



The Southern Regional Model United Nations—SRMUN XVII



Dear Delegates,

It is my distinct pleasure to welcome you to the Southern Regional Model United Nations (SRMUN) XVII. My name is A.J. Jenkins, and it is my honor to be serving you as the Director of the Security Council. This is my 3rd year on staff. Before becoming a Peace Corps Volunteer in Kazakhstan, I acted as the Assistant Director of the European Union at SRMUN XII and Director of Security Council at SRMUN XIII. I graduated from Berry College in 2003, and now live and work in Charleston, South Carolina.

Serving on the Security Council is quite different from any other committee at SRMUN. Many delegates find that while the Security Council is very exciting, it is also very challenging and demanding. Please familiarize yourselves with the unique characteristics of the Security Council by reading this background guide and its addendum and by doing additional research. The Security Council is the only committee at SRMUN with an **OPEN AGENDA**, whereby delegates are allowed to discuss any topic that is relevant to the Security Council's mandate. As a delegate, you will be able to choose whether or not to discuss the topics that we have prepared or instead discuss any other topic that pertains to the maintenance of international peace and security. Therefore you must be prepared for a variety of topics that may be placed on the agenda. The topics within the background guide indicate some of the conceptual notions that may arise during the sessions. The background guide for the Security Council will cover the following areas:

Peacekeeping, Human Security, The Situation in Darfur, Asymmetric Threats and Verification.

Please be aware that the open agenda also impacts position papers for the Security Council. Again, **ONLY** in Security Council, should you write a position paper discussing three topics that both fall under the mandate of the Security Council and are of utmost importance to your country. **Position papers should be sent by e-mail to Laura Merrell, the Director-General of SRMUN (dg@srmun.org), no later than 11:59 pm on October 30, 2006.**

Another unique aspect about the Security Council is that the committee may be faced with a crisis situation that may arise during one of the sessions. Finally, because of its special nature, the Security Council operates differently from other United Nations' bodies. Please do not forget to familiarize yourself with its rules of procedure before the conference begins. I emphasize learning these rules because you will find them most helpful when trying to communicate to both the dais and among other delegates. Communication is a key instrument when working together with other Member States during sessions as well as caucuses. Most delegations find that failure to communicate often hinders many efforts made on behalf of your own country as well as others.

If you should have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me. Also, should you have any questions regarding the format specifications for the position papers, please refer to the SRMUN website at www.srmun.org. Though it is a lot of work and commitment, the students who serve on the Security Council do find it to be one of the most rewarding experiences to be had at SRMUN. With that, I wish you the best of luck, and I look forward to meeting you in November.

A.J. Jenkins
Director
sc@srmun.org

Majida Khan
Assistant Director
sc@srmun.org

Laura Merrell
Director-General
dg@srmun.org

History of the United Nations Security Council

Representatives from China, Great Britain, the Soviet Union and the United States who met for the initial discussions at Dumbarton Oaks that would lead to the creation of the United Nations were mindful of the failure of the League of Nations to ensure that the guiding principles of the League Covenant were followed. There was broad agreement that it was necessary to establish a principle organ within the newly proposed international organization tasked specifically with promoting international peace and security. Though many felt that the League of Nations had the capacity to discuss significant international affairs, the body was not constructed in such a way that it could produce successful measures to deter aggression and prevent conflict. First of all, a major global power, the United States, did not join the organization, which did not lead the organization to the fullest possible financial backing and political support.¹ Secondly, there was no clear division of duties between the League's Assembly and Council committees. So, needless to say, tasks were often mismanaged. Additionally, in order for a resolution to be passed, it had to be done unanimously. Since there was no clear sense of collective security, individual Member States continued the policy of pursuing narrowly defined interests of their own country's foreign policy.² After careful consideration at the San Francisco Conference of 1945, delegates from countries that would become the first Member States of the United Nations came to the conclusion that a smaller body acting as the United Nations defense advisor and operations executioner, specifically charged with "the maintenance of international peace and security" should be commissioned.³

The Security Council is comprised of 15 member states, with 5 nations holding permanent seats and 10 holding rotating elected seats.⁴ The permanent five members are China, France, Great Britain, the Russian Federation and the United States.⁵ These countries are known as the P-5 Members and retain special privileges known as the veto power. These permanent members were given veto powers primarily to ensure that no P-5 member would attack another P-5 Member as well as to ensure that the leading nations were in unanimity before taking action on a particular issue, thereby acting like a coalition.⁶ The 10 nonpermanent member states are elected for a period of 2 year terms with 5 rotating out each December.⁷ These states are represented geographically, whereby there are three African, two Latin American, one Arab, one Asian, one Eastern European and two Western European states on the Security Council at any given time.⁸ Furthermore, Member States on the Council are mandated by the United Nations Charter to have a representative from each of their states present at the organization's headquarters in New York City so that the Council may operate "continuously" without delay or hesitation.⁹

Security Council members must be ready to deliberate at any given time to decide on "the fate of governments, establish peacekeeping missions, create tribunals to try persons accused of war crimes, and in extreme cases declare a nation to be fare game for corrective action by other Member States."¹⁰ This legislative right was granted to the Security Council through the UN Charter and is apparent in the associations between Articles 37 and 39, which allow the Council to settle a particular dispute and make its accords compulsory on any parties involved or on the international community as a whole, hence, becoming international binding documents.¹¹ Therefore, it is in this regard that the Security Council has the capability and authority to exercise powers from existing international law or by creating binding resolutions.¹²

One of the main reasons for its creation, size and power was to enable the Security Council to rapidly respond to

¹ Linda Fasulo. *An Insider's Guide to the United Nation* . New Haven :Yale University Press. 2004.

² Ibid.

³ *United Nations Charter*. United Nations. June 26, 1945.

⁴ "Members." United Nations Security Council. <http://www.un.org/sc/members.asp>

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Linda Fasulo. *An Insider's Guide to the United Nation* . New Haven :Yale University Press. 2004.

⁷ "Members." United Nations Security Council. <http://www.un.org/sc/members.asp>

⁸ Linda Fasulo. *An Insider's Guide to the United Nation* . New Haven :Yale University Press. 2004.

⁹ "United Nations Security Council." United Nations. http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/unsc_background.html

¹⁰ Linda Fasulo. *An Insider's Guide to the United Nation* . New Haven :Yale University Press. 2004.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid.

international crises as they arise. The Security Council is tasked with “transforming disaster into constructive development [which] requires a conceptual model different from the traditional, linear model of economic development which assumes a stable administrative system.”¹³ Alternatively, the Security Council must devise a strategy that is specifically aimed at the conflict. Before the Security Council can deal with a crisis, they must have a clear concept of the underlying problems causing the conflict and those who are affected by it. Another way the Security Council may prepare for a crisis is to be proactive in their planning, whereby “the parties carefully think about everything that could happen and then develop detailed plans.”¹⁴ However, the Security Council often finds that at too many times there is insufficient international will to provide the funds, troops and resources necessary to handle the crisis, and it must make due with limited resources.¹⁵

The Security Council primarily operates under the mandate of Chapter VI of the United Nations Charter. Chapter VI is titled “Pacific Settlement of Disputes” and mandates actions which may include peace talks, summit meetings, mediations and negotiations.¹⁶ For instance, sovereignty over the Kashmir region in South Asia has been disputed by Pakistan and India. While mediation efforts have yet to find resolution to the issue, the Security Council has been involved in monitoring the situation, particularly now that the conflict could produce a conflict that leads to nuclear war. Nevertheless, when measures of this stature fall short of effective, the Security Council has the capacity to incorporate the use of sanctions.¹⁷ Sanctions have long been used throughout history to correct or punish nations for actions considered contrary to the established norms of international behavior. Sanctions represent a step short of armed intervention, and the Security Council may attempt to isolate an aggressor by severing some or all relations with a nation in view of trying to alter offensive behavior. These actions consist of the “complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations.”¹⁸ Nevertheless, when the Security Council chooses to implement sanctions as a form of non-forcible enforcement, it is often combined with incentives, such as humanitarian aid, as part of a bargaining process to resolve conflict and encourage compliance.¹⁹

Though sanctions may seem like ideal measures to use, it is an area of much controversy. Many international organizations and agencies feel that at too many times sanctions cause civilian populations to suffer while only meeting limited success in coercing the government of the country in question to alter its position. One alternative is the use of “smart sanctions” which are sanctions that can be formulated in such a way as to minimize the detrimental effects on civilian population.²⁰ Instead, these sanctions are designed to apply pressure directly on those regimes that pose a threat to international peace and security as well as human rights.²¹ An alternative to these two measures which may follow if the other two methods prove ineffective is the use of force. The Security Council may invoke Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, which calls for the Council to “determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression” and make recommendations as to how “to maintain or restore international peace and security.”²² When the Security Council finds no other measures sufficient of deterring such behaviors, it is under Chapter VII that the Security Council finds the authority to use force.²³

The role of Secretary General is two-fold in relation to the Security Council. While the position of Secretary General is a leadership one whereby the individual who serves it acts as “chief administrator,” the position does not have any battalions of its own.²⁴ He or she that fulfills this office cannot offer any resolutions or amendments to

¹³ “United Nations Secretariat.” United Nations. <http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/un/unpan000751.pdf>

¹⁴ “Crisis Management.” Conflict Research Consortium. University of Colorado. 1998.

