

CHAPTER II.

THE SECURITY COUNCIL

STATE MEMBERS

Argentina	Ghana	Russian Federation
China	Greece	Slovakia
Congo	Japan	United Kingdom
Denmark	Peru	United Republic of Tanzania
France	Qatar	United States of America

Representatives to the Security Council should note that the agenda provided is only provisional. The Security Council may discuss any international peace and security issue brought before it. For this reason, Representatives must have a broad base of knowledge on current events in the international community. Also, the overviews provided below are only current through the publication of this handbook. **Many of the topics listed below will change significantly before the Conference, and Representatives should be familiar with the up-to-date situations.** Periodicals are one of the best recommended sources available for day-to-day updates. These include among others: *New York Times*, *UN Chronicle*, *London Times*, *Foreign Policy*, *The Economist* and *Keesing's Record of World Events*. Also, the UN Foundation's on-line daily newsletter, the *UN Wire*, is an excellent resource for timely information. Whenever possible, AMUN recommends that Representatives familiarize themselves with the most recent report(s) published by the Secretary-General on each situation, along with other UN documents. These can be found on the UN homepage under the Security Council documents section (www.un.org/Docs/sc/). Please note that the bibliographies for these topics focus primarily on UN sources, with some news sources provided for background on important aspects of the various situations.

Initial background research is provided below for each region, with one or two topics receiving a brief analysis. Security Council representatives are neither limited to the main topics discussed nor to any of the topics listed. Should world events move in a different direction from the topics provided in this handbook, the Security Council is welcome to discuss any peace and security matter which it desires.

Please note that draft resolutions should be written on the sub-topics of each regional area: i.e., resolutions would not be written about "Issues in Africa," but rather about "The Situation in Sierra Leone" or similar sub-topics within the region.

BACKGROUND RESEARCH

ISSUES IN AFRICA

THE SITUATION IN SUDAN

In 2003, a rebellion broke out in the Western region of Sudan known as Darfur. The rebels, calling themselves the Sudan Liberation Army, attacked government facilities and military bases in the region. As the fighting spread, local militias, often referred to as the Janjaweed, began to strike back at rebel held territory and villages, killing thousands of people and displacing hundreds of thousands more. Darfur has been called "the world's greatest humanitarian crisis" by the United Nations. Many NGOs and the United States believe the atrocities there constitute genocide. In response, the United Nations has attempted to provide aid to the refugees, but the levels of violence have often seriously impeded their efforts. In many instances, armed men have looted aid convoys and attacked humanitarian workers.

The international community has also tried more forceful responses to the violence in Darfur. In late 2004, the African Union deployed a force of military observers to the region with a mandate that charged it with patrolling the area and documenting any attacks against civilians in the region, but without authorizing it to intervene in the conflict. By all accounts, the African Union force failed to reduce the level of violence in the region, and the peacekeepers have become targets themselves on more than one occasion. Many outside observers believe that the force does not have enough personnel to adequately patrol the area, even after the African Union increased the size of the force from 3000 observers to 7000. In March of 2005, the Security Council took the additional step of referring allegations of war crimes in the region to the International Criminal Court, although the court has not

indicted or arrested any of the 51 prime suspects referred to it.

Since the beginning of 2006, the United Nations Security Council has begun to explore the possibility of replacing the African Union force in Darfur with a force under the command of the United Nations. Supporters of the plan believe that the United Nations could expand the force beyond the current capabilities of the African Union, and that the United Nations has more experience with long term, large scale deployments of this kind. However, the Sudanese government has expressed serious reservations about the deployment of peacekeeping troops under the command of the United Nations to Darfur. They have strongly resisted efforts to add non-African troops to the peacekeeping force, and many Arabs in Sudan believe the effort is a Western plot to undermine or replace the Sudanese government. In the meantime, the violence in Darfur spilled across the border into Chad. In April, rebels managed to reach the Chadian capital of Ndjamena, where government forces defeated them in an intense firefight. Chad directed blame for the incident at Sudan for giving the rebels safe haven. The violence has had the side effect of aggravating the living conditions for the hundreds of thousands of refugees who fled the violence in Darfur by moving across the border into Chad.

In May, the Sudanese government and the Sudanese Liberation Army signed a peace treaty under intense pressure from the American and Nigerian governments. However, several smaller factions of rebel fighters did not agree to the terms of the agreement and pledged to keep fighting. Despite diplomatic efforts, the rebel groups remain unwilling to disarm and the violence in the region has continued.

