius (Octavian)

Gaius Octavius, Caesar's great-nephew and adopted heir, is only eighteen years old when Caesar dies. He has no senatorial rank, no military command, no established political power - yet he

possesses something that none of the others can: Caesar's name, Caesar's blood, Caesar's legacy. His attitude is guarded, unshaped, but already he has the aura of legitimacy that no other Opportunist or Caesarian can forge. Even without offices, Octavian's very presence creates a complicated atmosphere and poses questions of succession and leadership for allies and enemies alike.

Octavian's potential is unparalleled: he's vulnerable, yet irreplaceable. People can view him as an instrument to be molded, influenced, or utilized to justify their own deeds. His name and fortune could make him a key player if directed correctly, but at the same time, his youth also makes him vulnerable to persuasion and manipulation. Octavian is the ultimate sign of political potential, and the way people treat him will partially determine the power balance in Rome. A symbol at first and a plausible statesman afterwards, he represents the potential for those who have the courage to grasp it.

14. Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa

Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa, at 44 BCE, is a rising Roman citizen with immense drive and military potential. Agrippa is closely associated with Octavian, yet he isn't exactly a political figure. His tactical skill and reputation as a loyalist make him an individual who could become valuable to whichever side captures his loyalty. His position is characterized by pragmatism: Agrippa desires advancement and purpose, and is prepared to pledge himself to those leaders who can give him the tools to realize both.

Overall, Agrippa's role is as a faithful sword. He can be envisioned as the commander who tightens a faction's martial backbone, or as a bright young protégé whose development is stability for the future. Many might see that his worth is not what he already possesses, but what he might be with the correct sponsor. He is a solid worker and loyalist, yet he strives for more and leans toward approval and diplomacy. He's both valuable and hazardous based on how his path is directed. His loyalty, once secured, can turn strategy into authority, but his desire for approval has to be managed very carefully.

15. **Gaius Maecenas**

Gaius Maecenas is an equestrian of riches, elegance, and far-flung connections. He commands no army, no magistracy, but he has money, circles, and a reputation for refined pragmatism. In 44 BCE, his position was characterized by opportunism: he was not limited by ideology, but by a craving for stability, prosperity, and personal gain. When others battle openly, Maecenas likes to operate in the shadows, providing finance, connections, and subtle persuasion.

Maecenas holds the possibility to be found, in his capacity, to change things without gathering too much attention or moving into the limelight. Those in the committee might feel that his wealth can finance campaigns, his patronage can secure allies, and his discretion can make him a kingmaker in times of doubt. His mainly non-biased ideological connections make him a malleable tool, capable of being aligned with either side should they be able to deliver what he desires. He stands as a reminder that power in Rome is not simply swords or words, but coin, reputation, as well as timing. Those who dismiss him, though, can find themselves

outmaneuvered by those who do not. Regardless of that, Maecenas must constantly be on alert with his slightly pragmatic and opportunistic outlook.

16. Lucius Munatius **Plancus**

Lucius Munatius Plancus, in 44 BCE, is a senator and veteran officer of Caesar with command of troops stationed in Gaul (a wealthy and strategically vital province whose legions and resources could decisively shift the balance of power in Rome). He holds a precarious position: a Caesarian by circumstance, but one who complexly balances allegiance with self-interest. His position is pragmatic, holding open the option for either side while maintaining the authority of both military leadership and political presence. Within this vacuum of power, Plancus is a precious yet unreliable asset, one whose choices might be pivotal in altering the balance of the chaotic system of government in Rome.

Plancus' strength is his leveraged stance of volatility. His soldiers make him desirable to commanders, while his senatorial status gives him prestige in political discourse. People of power might view him as a negotiable contender, one who can be wooed, persuaded, or pressured into rendering pivotal support. However, this very circumspection also renders him perilous: Plancus can withhold his power until he chooses the most lucrative moment. He is the embodiment of opportunists waiting for advantage, and he is thus a character others need to watch closely, or his late commitment will be their downfall. Regardless of that, Plancus must be sure to guard his reputation carefully, because if his opportunism appears as disloyalty, he may lose the trust that makes his support worth seeking in the first place.

17. Salvidienus **Rufus**

Salvidienus Rufus, in 44 BCE, is an ambitious and young commander looking for recognition in a city now leaderless, having lost Caesar. Without roots in political office, he must depend on his military and risk-taking prowess to establish himself. His is a position of sheer opportunism: his allegiance is to those who will move him upward, and he will not shy away from pushing for advancement if it presents itself. His ambition is restive, eager to grasp opportunities that others might be hesitant to accept.

In committee, Rufus' strength lies in his hunger. Many might view him as a malleable but forceful agent, someone who can be appended to their cause and used effectively. His unpredictability makes him a wild card: strong enough to make a faction's power greater, but simultaneously strong enough to be a liability unless carefully controlled. Rufus represents the unreliability of Rome's younger generation: untested, ambitious, and hungry to prove themselves. Those who steer him can win a ferocious friend; those who neglect him can see his dynamism turn the balance against them. Rufus must be careful with his choices and wise with his ambitions, since a hasty pledge or a reckless move could see him used as a pawn rather than a rising citizen or emerging leader in his own right.