¹⁵ Adam Roberts. “The Use of Force.” *From the Cold War to the Twenty-First Century*. Ed. David M. Malone. Boulder: Lynne Rienner. 2004.

¹⁶ *United Nations Charter*. United Nations. June 26, 1945.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ “Use of Sanctions under Chapter VII of the UN Charter.” Office of the Spokesman for the Secretary-General. www.un.org/News/press/docs/2001/20010601.unsecgssg.htm

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² *United Nations Charter*. United Nations. June 26, 1945.

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ Karen Mingst and Jack Snyder. *Essential Readings in World Politics*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company. 2001.

resolutions.²⁵ Instead, the Secretary General is to remain neutral, offering only his or her counsel on global affairs. However, the Secretary General may be requested by the Security Council to show interest in a particular issue so that it may be seen by the international community as a pertinent matter that requires special attention. Typically, the issues that Secretary General follows have come to include: maintaining a developmental focus on the continent of Africa; ensuring that there are adequate financial resources, military supplies, personnel, and political motivation to effectively manage peace operations and humanitarian catastrophes; and, promoting socio-economic needs through globalization so that all “the world’s people [can] share [its] benefits.”²⁶ Likewise, the position of the Secretary General is viewed among member states and the international community as a central figure of common interests and ideals that the United Nations embodies.

Progress of the Security Council has been rather varied. During the late 1940s, the Security Council was quite effective in dealing with many issues that arose.²⁷ Most affairs the Council encountered dealt with typically centered on decolonization.²⁸ However, as time went on, relations between the Soviet Union and the United States deteriorated, and the Council faced setbacks. This stalemate came about due to the frequent use of the veto by the Soviet Union which blocked many efforts.²⁹ The other P-5 Members also utilized the veto as well. For example, both France and Great Britain vetoed resolutions during the Suez crisis of 1956.³⁰ Despite the frequent use of the veto during this period, the Security Council was able to take action and settle conflicts in South Asia, the crisis in the Congo and the successful execution of the ceasefire agreement in Cyprus.³¹ As the Cold War dissolved in the late 1980s, significant changes were incorporated within the Security Council’s working methods.³² It had become apparent that every conflict was beginning to present new and “unique set[s] of circumstances.”³³

In the past few years, the Security Council has become under scrutiny as to whether or not it will be able sustain its legitimacy among the growing international community.³⁴ Many of these attitudes have stemmed from a large portion of member states who wish to see the compositional arrangement of the Security Council reformed.³⁵ However, other reform attitudes have come from within the United Nations. According to the Brahimi Report of 2000, the document suggested that United Nations was beginning to encounter a vast number of limitations in the struggle against war and violence.³⁶ The report insisted that in order for the United Nations to overcome these “shortcomings,” there must be “an ongoing effort for [its] institutional change.”³⁷ Since the inception of the United Nations, over a hundred countries have joined the organization, including Japan and Germany which are the second and third largest financial contributors to the UN budget.³⁸ Many reformists agree that in order for the Security Council to remain effective and legitimate in years to come, it must grow to be more “reflective of today’s international realities.”³⁹ Any change in the composition of the Security Council would require an amendment to the United Nations Charter. Any prospective change faces a significant hurdle; the permanent members must unanimously agree on it. The primary hesitance among the P-5 Members is that even though “reform is a loaded word and its meaning is often subjective” any significant change in permanent status may disrupt or even destabilize power relationships among many of the Member States.⁴⁰ While reform has yet to happen, it is certain that the topic will remain prevalent for years to come.

²⁵ “United Nations Secretary General: The Office.” United Nations. http://www.un.org/news/oss/sg/pages/sg_office.html

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Karen Mingst. *Essentials of International Relations*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company. 1999.

²⁸ Cameron R. Hume. “The Security Council in the Twenty-First Century.” *The U.N. Security Council: From the Cold War to the Twenty-First Century*. Ed. David M. Malone. Boulder: Lynne Rienner. 2004.

²⁹ Karen Mingst. *Essentials of International Relations*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company. 1999.

³⁰ Brian Urquhart. *A Life in Peace and War*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company. 1987.

³¹ David M. Malone. “Conclusion.” *The U.N. Security Council: From the Cold War to the Twenty-First Century*. Ed. David M. Malone. Boulder: Lynne Rienner. 2004.

³² Ibid.

³³ “Briefing of Post Conflict Peace-building.” United Nations Association of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. <http://www.una-uk.org/UN&C/Peacebuilding.html>

³⁴ “United Nations Secretary General: The Office.” United Nations. http://www.un.org/news/oss/sg/pages/sg_office.html

³⁵ William Boston, et. al. “Is There a Better Model For the U.N.?” *Time*. 164, no. 24. December 13, 2004.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Linda Fasulo. *An Insider’s Guide to the United Nation*. New Haven :Yale University Press. 2004.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

Current members of the Security Council include: ARGENTINA, CHINA, DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO, DENMARK, FRANCE, GHANA, GREECE, JAPAN, PERU, QATAR, RUSSIAN FEDERATION, SLOVAKIA, TANZANIA, UNITED KINGDOM, and UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

Conceptual Notions and Specific Problems Facing the UN Security Council

*“In an age of global inequities...and multiple security threats, the United Nations is the only universal institution that can deal with the twin imperatives for peace and development in an integrated manner.”*⁴¹ - Necla Tschirgi

Throughout history, armed conflict has been the defining character of the rise and fall of societies, civilizations and nations. Disagreements over policy, economy, religion and culture has led to countless deaths and untold abuses. Today, each conflict presents an exceptional, multidimensional set of conditions. It is a special feature of the modern Western world to believe that humans are capable to alter and control the physical and social environments in which they live, as well as changing the character of man so that conditions of life can be improved. “Like the elements of nature, people and their institutions have been seen as infinitely malleable, requiring only intelligence, good will, and the determination to improve and perfect [themselves].”⁴² As States begin to prepare themselves for matters of protection, at the same time they takes measures of developing a strong economic base, building up infrastructures, constructing armaments and generating mobilized militaries, to make and feel more secure. However, as States take these strides, their actions lead other states to greater insecurity by making them feel threatened. Known as the ‘security dilemma’, one State’s becoming more secure may cause another state’s security to feel diminished unless there is a presence of a centralized authority.⁴³

Prior to the establishment of the United Nations, international security was conceptualized primarily in terms of war, peace, and armed conflict. Essentially, state security revolved around protecting its people and territorial boundaries. “At the same time, a broader definition of security [became] elucidated—one that encompassed economic and social well-being, respect for human rights, adequate health care, and protection from diseases.”⁴⁴ More recently, international security has come to include development, attempts at eradicating poverty and any of the social ills associated with it, as these issues may in turn develop into security threats.

This year marks the sixth year anniversary since member states of the United Nations adopted the Millennium Declaration in 2000. While all of the major bodies of the United Nations have experienced some piece-meal achievements with regards to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), challenges still remain to their full attainment. In order for these challenges to be met and properly addressed by 2015, the United Nations, especially the Security Council, will have to face and provide solutions over concerns relating to peacekeeping operations and human security, but, also, to adequately counter threats to peace and security, not only including traditional war or conflict issues in border disputes, but issues of organized crime and civil violence, including terrorism and the drug trade, genocide, asymmetric threats, all of which can have equally catastrophic consequences, as well as the promotion of democracy and elections monitoring, including the verification of Iran.⁴⁵

Peacekeeping

⁴¹ Necla Tschirgi. “Root Causes of Peace and Challenges to Peacebuilding.” United Nations Global Security. <http://www.un-globalsecurity.org>

⁴² Donald Kagan. *On the Origins of War and the Preservation of Peace*. New York: Anchor Books. 1995.

⁴³ Barry R. Posen. “The Security Dilemma and Ethic Conflict.” *Survival*, 35, no. 1 (Spring 1993): 27-47.

⁴⁴ Karen Mingst. *Essentials of International Relations*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company. 1999

⁴⁵ Kofi Annan. “Report of the Secretary-General of the United Nations for decisions by Heads of State and Government.” United Nations. <http://www.un.org/largerfreedom/sumamary.html>

*“All Members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance, and facilities, including rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.”*⁴⁶ - Article 4, United Nations Charter

What Peacekeeping Is, and Why It Is Important

United Nations Peace operations entail three principle activities: conflict prevention and peacemaking; peacekeeping and peace building.⁴⁷ Long-term conflict prevention addresses the structural sources of conflict while peacemaking addresses conflict in progress and peace building establishes the foundations of peace.⁴⁸ While these operations are low-profile in nature and receive little notice, the United Nations’ largest and most visible peace operation is peacekeeping. Within the last 15 years, peacekeeping has evolved both in quality and quantity. While peacekeeping began with a military model designed to observe the ceasefires and separation of combatants after inter-State war, it has evolved and expanded into an integrated system of many elements, military, police and civilian personnel working to build peace after conflict.⁴⁹

Despite the best intentions of all parties involved, conflict does not end when peace agreements are signed. Inadequate political structures fail to provide for orderly transference of power, dissatisfied and vulnerable populations are manipulated and scarce resources intensify the anger and frustration among people trapped in poverty; these elements still remain once principle fighting within a conflict has ended and fuel the fires of war.⁵⁰ Many of today’s conflicts seem remote to those not directly in the line of fire, but nations should weigh the risks of action against the proven dangers of inaction.⁵¹ Failure by the international community to try and maintain peace and control conflict will eventually end in conflicts spilling over borders and across oceans. Further, many conflicts promulgate a host of problems including illegal traffic of arms, drugs and people, terrorism, refugee flows and damage to the environment.⁵² Therefore, it behooves the international community to take an active part in peacekeeping issues.