Questions to consider from your government's perspective on this issue include:

- What is the proper role of the UN in an internal conflict of a



- Member State which has a significant humanitarian dimension?
- Why has the crisis in Sudan continued to escalate? What factors have limited the ability of the Council to take action?
- What actions could be taken to differentiate a UN peacekeeping mission from the current African Union mission? Do these changes serve the strategic interest of your government?

Bibliography:

- Lacey, Marc, "Chadian Forces Repel Rebel Attack on Capital in Intense Combat," *The New York Times*, 14 April 2006: A10.
- Lederer, Edith, "Tribal Leaders Reject U.N. Force, Threaten 'Holy War,'" *The Washington Post*, 10 June 2006: A13.
- Pepper, Daniel and Abraham McLaughlin, "AU struggles to calm Darfur; The African Union's mission in Sudan has become a test...," *Christian Science Monitor*, 12 December 2005: 6.
- Polgreen, Lydia and Joel Brinkley, "Largest Faction of Darfur Rebels Signs Peace Pact," *The New York Times*, 6 May 2006: A1.

UN Documents:

- S/RES/1679
- S/RES/1672
- S/RES/1665
- S/2006/306 - Reports of the Secretary-General on Darfur
- S/2006/218 - Report of the Secretary-General on Darfur

THE SITUATION IN ETHIOPIA AND ERITREA

The future of the United Nations Mission in Eritrea and Ethiopia (UNMEE) remains in jeopardy as the border conflict between the two countries continues to simmer. The United Nations deployed the peacekeeping force to the region in 2000 as part of a peace accord that ended a two year long war between the two countries over a border dispute. As part of the peace treaty, both sides agreed to have an international boundary commission rule on disputed segments of the border, particularly the contested town of Badme. The commission awarded possession of the town to Eritrea in 2002, but the Ethiopians disputed the ruling. In late 2005, the Eritreans imposed a number of restrictions on the UNMEE peacekeepers, grounding helicopters, prohibiting night patrols, and ending de-mining operations. The restrictions eliminated the ability of the peacekeepers to verify troop deployments along the border, an essential trust-building measure between the two parties. Then, in December of 2005, Eritrea ordered all United States, Canadian, and European peacekeepers to leave the country, reducing the 3,300 strong force by 180. The Security Council called for Ethiopia to abide by the ruling of the border commission and for Eritrea to remove its restrictions on the peacekeepers, but so far neither side seems to be inclined to cooperate.

Questions to consider from your government's perspective on this issue include:

- What distinguishes UNMEE from other UN operations in Africa?
- Do the changing conditions in the region require a change in the objectives of UNMEE?

Bibliography:

- England, Andrew and Mark Turner, "UN threat to downgrade peace mission on Eritrean border," *Financial Times*, 11 April 2006: 9.
- Mitchell, Anthony, "Western peacekeepers expelled from...," *Seattle Times*, 16 December 2005: A15.
- Ngow, Rodrique, "Eritrea Pays a Heavy Price For Standoff With

- Ethiopia," *The Washington Post*, 9 April 2006: A16.
- "Threats, Many Fear Neglect Of Internal Problems, Regional Destabilization," *The Washington Post*, 25 December 2005: A23.
- Turner, Mark, "Annan urges action on UN force," *Financial Times*, 5 January 2006: 8.
- UN sanctions if they don't take steps to avert war," *Christian Science Monitor*, 27 December 2005: 6.

UN Documents:

- S/RES/1681 – The Situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia
- S/RES/1678 – The Situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia
- S/RES/1670 – The Situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia
- S/2006/140 – Report of the SG on Ethiopia and Eritrea

ISSUES IN ASIA

THE SITUATION IN THE DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF KOREA

In October of 2002, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) stunned the world by acknowledging that it had hidden a nuclear weapons program for years. In response, the six interested parties (United States, the Republic of Korea, DPRK, China, Japan, and Russia) set up a series of ongoing talks aimed at finding a resolution to the standoff. The talks initially made little progress, and a series of discouraging steps followed. First, the United States withdrew from the KEDO agreement, by which it provided energy aid with the ultimate promise of a pair of light-water nuclear reactors in return for a freeze on the DPRK's nuclear program. Shortly afterwards, the DPRK announced it was withdrawing from the Non-Proliferation Treaty, becoming the first nation in the world to do so. Many outside observers believe that the DPRK has since reprocessed a stockpile of plutonium from its nuclear facility at Yongbyon, which could give it enough nuclear material to make a small number of nuclear weapons.