18. Lucius Cornelius **Balbus**

Lucius Cornelius Balbus is the accurate embodiment of pragmatic ambition. He is a Spaniard by birth and although he is not a Roman by origin, he rises to vast political and economic influence by allying himself with those who can elevate his position (first on Pompey's side and then on Caesar's). His allegiance is not to ideology or the Republic but rather to opportunity itself. He excels in times of change, viewing power not as an ideal to maintain but as a rung to ascend. Adaptability is Balbus's defining characteristic: he reads the politics of Rome and navigates to the most likely victorious side. His role as a financier and administrator gives him immense leverage, placing him in a position of power. He has the ability to dictate resources, information, and access, all of which are politically desirable for politicians like him.

Balbus is a master facilitator: a man who can go between factions and spin negotiations to benefit himself. He's a strategic wild card in the committee with his charismatic oration, calculative mind, and ability to optimize persuasion or patronage to influence decision-making. Although he doesn't crave the limelight, he makes sure that those who do are in his debt. If his role is optimized well, Balbus can be the quiet mastermind behind coalitions, distilling ideological turmoil into personal benefit. His pragmatic devotion to whoever happens to be in power renders him the ultimate survivor, and in a committee of power-hungry men, that makes him perilous, invaluable, and worth being strategic with.

Recommended Reading

1. How Julius Caesar's Assassination Triggered the Fall of the Roman Republic:
<https://www.history.com/articles/julius-caesar-assassination-fall-roman-republic>

2. The Rise of Julius Caesar by Lily Ross Taylor:
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/641006>
3. Caesar, Caesarism, and the Historians:
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/259642>
4. History - The Fall of the Roman Republic:
https://www.bbc.co.uk/history/ancient/romans/fallofromanrepublic_article_01.shtml
5. Julius Caesar's Forgotten Assassin:
<https://www.history.com/articles/julius-caesar-assassin-ides-of-march>

Questions A Resolution Must Answer

1. Who should be enabled to hold ultimate authority in Rome?
2. Should Caesar's reforms be preserved, reversed, or adapted?
3. How can Rome prevent civil war and restore stability in the face of competing factions?
4. Should the conspirators (the Liberatores / the Republicans) be punished as traitors or should they instead be honored as defenders of the Republic?
5. How should the Senate manage the loyalty of the legions?
6. What can the Senate do in order to maintain public order in Rome?
7. What strategies should be adopted by the system of government chosen in Rome?

Glossary

1. Republic:

A form of government under which power belongs to elected officials and citizens.

2. Dictator Perpetuo:

Latin for “dictator for life” and it was the title Caesar took before his death.

3. Senate:

A powerful council of rich and important Romans who made laws and advised leaders.

4. Consul:

One of the two highest elected officials in Rome's Republic,

5. Praetor:

A high-ranking government or military officer whose rank is just below that of a consul.

6. Tribune of the Plebs:

An official chosen to protect the rights of the plebeians (commoners).

7. Plebeians:

The ordinary citizens of Rome’s working class (farmers, merchants, etc).

8. Patricians:

The rich, aristocratic families that had dominating power in the early Republic.

9. Legions:

Large groups of Roman soldiers, these are the backbone of Rome’s military strength.

10. Triumvirate:

A political alliance that commenced between three powerful men who chose to divide control (these political figures were Caesar, Pompey, and Crassus in the First Triumvirate).

11. Liberatores:

Although they hold the same stance as Republics, this name was particularly given to the group of senators who killed Caesar, calling themselves the “liberators” of Rome.

12. Autocracy:

A regime in which one person has absolute control over all others (king / dictator).

13. Power Vacuum:

A situation where no one holds definitive power, creating chaos and competition.

14. Reforms:

Changes or improvements made to laws or systems (Caesar added many during his reign).

15. The Ides of March:

The 15th of March or the date on which Julius was assassinated in 44 BCE.

Position Papers

As a specialised committee, position papers could be an area of concern. Listed below are a few basic guidelines that should help make the process easier:

- ‘The Fall of Rome’ is still an MUN committee - meaning that a position paper takes the same structure, except you are writing as a person - not a nation

- Make sure to follow the general, basic structure of an MUN position paper (numerous guides/videos can be found online)
- Below are a few things that could be included across your study guide in order to strengthen it, wherever you see fit:
 - A sufficient overview/introduction of your delegation (character overview)
 - Political stance/view (What is your vision in regard to succession and governance for the future of Rome? - address the topic statement)
 - Past actions (preceding the freeze date of course!)
 - Key issues and policies to be addressed in committee
 - Possible reforms and ideas that could be implemented
- **Remember** - creativity, balanced with pragmatism, is key to making your position paper stand out. Explore new avenues of possibility, and make your paper as innovative as you want, but remember to keep it strategic and convincing as well
- The font style must be **‘Times New Roman’**, with font size of **12 pt.**
- The document must range from **2-3 pages minimum**

MLA Bibliography

Klein, C. (2021). *How Julius Caesar's Assassination Triggered the Fall of the Roman Republic*.

[online] History. Available at:

<https://www.history.com/articles/julius-caesar-assassination-fall-roman-republic>.

Taylor, L.R. (1957). The Rise of Julius Caesar. *Greece & Rome*, [online] 4(1), pp.10–18.
Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/641006>.

Yavetz, Z. (1971). Caesar, Caesarism, and the Historians. *Journal of Contemporary History*,
[online] 6(2), pp.184–201. Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/259642>.

Beard, M. (2011). *The Fall of the Roman Republic*. [online] BBC. Available at:
https://www.bbc.co.uk/history/ancient/romans/fallofromanrepublic_article_01.shtml.

Strauss, B. (2018). *Julius Caesar's Forgotten Assassin* | *HISTORY*. [online] HISTORY. Available
at: <https://www.history.com/articles/julius-caesar-assassin-ides-of-march>.