A Historical Overview

According to scholars, there have been at least five approaches to managing the insecurity among states that recognize an “anarchic international environment.”⁵³ While two of the approaches fall under a liberal theoretical perspective, focusing on multilateral efforts, the other two are embedded within realist theoretical perspectives, emphasizing individual state power. A 5th approach, not identified in either the liberal or realist perspectives, consists of a combination of the theoretical elements between the two, an approach identified as peacekeeping.

Though not specifically mentioned anywhere in the UN Charter, peacekeeping is a “quintessential function” of the United Nations Security Council in an era when collective security was viewed as virtually impossible.⁵⁴ It has evolved as a pragmatic solution in the early years of the UN when it became apparent that some of the Charter provisions relating to maintenance of international peace and security could not be implemented as they were envisioned.⁵⁵ With one of the Security Council’s first resolutions and the establishment of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO), the concept of peacekeeping was established as a method for preventing conflicts from escalating into war.⁵⁶ Thus, peacekeeping can be documented as an invention of the United Nations,

⁴⁶ *Charter of the United Nations*. The United Nations. June, 26, 1945.

⁴⁷ “United Nations Peacekeeping: Meeting New Challenges.” United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations. <http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/dpko/faq/preview.htm>

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ Karen Mingst. *Essentials of International Relations*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company. 1999.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ “Peacekeeping.” United Nations Dag Hammarskjold Library. <http://www.un.org/Depts/dhl/resguide/specpk.htm#pkdoc>

⁵⁶ Linda Fasulo. *An Insider’s Guide to the United Nation*. New Haven :Yale University Press. 2004.

created to demonstrate a consensual commitment among the international community to provide an unparalleled legitimacy in acts of intervention.⁵⁷

Generally, peacekeeping operations have fallen under one of two categories. The first category, first-generation peacekeeping, included the work of multilateral institutions seeking “to contain conflicts between two states through third-party military forces,” primarily with deploying troops to monitor and maintain armistices and ceasefire agreements.⁵⁸ Acting as a military service, first-generation peacekeepers physically imposed themselves as a situational buffer zone until the dispute could be settled. United Nations peacekeeping initially developed during the Cold War era as a means to ease tensions and help resolve conflicts between States by deploying unarmed or lightly armed military personnel from a number of countries, under UN command, between the armed forces of the former warring parties.⁵⁹ As a general rule, peacekeepers were deployed when a ceasefire was in place and the parties to the conflict had given their consent.

Peacekeeping continued to evolve with the end of the Cold War into what is referred to as second-generation peacekeeping. “Whereas first-generation peacekeeping activities primarily address interstate conflict,” second-generation peacekeeping activities are used to respond to civil strife and domestic unrest through the utilization of various functions, both military and nonmilitary means.⁶⁰ Freed from bipolarization, the Security Council established larger and more complex UN peacekeeping missions, often to help implement comprehensive peace agreements between protagonists in intra-State conflicts.⁶¹ With military means, peacekeeping forces have monitored the verification of troop withdrawals and separated warring factions until disrupting issues could be resolved. With nonmilitary means, peacekeeping forces have assisted in upholding “law and order” in failed or abusive states by participating in civil administration, policing, and infrastructure rebuilding.⁶²

The Basics of Peacekeeping

Being a member state of the United Nations “entails to an obligation to aspire to the principle of universal inclusiveness articulated” within its charter.⁶³ To be able to fully extend protection to the entire alliance, standards of the international organization must truly be universal on the basis of certain attributed characteristics, including race, religion, culture, and political beliefs. The concept of peacekeeping is one of those principles most, if not all, Member States have supported since it was first drafted.⁶⁴ Peacekeeping operations are established by the Security Council as the organ designated by the UN Charter as primarily responsible for peace and security, however, the financial aspects of peacekeeping are considered by the General Assembly.⁶⁵

Peacekeeping is a way to help countries torn by conflict to create conditions for sustainable peace. UN peacekeepers monitor and observe peace processes that emerge in post-conflict situations and assist conflicting parties to implement the agreements they have signed. The form this assistance comes in includes: promoting human security, confidence-building measures, power-sharing arrangements, electoral support, strengthening the rule of law and economic and social development.⁶⁶

Today, more than 100 countries contribute to peacekeeping operations with more than 90,000 personnel serving in 1 of the 18 United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations on 4 continents in 10 time zones.⁶⁷ Of those serving, roughly 70% serving as troop members of military observers, 8% serving as police forces and the remaining

⁵⁷ “Fact Sheet.” United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations. <http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/dpko/index.asp>

⁵⁸ Karen Mingst. *Essentials of International Relations*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company. 1999.

⁵⁹ “United Nations Peacekeeping: Meeting New Challenges.” United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations. <http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/dpko/faq/preview.htm>

⁶⁰ Karen Mingst. *Essentials of International Relations*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company. 1999.

⁶¹ “United Nations Peacekeeping: Meeting New Challenges.” United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations. <http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/dpko/faq/preview.htm>

⁶² Karen Mingst, *Essentials of International Relations*, (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1999): 165-194

⁶³ John D. Steinbruner. *Principles of Global Security*. Washington D.C.: Brookings Institute. 2000.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ “Peacekeeping.” United Nations Dag Hammarskjöld Library. <http://www.un.org/Depts/dhl/resguide/specpk.htm#pkdoc>

⁶⁶ “United Nations Peacekeeping: Meeting New Challenges.” United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations. <http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/dpko/faq/preview.htm>

⁶⁷ “Fact Sheet.” United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations. <http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/dpko/index.asp>

22% serving as international civilian personnel, local civilian staff, or organizational volunteers.⁶⁸ Over 108 countries contribute military and police personnel to UN peacekeeping operations.⁶⁹ In comparative terms, the United Nations is the largest multilateral organization that deploys more personnel than any other international body, and is second behind the United States in deploying military personnel.⁷⁰ Since the inception of the United Nations in 1948, peacekeeping operations have negotiated 172 settlements, have assisted in citizen's participation in free and fair elections of 45 countries and have undertaken approximately 60 field missions.⁷¹ The environments in which peacekeepers enter into are "the most difficult and least governed of any that international operations have ever encountered."⁷² UN operations have provided practical assistance to tremendously vulnerable populations, deploying where others cannot or will not play a vital role in providing a bridge to stability and eventually long-term peace and development.⁷³

In addition to maintaining peace and security, peacekeepers are increasingly charged with assisting in political processes, reforming justice systems, training law-enforcement and police forces and disarming former combatants.⁷⁴ For example, under its disarmament, demobilization and reintegration program, the UN Mission in Sierra Leone (UNIOSIL) destroyed 42,330 weapons and more than 1.2 million rounds of ammunition, disarmed 75,490 combatants (including 6,845 child soldiers) and provided reintegration benefits to almost 55,000 ex-fighters.⁷⁵ The UN Mission in Timor-Leste (UNOTIL) created a Gender Affairs Unit which provided training to women entering public service and worked to ensure that women were represented in the new government and civil society. Today, over 25% of the country's parliament is made up of women, one of the highest numbers of women in parliament in the world.⁷⁶

To establish a new peacekeeping mission, or change the mandate or strength of an existing mission, nine of the Security Council Member States must vote in favor.⁷⁷ However, if any one of the five permanent members votes against the proposal, it fails. Once a mission is created, it is the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) that directs and manages the missions on behalf of the Secretary-General, who reports to the Security Council on their progress.⁷⁸ Most missions are headed by a Special Representative of the Secretary-General.⁷⁹ DPKO assists the Secretary-General in formulating policies and procedures for peacekeeping, making recommendations on the establishment of new missions and in managing ongoing mission.

Senior military officers, staff officers and military observers serving on United Nations missions are directly employed by the UN, though usually on secondment from their national armed forces.⁸⁰ Peacekeeping troops, known as Blue Helmets, participate in UN peacekeeping under terms that are carefully negotiated by their Governments and remain under the overall authority of those governments while serving under UN operational command.⁸¹ The authority to deploy peacekeepers remains with the Government that volunteered them, as does responsibility for pay, disciplinary and personnel matters. Police officers are also contributed by Member States and serve on the same basis military observers.⁸²

The cost of peacekeeping efforts has fluctuated over the past two decades, ranging from between \$1 billion and \$3 billion on a biannual budget, dependant upon both the nature of the conflicts and the peace missions that are

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ Ibid.

⁷² Ibid.

⁷³ Ibid.

⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁷ "United Nations Peacekeeping: Meeting New Challenges." United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations. <http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/dpko/faq/preview.htm>

⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹ Ibid.

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² Ibid.

established to resolve the disputes.⁸³ However, a survey of Oxford University economists found that international military intervention under the UN is the most cost-effective means of reducing the risk of conflict in post-conflict situations.⁸⁴ The approved peacekeeping budget for 2005-2006 represents only 0.5% of global military spending during that time period.⁸⁵ Although Member States are obliged by law to pay certain percentages of the total peacekeeping budget based on their nation's yearly GNP (one that is separate from that of the UN's budget) as of summer 2004, roughly \$1.2 billion in current and back peacekeeping dues were owed.⁸⁶ Despite the large amount of countries that contribute personnel and financial resources to United Nations peacekeeping, operations still require vast amounts of workers and economic aid.