The six party talks appeared to reach a breakthrough in September of 2005 when the United States and the DPRK agreed that the US would give the DPRK a light-water reactor in return for which the DPRK would abandon its nuclear program and rejoin the Non-Proliferation Treaty. However, the agreement broke down the day after it was announced, as the parties differed over the timing of the implementation of the agreement. The United States has insisted that the DPRK verifiably dismantle its nuclear arsenal before it could build a light-water reactor, while the DPRK has insisted that it must have the reactor before it will give up its deterrent. The talks have recessed while the various parties try to find a new approach to break the impasse.

At the same time, the US launched a crackdown on a DPRK attempt to launder counterfeit US currency through the world financial system. In September, while the six party talks hammered out their agreement, the United States Treasury Department ordered US banks to cut ties with the Banco Delta Asia in Macao as part of a wide reaching money laundering investigation involving the government of the DPRK, members of the Triad organized crime syndicate, and the Irish Republican Army. The action triggered a ripple effect through the world financial system as other banks cut ties to accounts linked to the DPRK to avoid similar measures. The measures appear to have had an effect, as the DPRK has made the removal of "financial sanctions" one of their primary demands before resuming talks on the nuclear issue. In the meantime, the negotiations remain stalled.



For the purposes of the Council, it should be noted that the situation in the DPRK is an important underlying international issue in many discussions. It has not, however, been actively discussed very much in public Council meetings.

Questions to consider from your government's perspective on this issue include:

- Should the international community give economic, development, or humanitarian aid to DPRK to encourage it to give up its nuclear ambitions?
- How does the history of the DPRK's nuclear program affect the compromises made in the Non-Proliferation Treaty?
- How does the progression of the DPRK's nuclear program affect the negotiations over the Iranian nuclear program?

Bibliography:

- Baker, Peter and Anthony Faiola, "U.S., South Find Unity Against North's Nuclear Arms...", *The Washington Post*, 17 Nov 2005: A20.
- Brinkley, Joel, "U.S. Squeezes North's Money Flow," *The New York Times*, 10 March 2006: A12.
- Cody, Edward, "N. Vows to Quit Arms Program; Nuclear Agreement Set at 6-Nation Talks," *The Washington Post*, 19 September 2005: A1.
- Fackler, Martin, "North Korean Counterfeiting Complicates Crisis," *The New York Times*, 29 January 2006: 13.
- Faiola, Anthony, "N. Korea Gains Aid Despite Arms Standoff," *The Washington Post*, 16 November 2005: A15.
- Kerr, Paul, "North Korean Talks Hit Impasse," *Arms Control Today*, 36 (Jan/Feb 2006): 29-31.
- Kessler, Glenn, "Nations Seek to Hold North Korea to Text of Agreement," *The Washington Post*, 21 September 2005: A15.
- Kim, Tong, "You Say Okjeryok, I Say Deterrent; No Wonder We Don't Agree" *The Washington Post*, 25 September 2005: B1.

The Situation in Timor-Leste

In 1999, the former Portuguese colony of Timor-Leste voted for independence from Indonesia after a 24 year long occupation noted for its human rights abuses. When Indonesian backed militias rampaged through the newly born nation, the United Nations sent in peacekeepers to restore order and advisors to help the Timorese create a new nation. The United Nations administered the area until 2002, when the UN mission handed control over to an elected Timorese government. Timor-Leste was considered a major success in nation-building until May of 2006, when approximately 600 disgruntled soldiers resigned from the army complaining of ethnic discrimination. Shortly afterwards, a riot broke out during a demonstration in support of the former soldiers, and the violence spread across the capital. Both the national army and the police have been torn apart by the fighting, and both will likely take many years to reconstitute into an effective force. Even more disturbing, the violence seems to have taken on an ethnic character, despite the lack of pre-existing ethnic tensions. It is estimated that up to 65,000 people have fled the violence in the capital, and the refugees are disproportionately from the Eastern section of the country. Peacekeepers have now returned to the country, led by an Australian battalion, and long term plans are being made for a UN mission to return to the country. However, the relatively small Australian military has found itself increasingly strained by multiple simultaneous deployments across the South Pacific, calling into question its ability to sustain another long term deployment to Timor-Leste.