Challenges in the New Millennium

Peacekeeping is considered successful in the short term when the mandate given to it by the Security Council was effectively fulfilled. However, ultimately UN involvements in post-conflict situations are judged by the ability of the country involved to sustain long-term peace and stability and embark on the road to rebuilding and development. There are several examples of several peacekeeping missions, including: transitions to democratic rule in Namibia, El Salvador, Nicaragua and Guatemala. UN peacekeepers oversaw the withdrawal of foreign forces from Cambodia and conducted the 1993 free elections.⁸⁷

Yet each peacekeeping mission does not bring success. Some countries have lapsed back into conflict a few years after the UN mission was completed, as Under-Secretary-General Guehenno said, "Successful operations...in which the patient dies."⁸⁸ A recent example of a post-UN peacekeeping situation going astray occurred recently in Timor-Leste. In Spring 2006, only a year after a successful peacekeeping mission, violence has again broken out. Secretary-General Kofi Annan has said that the United Nations needed to look critically at its role in the recent past and carefully assess whether it had withdrawn its peacekeeping forces too soon.⁸⁹ Building peace takes time and the international community must be willing to work with local institutions until they are ready to should responsibility for democratic governance.

Over the past few years the challenges that UN peacekeepers face have grown immensely as the international community has witnessed a major surge in demand for United Nations peace operations. New complex and multidimensional missions, massive deployments of military and civilian personnel and charges of sexual exploitation and abuse by UN peacekeepers have challenged the UN like never before. The recent revelations of sexual exploitation and abuse by UN peacekeepers has harmed their reputation and threatened to undermine their ability to implement Security Council mandates.⁹⁰ These incidences have also undermined the trust of traumatized and poverty stricken local populations and violated the fundamental duty of care incumbent upon all peacekeepers.⁹¹ The UN Secretariat and Member States reacted with a series of measures designed to prevent and punish violations of the UN's standards of conduct. In 2004, the Secretary-General appointed a Special Advisor to produce a framework for effective and long term action which endorsed wide ranging reforms covering standards of conduct; investigations; organizational, managerial and command responsibility; and individual disciplinary, financial and criminal accountability.⁹² In the field, a network of focal points on sexual exploitation and abuse in all peacekeeping mission headquarters facilitate receipt of allegations and requests for assistance.⁹³ All peacekeepers are also required to undergo training on standards of conduct relating to sexual exploitation and abuse and have established some geographical areas which are out of bounds to troops.⁹⁴

⁸³ "Fact Sheet." United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations. <http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/dpko/index.asp>

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ "United Nations Peacekeeping: Meeting New Challenges." United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations. <http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/dpko/faq/preview.htm>

⁹¹ Ibid.

⁹² Ibid.

⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁴ Ibid.

Related to the issue of sexual exploitation, has been the prominence of HIV/AIDS within peacekeeping units. Reducing the risk of peacekeepers contracting or transmitting HIV while on mission is a key priority of the UN. Member States are strongly encouraged to provide pre-deployment voluntary counseling and testing for peacekeepers and a standardized training module has been developed for troop and police contributing countries to establish a base level of HIV knowledge and awareness prior to deployment.⁹⁵ Further, all major peacekeeping operations have AIDS advisors, supported by UN volunteers and national professionals to provide ongoing sensitization and awareness for civilian and uniformed personnel, including training of peer educators and distributing UNAIDS awareness cards in 12 languages that contain basic facts about HIV transmission and what to do in an accident.⁹⁶

Despite these and other challenges, the surge in demand for peacekeepers has demonstrated that countries emerging from conflicts need United Nations assistance and reflects the confidence of Member States in UN peacekeeping as the right tool to handle these difficult tasks.

Theoretical Observations on Peacekeeping and Collective Security

Collective security is a system aspiring to the maintenance of peace, in which participants agree that any “breach of the peace is to be declared to be of concern to all the participating states,” and will result in a collective response.⁹⁷ Essentially, the notion is “captured in the old adage ‘one for all and all for one,’” and, ideally, no government could conquer another or otherwise disturb the peace for fear of retribution from all governments.⁹⁸ The principles for collective security necessary for success include: all major players must be involved and committed, there must be a sense of community among all participants in sharing an ideological agreement or clear purpose, members must renounce war and territorial expansion, all members must be committed to respond to breaches of the peace regardless of previous alliances or ally ties, and members must have a rough military balance.⁹⁹

Though central to the idea of peacekeeping, some scholars have begun questioning whether or not collective security can be relied upon to protect or restore peace in times of conflicting situations, as “experience with collective security indicates considerable ‘gaps’.”¹⁰⁰ First, many states refuse to join a collective effort because they have already defined their enemies and allies. Take for instance whether or not a Member State of the United Nations would join in on an UN led effort against one of its allies. Second, balance of power problems exist in regulating strong aggressors. When trying to exercise a collective effort against a state with nuclear capabilities, the international community would face an insurmountable difficulty if massive destruction were to occur. Third, collective efforts can be costly through a direct and indirect means. Not only do Member States have to pay dues to an overall budget, but they may also suffer economically as sanctions can affect both the aggressor and sometimes those that initiated the sanctions. Fourth, the concept of collective security bases its premise on all victims being treated equally. However, the past reveals that many Member States differentiate between what states are worth defending and those that are not.¹⁰¹ Thus, “collective security has been viewed sometimes as a halfway house between world government and the pure state system,” as it is often seen “as a process that could make the state system more livable by making it more secure.”¹⁰²

With concerns mounting over whether or not collective security is worthwhile, others too, began questioning if peacekeeping efforts are imposed on lesser powers as a means to avoid a power competition. An unpleasant truth behind war is that although it is seen as a great evil, it also has some virtue in that it can resolve conflict, thereby leading to peace. “Since the establishment of the United Nations and the enshrinement of great-power politics in its Security Council... wars among lesser powers have rarely been allowed to run their natural course.”¹⁰³

⁹⁵ Ibid.

⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁹⁷ Martin Wight. *Systems of States*. London: Leicester University Press. 1977.

⁹⁸ Karen Mingst, *Essentials of International Relations*, (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1999): 165-194

⁹⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰ Thomas G. Weiss, David P. Forsythe, and Roger Coate. *The United Nations and Changing World Politics*, 3rd ed. Boulder: Westview Press. 2004.

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

¹⁰² Ibid.

¹⁰³ Edward N. Luttwak. “Give War a Chance.” *Foreign Affairs*. 78, no. 4. July 1999.

At times, uninterrupted war can often lead to unjust outcomes and human rights violations. However, war can also lead to a more stable environment. Over the past 60 years, the international community has witnessed an interruption in wars early on. Instead, ceasefire agreements and armistices have been imposed permitting belligerents to reorganize and rearm their forces. In the case of ceasefires, “opponents [use the pause] to recruit, train, and equip additional forces for further combat, prolonging the war and widening the scope of its killing and destruction.”¹⁰⁴ And, in armistices, unless peace accords happen shortly thereafter instances “artificially freeze conflict and perpetuate a state of war indefinitely by shielding the weaker side from the consequences of refusing to make concession of peace.”¹⁰⁵

Most agree that peacekeeping strategies need to be more fully devised and realistic benchmarks need to be set in order for missions to be successful. It is imperative that the Security Council find new ways to bring Member States and any affiliated organizations together in hopes of preventing conflict, as sustained support and diplomatic cooperation is needed for these missions to be successful. Without Member States’ endorsements, the United Nations will have difficulty implementing the peacekeeping agenda, where human rights, development and peace interconnect. Although many techniques are employed to manage insecurity, they are not always successful. Therefore, the United Nations should move to consider that in order for “peace-making and peace-keeping operations, to be truly successful, [they] must come to include comprehensive efforts to identify and support structures which will tend to consolidate peaces and advance a sense of confidence and well-being among people.”¹⁰⁶

Human Security

“The world must advance the causes of security, development and human rights together, otherwise none will succeed. Humanity will not enjoy security without development, it will not enjoy development without security, and it will not enjoy either without respect for human rights.”¹⁰⁷ - Kofi Annan

Security Matters

Throughout the Cold War, a competing bipolar world existed between the United States and the Soviet Union, east and west.¹⁰⁸ This situation presented a lack of communication and involvement among states, intelligence agencies and non-governmental organizations in escalating security situations.¹⁰⁹ However, as the Cold War came to an end, and there was no longer a threat of nuclear annihilation, new threats that posed just as great of a danger emerged.

Since the end of the Cold War, our understanding of state security has greatly changed. In addition to securing borders and people from external attacks, we have come to understand the dangers of environmental pollution, the spread of infectious diseases such as HIV/AIDS, massive population movements and the threat of transnational crime and terrorism.¹¹⁰ The process of globalization has deeply transformed relationships between and within states. Money, goods, information and people move fast within and across borders.

And yet, not everyone has experienced the triumphs of globalization. The income gap that exists between rich and poor is by far the widest it has seemingly ever been. Each day 40,000 children die from malnutrition and disease.¹¹¹ Water contaminated by sewage is estimated to kill two million children every year.¹¹² Some 840 million people go

¹⁰⁴ Ibid.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid.