Questions to consider from your government's perspective on

this issue include:

- What bearing does the United Nations experience in Timor-Leste have on other conflicts in the world?
- What is the appropriate priority of the situation in Timor-Leste relative to other conflicts in the world?

Bibliography:

- Donnan, Shawn, "East Timor's ethnic violence puzzles analysts. The emergence of fighting has taken many by surprise after a hard-won...", *Financial Times*, 10 June 2006: 9.
- Perlez, Jane, "Poverty and Violence Sink Grand Plans for East Timor," *The New York Times*, 31 May 2006: A3.
- Sipress, Alan, "In E. Timor, an Optimistic Enterprise Turns to Ashes," *The Washington Post*, 2 June 2006: A13.
- Squires, Nick, "Australia rushes to East Timor; East Timor's call for help Wednesday opened a new mission for an already stretched military," *Christian Science Monitor*, 25 May 2006: 7.
- Squires, Nick, "Why East Timor is falling apart; Rebel leader Alfredo Reinado called Thursday for the prime minister's exit," *Christian Science Monitor*, 2 June 2006: 6.

UN Documents:

- S/RES/1690 - The Situation in Timor-Leste
- S/RES/1677 - The Situation in Timor-Leste
- S/2006/251 - End of mandate report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Office in Timor-Leste
- S/PRST/2006/25 (25 May 2006) – The Situation in Timor-Leste

ISSUES IN THE MIDDLE EAST

THE SITUATION IN IRAQ

Iraq is a frequent topic of discussion in the Security Council, but the Council's active role since the removal of Saddam Hussein's government in 2003 has been limited. While the UN was forced to withdraw much of its presence in Iraq due to safety concerns following the August and September 2003 bombings of UN offices and personnel, this presence has increased again recently in an attempt to further assist the Iraqi people.

The Council's primary action since that time was to establish the UN Assistance Mission for Iraq (UNAMI) on 14 August 2003, and to renew the work of that mission on an annual basis. UNAMI was instrumental in assisting the Iraqi government in holding widely acclaimed elections in December, 2005. It has also been active in assisting the Iraqi people and government with political and economic development, as well as in coordinating reconstruction and humanitarian assistance efforts. Problematically, ongoing violence, including recently increased sectarian violence, is a constant, underlying impediment to the successful work of UNAMI, the allied forces in Iraq, and the Iraqi people on these issues.

In 2006, the Council had not passed a resolution on Iraq as of this writing. Most meetings on Iraq conclude with a Presidential Statement to describe the ongoing situation. The Secretary-General also frequently reports to the Council on UNAMI's progress, as well as the overall situation in Iraq. While the establishment of the new government in late 2005 was a hopeful step, progress is nonetheless difficult.

Questions to consider from your government's perspective on this issue include:

- Is there more that the Council can do to assist the Iraqi people?
- What is the proper role of the Security Council in this situation?



What role would your government like the Council to take?

Bibliography:

- Fisher, Ian, "Italy to Withdraw Troops from Iraq by End of Year," *New York Times*, 20 Jan 2006.
- Hoge, Warren, "U.N. Chief Bemoans 'Really Difficult' Year and Looks Toward '06," *New York Times*, 22 Dec 2005.
- Oppel, Richard, "Iraq Vote Shows Sunnis Are Few in New Military," *New York Times*, 27 Dec 2005.
- Semple, Kirk, "The Struggle for Iraq: Politics; Sunni Leaders Say U.S.-Iran Talks Amount to Meddling," *New York Times*, 18 Mar 2006.
- Tavernise, Sabrina, "The Struggle for Iraq: Politics; Iraqis Certify Election Results on a Day of More Violence," *New York Times*, 11 Feb 2006.

UN Documents:

- S/RES/1637 (2005) – includes 2 annexes
- S/RES/1619 (2005)
- S/RES/1618 (2005)
- S/RES/1546 (2004)
- S/RES/1483 (2003)
- SC/8661 (15 Mar 2006) - Press Release
- SC/8752 (15 Jun 2006) - Presidential Statement
- S/2006/428 (21 Jun 2006) - SG Report
- S/2006/630 (2 Jun 2006) - SG Report

The Situation in Iran

Although there have long been allegations of a secret Iranian program to develop nuclear weapons, these rumors took on a new life when an Iranian opposition group revealed two previously unknown nuclear sites in 2002. Although Iran claimed that its nuclear program exists solely to provide electrical power, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) increased its inspections in the country attempting to definitively prove whether or not Iran had a military nuclear program operating alongside its civilian program. Over the past few years, the IAEA has found numerous instances where Iran failed to report nuclear activities and nuclear facilities to the IAEA, but it has yet to conclusively determine whether Iran has a second, clandestine military program in addition to its declared civilian nuclear program.