¹⁰⁶ Boutros Boutros-Ghali. “An Agenda for Peace Preventive diplomacy, peacemaking, and peace-keeping.” United Nations Security Council. <http://www.un.org/Docs/SG/agpeace.html>

¹⁰⁷ Kofi Annan. “In larger Freedom’: Towards Development, Security and Human Rights For All.” *UN Chronicle*. 1 .2005.

¹⁰⁸ Jeffery T. Richelson. *A Century of Spies: Intelligence Gathering in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Oxford University Press. 1995.

¹⁰⁹ “U.N. System and Civil Society – An Inventory and Analysis of Practices.” Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations. <http://www.ngocongo.org/UN-civil%20society-background%20paper1.doc>

¹¹⁰ Sadako Ogata. “Empowering People for Human Security: Payne Lecture at Stanford University.” Commission on Human Security. www.humansecurity-chs.org/newsandevents/payne.htm

¹¹¹ Oscar Arias. “Globalization and the Challenges of Human Security.” University of San Diego. 1998.

¹¹² Ibid.

hungry or face food security; while nearly 1/3 of the people in the least developed countries are not expected to live past the age of 40.¹¹³ Over 1 billion people live on less than a dollar a day, lack access to basic health services and potable water and are illiterate.¹¹⁴

Traditionally, the word security refers to the protection against danger or loss of life, autonomy or property. On the international spectrum, however, this term is most often applied when referring to nation states, hence, national security. However, conflict and deprivation are interconnected. “Deprivation has many causal links to violence... Conversely, wars kill people, destroy trust among them, increase poverty and crime, and slow down the economy.”¹¹⁵ Therefore, the approach towards alleviating conflict and deprivation should “be seen as part of a broader theoretical framework, a concept referred to as human security.”¹¹⁶

The Importance of Human Security

The Commission on Human Security defines human security as the protection of “the vital core of all human lives in ways that enhance human freedoms and fulfillment.”¹¹⁷ Human security protects fundamental freedoms and protects people from critical and pervasive threats and situations by using processes that build on people’s strengths and aspirations.¹¹⁸ Human security is a fairly new practice that “attempts to broaden security thinking from ‘national security’ and the military defense of boundaries to a ‘people-centered approach of anticipating and coping with the multiple threats faced by ordinary people in an increasingly globalizing world.”¹¹⁹ While national security focuses on the defense from external attack, human security is about protecting individuals and communities from any form of political violence.¹²⁰ Independently, the concept entails defending fundamental freedoms of people, protecting them against critical and pervasive threats or situations, using processes that build on their strengths and aspirations as well as creating political, social, environmental, economic, military and cultural systems that, when joined together, provide the building blocks for survival, livelihood and dignity.¹²¹

These building blocks can be broken into three distinct categories: freedom from wants, freedom from fears and the freedom to live in dignity. Freedom from wants insures that a person or family does not lack both the financial means and basic necessities required, mostly including food, water, education and shelter, to have a healthy and successful life. Approximately 18 million people die each year from living in impoverished conditions around the world, and nearly a billion individuals live on less than \$1 per day.¹²² While these figures still indicate an alarming presence of poverty, the international community has seen a dramatic decrease in it within the last 25 years. Thus, with a shared and continuous vision, the present generation has the resources and technology to eradicate the human race from wants.¹²³

The concept of security entails various meanings. In fact, there is no broad consensus on the meaning of it. The fight against terrorism, the diffusion of weapons of mass destruction, the Iraqi war, the spread of infectious diseases, the loss of employment and the decline in economic growth all impact security in a different way. And, as a consequence, people and countries feel more insecure and apprehensive today than just five years ago. Therefore, the freedom from fear would afford opportunities for working towards the removal of these threats. The rapid

¹¹³ Ibid.

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

¹¹⁵ “Outline of the Report of the Commission on Human Security.” Commission on Human Security. <http://www.humansecurity-chs.org/finalreport/index.html>

¹¹⁶ Sorpong Peou. “The UN, Peacekeeping and Collective Human Security.” *International Peacekeeping*. 9. No. 2. Summer 2002.

¹¹⁷ “Human Security.” United Nations Offices for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. <http://ochaonline.un.org/webpage.asp?SiteID=311>

¹¹⁸ Ibid.

¹¹⁹ Lincoln Chen, Jennifer Leaning and Vasant Narasimhan. *Global Health Challenges for Human Security*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 2003.

¹²⁰ “What is Human Security?” *The Human Security Report 2005*. Human Security Centre. <http://www.humansecurityreport.info/content/view/24/59/>

¹²¹ “Outline of the Report of the Commission on Human Security.” Commission on Human Security. <http://www.humansecurity-chs.org/finalreport/index.html>

¹²² Ibid.

¹²³ Kofi Annan. “‘In larger Freedom’: Towards Development, Security and Human Rights For All.” *UN Chronicle*. 1. 2005.

movement of people, capital, goods and ideas within and across borders has greatly affected the capacity of states to manage security issues in an interdependent world. Thus, globalization has created unprecedented opportunities for economic expansion, having the potential to reach people and countries once before excluded.¹²⁴

Freedom to dignity offers people the right to be treated as free and equal individuals within society. It allows them to be free from all forms of discrimination. Since the beginning of the United Nations a number of conventions have been signed, proclaiming the inalienable rights of all people. However, in some parts of the world, without a renewed commitment to see that the agreements have been put into practice, their intentions are void and actions meaningless. Thus, only the international community can hold states in violation and move the world from one of “legislation to implementation.”¹²⁵ “In a world of interconnected threats and opportunities, it is in each country’s self-interest that all of these challenges are addressed effectively. Hence the cause of larger freedom can only be advanced by broad, deep and sustained global cooperation among states.”¹²⁶

Broadening the Concept of Security to Include Individuals

Human security and national security should be mutually reinforcing. Unfortunately, secure states do not automatically mean secure peoples.¹²⁷ Indeed, during the last 100 years far more people have been killed by their own governments than by foreign armies.¹²⁸ Over the last couple of decades, our understanding of state security and the many types of threats has broadened to include civil violence, organized crime, transnational terrorism, weapons of mass destruction and other elements. This reflects the growing recognition of the important role that individuals and communities can play in ensuring their own security. When the needs of individuals are not met, they become marginalized. This marginalization of whole groups often leads them looking for validation in places that many have political motivations against states, for example some madrasahs filled with impoverished children.

To attain the goals of human security, the Commission on Human Security proposes a framework based on the protection and empowerment of people. The protection-empowerment framework is not a new concept. It can be found in the operations of any well-governed state. It is the combination of “top down” norms, processes and institutions, including the establishment of rule of law, good governance, accountability, and social protective instruments with a “bottom up” focus in which democratic processes support the important role of individuals and communities as actors in defining and implementing their essential freedoms.¹²⁹

Attempts are being made to realize the United Nations’ *Millennium Declaration* and the MDGs, by building on them and undertaking efforts to address the full range of critical and pervasive threats facing people through human security. The Commission on Human Security has identified 6 areas in which human security can be achieved: by protecting people in violent conflict; protecting and empowering people on the move; protecting and empowering people in post-conflict situations; by giving people economic power to choose among opportunities; securing human health and building knowledge, skills and values among people.¹³⁰

Challenges Faced in Addressing Human Security Issues

If security is to be protected conflict prevented, human rights respected and poverty eradicated, the United Nations will require a new consensus on security, a consensus with a shared responsibility. Human security provides an impetus for all countries, whether developed or developing, to review existing security, economic, development and social policies, by creating genuine opportunities for people’s safety, livelihood and dignity should be the overall objective of these guiding principles.

¹²⁴ Micheline Ishay. “Promoting Human Rights in the Era of Globalization and Interventions: The Changing Spaces of Struggle.” *Globalizations*. 1 No. 2 .Dec. 2004.

¹²⁵ Kofi Annan. “‘In larger Freedom’: Towards Development, Security and Human Rights For All.” *UN Chronicle*. 1. 2005.

¹²⁶ Ibid.

¹²⁷ “What is Human Security?” *The Human Security Report 2005*. Human Security Centre.
<http://www.humansecurityreport.info/content/view/24/59/>

¹²⁸ Ibid.

¹²⁹ “Q & A on Human Security.” United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs.
<http://ochaonline.un.org/webpage.asp?ParentID=10473&MenuID=10480&Page=2048>

¹³⁰ “Outline of the Report if the Commission on Human Security.” Commission on Human Security.
<http://www.humansecurity-chs.org/finalreport/index.html>

While “virtually everyone would concede that [human security] occasionally is a necessary means of overcoming oppression or unlocking other restraints on social progress,” many began to wonder whether or not the Security Council is capable of handling such a multidimensional matter.¹³¹ Most people would like to believe that the United Nations is an idealistic organization, acting upon “impartial moral and legal authority.”¹³² According to many international scholars, the organization is merely another forum where members engage in political maneuvers. Many find this behavior unbecoming, thereby causing the Security Council’s effectiveness to be weakened. The General Assembly does not have enough power to effectively deal with human security, and the Security Council is restrained by those permanent members with veto powers whose national interests vary. This coupled with the belief that “sovereignty is the bedrock of international order” leaves the United Nations stranded when trying to determine whether or not to take action on issues centering on human security.¹³³

Nonetheless, building the political will for a task of this magnitude is a difficult task. Efforts among actors to create the political will for human security must include raising awareness, coalition forming and policy advocacy. Once this has been accomplished, only then can state actors move towards implementing an effective early warning system to alert the international community, regional alliances, and, especially, the Security Council about human security concerns. In order for this to be accomplished, the Security Council must call for an “international, decentralized global effort of many organizations.” However, some states only see this possible if adequate reform takes place among the Security Council, including attempts at defining and adequately addressing the issues of genocide and terrorism.

Asymmetric Threats

Asymmetric warfare is a term that describes a military situation in which two belligerents of unequal strength interact and take advantage of their respective strengths and weaknesses. This interaction often involves strategies and tactics outside the bounds of conventional warfare. Simply put, asymmetric threats or techniques are a version of not “fighting fair,” including the prospect of an opponent designing a strategy that fundamentally alters the terrain on which a conflict is fought.¹³⁴

Historical examples of such strategies include terrorism by proxy, used by various Islamic states against U.S. and European interests and the Serbs taking UN personnel hostage to deter military escalation by NATO forces during 1994 and 95.¹³⁵ Recent examples include the use of nerve agent in the Tokyo subway by Aum Shinrikyo and Al Qaeda’s offensive leading to its attacks on 9/11.¹³⁶ Emerging asymmetric threats include high-technology sensors, communications and weapon systems, means that only require an extremely small amount of manpower and financial backing to carry out. Cyber-warfare could be used to disrupt the new generation information-technology military logistics systems.¹³⁷ Whether most people know it or not, asymmetric warfare now dominates public attention in relation to matters of security.

Characteristics of Asymmetry

Technology plays a critical role in asymmetric threats. Strategically, standards of living worldwide depend fundamentally on integrated technical systems that are susceptible to idiosyncratic threats, from financial markets to transportation and communication systems to electric power grids.¹³⁸ The word idiosyncratic means possessing a

¹³¹ Tom Freeman. “Mission Impossible?” *New Statesman*. Oct. 2004.

¹³² Ibid.

¹³³ Ibid.

¹³⁴ “Asymmetric Threats.” *1998 Strategic Assessment: Engaging Power For Peace*. National Defense University. <http://www.ndu.edu/inss/Strategic%20Assessments/sa98/sa98cont.html>

¹³⁵ “Asymmetric Threats.” *1998 Strategic Assessment: Engaging Power For Peace*. National Defense University. <http://www.ndu.edu/inss/Strategic%20Assessments/sa98/sa98cont.html>

¹³⁶ Montgomery C. Meigs. “Unorthodox Thoughts about Asymmetric Warfare.” *Parameters: US Army War College Quarterly*. Summer 2003.

¹³⁷ “Asymmetric Threats.” *1998 Strategic Assessment: Engaging Power For Peace*. National Defense University. <http://www.ndu.edu/inss/Strategic%20Assessments/sa98/sa98cont.html>

¹³⁸ Montgomery C. Meigs. “Unorthodox Thoughts about Asymmetric Warfare.” *Parameters: US Army War College Quarterly*. Summer 2003.

peculiar or eccentric pattern.¹³⁹ Idiosyncratic threats, like asymmetric, are unorthodox approaches or means of applying a capability and do not follow the rules and is peculiar in a sinister sense.¹⁴⁰ While these systems that we depend so much on have internal safeguards against failure in normal operations, they do not have the ability to avoid catastrophic failure when they are interrupted or attacked in an unexpected, unanticipated, and peculiar way that generates cascading or accelerating effects.¹⁴¹ Considering that young hackers have been able to break into the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) computers, suggests that determine 'cyber-warriors' from a hostile nation or a well-financed terrorist group might inflict considerable damage on a vast number of networked processors and databanks necessary for the operation of critical infrastructure.¹⁴²

Additionally, an asymmetric threat can also be created when one uses technology or weaponry that is not even particularly highly technological in nature when it is used in an idiosyncratic nature. Take for example, the Al Qaeda's attack on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. "If one thinks of a modern passenger plane in terms of its explosive and incendiary potential, one has a guided missile of devastating effect."¹⁴³ Al Qaeda was able to take for granted the system of commerce and transportation; easy ticketing procedures, passenger handling, and access to the cockpit made it that much easier.¹⁴⁴ Al Qaeda was able to change its operational system at will in response to the methods needed to approach and attack a new target. Its use of one-time cellular teams and support structure and command system were all new forms of asymmetric warfare.¹⁴⁵ Another characteristic of asymmetric threats (though it has also increasingly become a characteristic of 'conventional' warfare) is the disregard for civilian life. Indeed, like terrorists, asymmetric warfare often specifically targets civilian populations in order to demoralize their true targets (often governments).¹⁴⁶ Because perpetrators of asymmetric threats do not often wear distinguishing clothing or symbols (like opposing militaries may) they are often able to hide 'in the open' among civilian populations.¹⁴⁷

Trials and Countermeasures

There are many challenges inherent in addressing issues of asymmetric threats. The information age creates difficulties for national and international decision makers and intelligence agencies. Modern encryption easily available to the public domain gives anyone with internet access the ability to encrypt their personal communications with keys that are virtually impossible to break.¹⁴⁸ More and more, opponents using asymmetric threats, whether traditional military or terrorist, can communicate via commercial channels without the fear of being caught and punished.¹⁴⁹ As former retired General Montgomery C. Meigs, former Commander of the US Army Europe points out,

"In the growing sea of bits, finding and getting to the relevant information takes significantly more time, effort, and money. No longer must the spy, terrorist, criminal, or rogue paramilitary develop his own secure and stealthy means of communication. Instead, they can wrap themselves in 128- or 512-bit encryption, knowing that if they act quickly the intelligence value of the content of their communications will decay, usually well before they can be caught."¹⁵⁰

¹³⁹ "Idiosyncratic." Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary. <http://www.m-w.com/dictionary/idiosyncratic>

¹⁴⁰ Montgomery C. Meigs. "Unorthodox Thoughts about Asymmetric Warfare." *Parameters: US Army War College Quarterly*. Summer 2003.

¹⁴¹ Ibid.

¹⁴² Jonathan B. Tucker. "Asymmetric Warfare." Forum for Applied Research and Public Policy. <http://forum.ra.utk.edu/1999summer/asymmetric.htm>

¹⁴³ Montgomery C. Meigs. "Unorthodox Thoughts about Asymmetric Warfare." *Parameters: US Army War College Quarterly*. Summer 2003.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid.

¹⁴⁶ Steven Lee. "Double Effect, Double Intention, and Asymmetric Warfare." *Journal of Military Ethics*. 2004

¹⁴⁷ Ibid.

¹⁴⁸ Montgomery C. Meigs. "Unorthodox Thoughts about Asymmetric Warfare." *Parameters: US Army War College Quarterly*. Summer 2003.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid.

Moral conviction and conventional diplomatic and military efficiency alone will not allow the international community to understand and counter a threat that attacks society and its operational structures. To respond properly, the international community needs to address the full range of military activity associated with unconventional warfare. To address the challenges of the new strategic environment, a new form of hybrid intelligence and cooperation is required. Unless structures can be placed in the field that obviate the boundaries of organizational culture and turf and fuse intelligence across disciplines, the danger of missing ‘the big picture’ is magnified.

Verification

“Rigorous design, monitoring and compliance with the agreed terms of such embargoes can contribute significantly to the promotion of international peace and security, and to the respect of a wide range of human rights and fundamental freedoms as required in international law.”¹⁵¹ - Brian Wood

Nuclear Compliance and the United Nations

Ever since the beginning of the Cold War, the international community has been focused on how the threat of nuclear destruction may affect international peace and security. The Charter of the United Nations highlights the importance that its founders placed on disarmament, even though the majority of States knew virtually nothing about nuclear weapons and their destructive power.¹⁵² Even then, it was not an issue that could be considered on its own; instead it was seen as part of a general framework for international peace and security. The Charter makes two references to disarmament. Article 11 notes that the General Assembly “may consider the general principles of cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments.”¹⁵³ Article 26 says that the Security Council, “in order to promote the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion for armaments of the world’s human and economic resources...shall be responsible for formulating, with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee...plans to be submitted to the Members...for the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments.”¹⁵⁴ Therefore, the General Assembly was supposed to discuss the general principles and the Security Council was supposed to work out the plan for a system of arms regulation.