Although the United States refused to negotiate with the Iranians over the dispute, as has been standing US policy, France, Germany, and the United Kingdom (often known collectively as the EU3) began negotiations with Iran. The Europeans sought to broker a deal that would allow Iran to develop nuclear reactors that would produce electric energy without allowing Iran technology that could later serve as the building blocks for a military program, such as the enrichment of uranium. The Iranians agreed to suspend controversial activities, such as enrichment, while the negotiations continued. In August of 2005, the negotiations reached a climax, as the EU3 made their final offer to Iran, consisting of a series of economic and political incentives to Iran in return for Iran's suspension of nuclear activities. In particular, the Europeans insisted that Iran give up its right to enrich uranium domestically in return for a guarantee that Iran would be allowed to purchase uranium for its power plants. Iran rejected the offer and resumed enriching uranium shortly thereafter.

In April, President Ahmadinejad announced that Iran had "joined the nuclear countries of the world", and that Iran had no intention of giving up its right to enrich uranium as part of ne-

gotiations over its nuclear program. This preempted a scheduled report of the IAEA to the Security Council on Iran's nuclear program. Although some outside experts have questioned Iran's proficiency at uranium enrichment, the announcement raised the stakes in the diplomatic talks. Other Iranian leaders have also shown their support for the nuclear program. Supreme Leader Khamenei warned that Iran would respond to any "harsh measures" imposed on the Iranians by possibly restricting oil exports or transferring nuclear technology to other nations. On April 28th, the IAEA submitted its report to the Council with its findings on the Iranian program. The report detailed the decreasing levels of cooperation from the Iranians as well as many areas of open questions on the Iranian program. The agency was able to confirm Iran's ability to enrich uranium to low levels, but it admitted that significant gaps existed in its understanding of the Iranian enrichment program. One official admitted, "With the information we have, we cannot proceed any further. We are stuck."

While the Security Council has often been divided on the issue, the so-called "six powers" (the United States, United Kingdom, France, Germany, Russia, and China) agreed in early June on a set of proposals for Iran, containing both incentives and disincentives for Iran to cease enriching uranium. At the same time, the United States offered to join the negotiations with the Europeans, if Iran agreed to a freeze on uranium enrichment, while rejecting an Iranian proposal for direct talks. Both the American and Iranian offers are diplomatic firsts, as neither country has had diplomatic relations of any kind since the 1979 revolution in Iran. As of this writing, the Iranians have not definitively answered the proposals. The situation may be referred to the Council again if an answer is not forthcoming.

Questions to consider from your government's perspective on this issue include:

- How does the Iranian nuclear program relate to the implementation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty?
- What are the Iranian's intentions for their nuclear program?
- What assurances should the international community expect from the Iranians about their program?

Bibliography:

- Broad, William, David Sanger, and Nazila Fathi, "Iran's Drive to Nuclear Fuel Has Slowed, Diplomats Say," *The Washington Post*, 29 May 2006: A9.
- Kessler, Glenn, "Six Powers Reach Accord On Iran Plan; U.S. Supports Combination Of Incentives, 'Disincentives,'" *The Washington Post*, 2 June 2006: A1.
- Moore, Molly, "Iran Raises Stakes in Nuclear Dispute; Atom Technology Exports, Oil Cuts Are Threatened," *The Washington Post*, 26 April 2006: A19.
- Richter, Paul and Kim Murphy, "The World; U.S. Wants Embargo on Arms to Iran; An official urges nations to 'use their leverage' to halt Tehran's nuclear program.," *Los Angeles Times*, 22 April 2006: A16.
- Sciolino, Elaine, David Sanger, William Broad, and Nazila Fathi, "U.N. Agency Says Iran Falls Short on Nuclear Data," *The New York Times*, 29 April 2006: A1.
- Vick, Karl, "Iranian Details Intention To Grow Nuclear Program; Project Announced to Install 54,000 Centrifuges," *The Washington Post*, 13 April 2006: A18.

UN Documents:

S/PRST/2006/15 of 29 March 2006 – Non-Proliferation