Unfortunately, the Charter did not create a legal basis for disarmament. However, the very first resolution of the General Assembly addressed disarmament and expressed the need to bring nuclear power under control.¹⁵⁵ In 1957, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) was established as an autonomous organization under the United Nations as the world’s foremost forum for scientific and technical cooperation in the peaceful use of nuclear technology.¹⁵⁶ The IAEA is also mandated to create safeguards to ensure that countries using nuclear technologies are not secretly developing nuclear weapons; a process called compliance. This has led to hundreds of nuclear facilities being safeguarded by the IAEA in over 70 countries.¹⁵⁷

The process of gathering and analyzing information to make a judgment about parties’ compliance or non-compliance with an agreement is referred to as verification, and it serves as a confidence building measure between parties’ in concern in order to assure the international community that the agreement in concern is implemented effectively.¹⁵⁸ While the process of verification adds credibility to international agreements on nuclear issues, it also serves as a mechanism to facilitate trust and cooperation among member states of the Nuclear Non Proliferation Treaty (NPT). The NPT requires that all non-nuclear-weapon States conclude comprehensive IAEA safeguard

¹⁵¹ Brian Wood. “Strengthening compliance with UN arms embargoes –key challenges for monitoring and verification.” Amnesty International. <http://web.amnesty.org/library/index/engior400052006>

¹⁵² Dr. Nabil Elaraby. “The Security Council and Nuclear Weapons.” Global Policy Forum. <http://www.globalpolicy.org/security/docs/elaraby.htm>

¹⁵³ *Charter of the United Nations*. The United Nations. June 26, 1945.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁶ “IAEA Fundamentals.” International Atomic Energy Agency. <http://www.iaea.org/Publications/Factsheets/English/iaea-e.pdf>

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁸ “Chapter 1: Verification.” United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research. <http://www.unidir.org/pdf/articles/pdf-art1931.pdf>

agreements and submit all nuclear material to IAEA monitoring.¹⁵⁹ The NPT is central to all verification measures as it establishes a binding, international commitment to the goal of disarmament. Governments sign agreements with the IAEA pledging to disclose their materials. Thus, the primary objective of verification is to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and weapons technology and to promote cooperation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.¹⁶⁰

Verification can be achieved through detection, deterrence and confidence building.¹⁶¹ In addition to the objectives of detecting non-compliant states and deterring potential non-compliers, an effective verification regime also allows the parties in concern to demonstrate compliance through confidence building measures. By establishing official, systematic and consistent communication, confidence building measures helps prevent unnecessary doubts and suspicions and assures the international community of the peaceful intentions of the State's nuclear program.¹⁶² Confidence building measures therefore, are integral to the success of the verification process, without which relevant organs such as the IAEA cannot verify a state's compliance to the NPT and additional safeguards put in place under its statute.¹⁶³

The Security Council and Verification

Although the IAEA plays the central role in the verifications process, it has increasingly become an issue of concern for the Security Council. As stated before, the Security Council is given particular responsibilities with regards to disarmament by the United Nations Charter. However, some believe that over the last half century, the Security Council has neglected this obligation, until recently. The Security Council first approached the issue of disarmament in 1968 when it adopted Resolution 255, a resolution that contained assurances for non-nuclear weapon states, yet not much has happened since.¹⁶⁴

Since Resolution 255, the Security Council has created two verification bodies – the United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) and the United Nations Monitoring and Verification and Inspection Commission (UNMOVIC); both, of which were for Iraq and responsible for verifying arms control and disarmament initiatives.¹⁶⁵ UNSCOM was established for the purpose of verifying the declarations by Iraq of its weapons of mass destruction and capabilities for acquiring such weapons; planning and carrying out or supervising the destruction of Iraq's prohibited weapons and capabilities; and ongoing monitoring to ensure that such capabilities were not revived.¹⁶⁶ The IAEA collaborated with UNSCOM regarding each of the nuclear related mandates. UNSCOM provides an essential example for the Security Council in establishing future verifications regimes on a case by case basis. It brought about several techniques and technologies such as environmental sampling and documentary archeology, which can be applied to a number of different verification cases.¹⁶⁷

Yet many questions still remain about the role of the Security Council in Verification. One question arises, why shouldn't the Security Council ask for regular reports on the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction? After all, verification and disarmament is integrally linked to the maintenance of peace and security, which is the primary responsibility of the Security Council.

A Case Study: Iran

On March 29, 2006, the President of the Security Council, on behalf of council members, issued a presidential statement addressing the Nuclear Crisis in Iran directly and thus, officially beginning Security Council intervention

¹⁵⁹ "IAEA Fundamentals." International Atomic Energy Agency. <http://www.iaea.org/Publications/Factsheets/English/iaea-e.pdf>

¹⁶⁰ "WMD: Brief Background." United Nations. <http://www.un.org/Depts/dda/WMD/treaty>

¹⁶¹ "Chapter 10: Verification and Compliance." United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research. <http://www.unidir.org/pdf/articles/pdf-art2079.pdf>

¹⁶² Ibid.

¹⁶³ Ibid.

¹⁶⁴ Dr. Nabil Elaraby. "The Security Council and Nuclear Weapons." Global Policy Forum. <http://www.globalpolicy.org/security/docs/elaraby.htm>

¹⁶⁵ "Chapter 5: Security Council-Mandated Verification." United Nations Institute fir Disarmament Research. <http://www.unidir.org/pdf/articles/pdf-art1935.pdf>

¹⁶⁶ Ibid.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid.

on the issue. Tehran's nuclear program currently enjoys the status of an international threat mainly due to concerns related to verification. IAEA investigations starting in 2001 focused solely on verifying Iran's compliance to the NPT and ensuring the international community of its peaceful intentions. Despite conducting numerous on site investigations and obtaining various data and evidence, the Agency, in its last report to the Security Council, was still unable to prove Iran's peaceful intentions regarding its nuclear program.¹⁶⁸

Lack of verification measures on Iran's part encourages the existing doubts and suspicions of the international community. Furthermore, lack of cooperation on verifying its current and future nuclear capabilities – a lack of transparency – is not an act of good faith on the part of Iran's government. This in turn, implies that the government's intentions for the program may not be completely honorable. This position triggered the Council's intervention. The issue of verification is a central concern for both the Agency and now the Security Council because a decisive position cannot be established without the implementation of confidence building measures, the Safeguards Agreements, the Additional Protocol and all other measures necessary to prove Iran's compliance to the international agreements in concern.

The treaty verification aspect of the IAEA serves two purposes; first, to allow confidence building measures between all concerned parties and secondly, to deter violations of the treaty by early detection. The process of verification is made effective through the Agency's rights to information, rights to access, and the availability of and rights to apply verification technology.¹⁶⁹ Thus, verification can only be effective through full cooperation of both the state in question and the Agency. Without allowing the means necessary to conduct effective verification procedures, transparency of work cannot be achieved; thus, resulting in a lack of credible assurance for the international community that the nuclear program in question is indeed peaceful. Lack of credible assurance causes the international community to draw conclusions based on available evidence that often times, supports the fears and suspicions it may already have regarding the state in question.

Three years of ongoing investigations by the IAEA have focused mainly on seeking clarity of the content and scope of Iran's nuclear program. The report reiterates the fact that a complete understanding cannot be achieved without full transparency and active cooperation on the part of Iran.¹⁷⁰ Both Confidence Building measures and Safeguards Obligations are necessary to fulfill in order to resolve the outstanding verifications issues. Finally, the report made important note of the fact that the judgment and conclusions the Agency draws in the case of Iran and all other similar cases, are limited to verifiable information that is made available to the agency.¹⁷¹ Hence, even with the case now being considered by the Security Council, conclusions will be drawn based on the limited data that is available to the international community. For this reason, it is of great imminence to make all efforts necessary to maintain transparency throughout the verifications process, without which final conclusions are confined to the limited data available to the agency and the Security Council. On 4 February 2006, at a special session of the IAEA, the Agency adopted a resolution reporting the issue of Iran to the Security Council and requesting Iran to make efforts for immediate cooperation with the agency.¹⁷²

Key Issues in the Security Council

Throughout the process of Security Council involvement in this issue, council members shared a common concern with Iran's failure to fulfill the requests of IAEA Board resolutions and agree that the State's unwillingness to comply with verification measures is indeed a serious problem for the international community. The main disagreement within Council members is regarding the method in which a Security Council negotiation with Iran should be pursued.¹⁷³ While Russia and China prefer to take small, incremental measures towards a diplomatic resolution, France, the United States and the United Kingdom have insisted on adopting a resolution and defining Iran's Nuclear Program as a threat to international security under Chapter VII of the UN Charter. Another option

¹⁶⁸ "Report on Iran's Nuclear Programme Sent to UN Security Council." International Atomic Energy Association. <http://www.iaea.org/NewsCenter/News/2006/bog080306.html>

¹⁶⁹ Ibid.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid.

¹⁷¹ Ibid.

¹⁷² "March 2006 Iran." Security Council Report http://www.securitycouncilreport.org/site/c.gKWLeMTIsG/b.1439235/k.5651/March_2006BRIran.htm

¹⁷³ Ibid.

being taken into consideration is a proposal to turn the current request for Iran to suspend all enrichment activity into an actual obligation treaty under the NPT, which would bind Iran under international law.¹⁷⁴ France, the United Kingdom and the United States place utmost emphasis on time in resolving the Iran issue and contend that further delay in the negotiation process allows Iran more time to possibly solidify its weapons program such as the case in North Korea. Their willingness to act timely and decisively has led them to even consider possible alternatives in the event that the Council fails to take action, such as coordinated economic and political pressure outside of the United Nations.¹⁷⁵ To this end, Russia and China make it clear that sanctions prove to be counter productive in achieving the desired outcome of a diplomatic solution. Russia, in particular, contends that in the absence of strong and clear evidence of Iran's non-compliance, the use of sanctions is inappropriate.¹⁷⁶ Furthermore, Russia and China both support a continued IAEA role in the investigations and negotiations process.

Key issues that are central to the negotiations process is the continuing role of the Security Council. Up to this point, the IAEA has been at the forefront of the investigation and negotiations process. Amongst arguments that the IAEA should continue to play its central role in the next step, it remains to be seen how the Security Council handles the verifications and compliance challenge associated with the Nuclear Crisis in Iran. The most probable option in this regard, is one of compromise in which, the IAEA may play a role parallel to that of the Security Council in upcoming developments.

The Security Council's next options depend on Iran's official response to the Incentives package. In the event that Iran rejects the proposals outright, then the Council has the option of imposing sanctions; which, in this case would be targeted sanctions against individuals or limited economic sanctions targeting specific commodities or a combination of both.¹⁷⁷ Full economic sanctions, such as in the case of Iraq in 1990, are unlikely. However, if Iran shows positive consideration to the package being offered, another option for the Council can be to call for a more inclusive negotiation process, for the purpose of working out concrete details.¹⁷⁸ The idea would be to allow such a negotiation to take place within a framework that compels Iran to suspend the uranium enrichment process and allows the resumption of full inspections under its safeguards agreement during the negotiations.

The Situation in Darfur

"We have the means and the capacity to deal with our problems, if only we can find the political will." ~ Kofi Annan¹⁷⁹

Introduction to the Conflict

Civil war and decades of ethnic turmoil define the turbulent political history of Sudan following its independence from the United Kingdom in 1956. Civil war still looms in the country, with violent conflicts that are intertwined and spread across virtually all of Sudan. Several underlying factors contribute to the prevalence of tension throughout Sudan's history. Issues such as competition over resources, political representation and ethnic rivalry are only part of the complex framework of conflicts in Sudan. In recent years, war in Sudan's Western region of Darfur took center stage in gaining international attention. In the midst of preexisting conflicts in the region, violence escalated to an alarming level in 2003 when a rebel group began attacking government targets on the premise that the government in Khartoum neglected the needs of Darfur.¹⁸⁰ The rebels claimed that the government oppressed black Africans in favor of the Arabs in political power.¹⁸¹ Tension over issues such as land and grazing rights between the predominantly nomadic Arabs and farmers from the Fur, Massaleet and Zagawa communities among other socioeconomic disagreements partly contribute to the massive explosion of conflict witnessed during the past three years. The two main rebel groups, responsible for waging the current conflict are the Sudan Liberation Army

¹⁷⁴ Ibid.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid.

¹⁷⁹ Kofi Annan. "UN-Summit-Annan: Annan says halving global poverty is achievable aim." Aids Education Global Information System. September, 5, 2000.

¹⁸⁰ "Sudan's Darfur Conflict." BBC News Online. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/3496731.stm>

¹⁸¹ S. Straus. "Darfur and the Genocide Debate." *Foreign Affairs*. 84, no. 1. January/February 2005.

(SLA) and the Justice and Equality Movement (JEM). An armed rebellion quickly escalated to what is considered today as a major humanitarian crisis.¹⁸²

The United Nations estimates that as a result of the conflict, to date, nearly 300, 000 people have been killed and more than three million people have either fled their homes or are in dire need of food.¹⁸³ The government of Sudan, responsible for providing protection and security for its citizens, admitted to mobilizing “self defense militias” in response to the rebel attacks.¹⁸⁴ However, the government categorically denies links to the Janjaweed militia – which has been accused of fighting with the intent to rid black Africans from the territory in the Darfur region.¹⁸⁵ Reports of the Janjaweed’s acts of violence in wake of this conflict raised concerns in the international community regarding conditions that may give rise to genocide.¹⁸⁶ During the initial stages of the conflict, it was this issue that took the forefront in international debate regarding Darfur. In addressing the United Nations, President George W. Bush formally proclaimed conditions in Darfur as genocide.¹⁸⁷ However, based on a UN investigation team sent to Sudan, the UN concluded that war crimes were indeed committed in Sudan but there was no intent of genocide.¹⁸⁸ Although prospects for genocide in Darfur still hold immense international concern, the issues of debate have shifted due to recent developments and are now focused largely on efforts to put an end to the conflict itself.

Darfur and the Security Council

The Machakos protocol, signed in July 2002, provided the basis for the negotiations that took place in Darfur between 2002 and 2004.¹⁸⁹ This agreement established the principles and procedures to guide political development in Sudan until a referendum takes place in the South in 2011. The Machakos Protocol secured the right to self-determination for Southern Sudan and provided the people of Southern Sudan with the opportunity to vote in a referendum at the end of the Interim Period, choosing between unity of Sudan or secession. The interim period is of six years, between July 9, 2005 and July 8, 2011.¹⁹⁰ In February 2003 the conflict escalated and gained alarming momentum when an armed rebellion began in Darfur. In response to the humanitarian catastrophe, the Security Council passed Resolution 1502 on August 26, 2003, which called on Sudan to allow access for humanitarian workers to assist populations in need.¹⁹¹ That fall, the North-South cease fire agreement was signed.¹⁹² Technically, although the North-South Conflict is an individual issue in itself, it is intertwined with the issues in Darfur on many levels. The North South ceasefire agreement between the Sudanese government and the rebel Sudan People’s Liberation Army (SPLA) was mediated by the US, Britain, Italy and Norway. In addition to a cease fire, it set out conditions for power sharing and outlines a basic direction for the South’s political future.¹⁹³ Regional efforts for peace marked further efforts in April 2004 with the signing of the Darfur N’Djamena Ceasefire Agreement.¹⁹⁴

The Security Council first made an official Presidential Statement on May 25, 2004 in which it expressed grave concern over the deteriorating humanitarian situation in Darfur and demanded that those responsible for human rights violations be held accountable.¹⁹⁵ Based on the report of the Secretary General on Sudan, the Security Council adopted Resolution 1547 on June 11, 2004.¹⁹⁶ This resolution implemented his recommendations. In addition, the Government of Sudan and the UN Secretary General issued a Joint Communiqué on July 3, 2004,

¹⁸² Ibid.

¹⁸³ Darfur One Year On (2004). World Health Organization.

http://www.who.int/hac/crises/sdn/sitreps/darfur_report_2004_final.pdf

¹⁸⁴ Ibid.

¹⁸⁵ “Sudan’s Darfur Conflict.” BBC News Online. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/3496731.stm>

¹⁸⁶ S. Straus. “Darfur and the Genocide Debate.” *Foreign Affairs*. 84, no. 1. January/February 2005.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸⁸ “Sudan’s Darfur Conflict.” BBC News Online. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/3496731.stm>

¹⁸⁹ “Secretariat on Peace in the Sudan.” *Machakos Protocol*. Intergovernmental Authority on Development.

http://www.iss.co.za/Af/RefOrg/unity_to_union/pdfs/igad/MachakosProt.pdf

¹⁹⁰ Ibid.

¹⁹¹ SC/1502. United Nations Security Council. http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/unsc_resolutions03.html

¹⁹² “Sudan.” Global Policy Forum. <http://www.globalpolicy.org/security/issues/sudanindex.htm>

¹⁹³ Ibid.

¹⁹⁴ SC/8521. Security Council Presidential Statement. <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2005/sc8521.doc.htm>

¹⁹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁹⁶ SC/1574. United Nations Security Council. http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/unsc_resolutions04.html

which created the Joint Implementation Mechanism and acknowledged the progress towards humanitarian access.¹⁹⁷ On July 30, 2004, the Security Council passed Resolution 1556 which imposed an arms embargo on Darfur.¹⁹⁸ This resolution supported the African Union (AU) led monitoring mission in Darfur and demanded Sudan's government to disarm the Janjaweed Militia.¹⁹⁹ The following year, on January 9, 2005, the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) was signed between the Government of Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement.²⁰⁰

In March of 2005, Security Council Resolution 1590 established the United Nations Mission to Sudan (UNMIS)²⁰¹. This was established for an initial period of six months with up to 10,000 military personnel. This resolution requested that UNMIS coordinate with the African Union (AMIS) for the purpose of reinforcing the peace agreement.²⁰² On March 29, 2005, the Council passed Resolution 1591 which imposed further sanctions on Sudan.²⁰³ UN action on Darfur reached a significant peak of international concern, when on March 31, 2005 the Council adopted Resolution 1593, which referred Sudan to the International Criminal Court.²⁰⁴ Summer of 2005 ushered in momentary political stability in Sudan.²⁰⁵ The government of the National Unity Party was inaugurated and John Garang was sworn in as first Vice-President.²⁰⁶ However, Garang served a brief term and passed away on July 30, 2005. On August 11, 2005, Salva Kiir was sworn in to serve in Garang's place. In the Fall of 2005, the Darfur peace talks resumed in Abuja. On December 13, 2005, the ICC Chief prosecutor Luis Moreno Ocampo briefed the Council and proceedings regarding Darfur's referral to the Court.²⁰⁷ In response, Khartoum declared it would not cooperate with the ICC. Between December 10th and 20th 2005, a joint AU-UN mechanism to assess AMIS visited Darfur. On 12 January 2006, the AU PSC announced that it accepted, "in principle," the deployment of UN peacekeepers in Darfur.²⁰⁸ Negotiations on this issue are still ongoing. On April 25, 2006, Security Council Resolution 1672 imposed targeted travel bans and an asset freeze in response to the conflicts.²⁰⁹ Most recently, on 16 May 2006, Security Council Resolution 1670 set new deadlines for the assessment mission and threatened sanctions.²¹⁰

Key Issues in the Security Council

Among the central issues of debate regarding the current situation in Darfur are discussions of the transition to a UN operation in Darfur.²¹¹ The exact direction of future Council decisions is still unclear because the government of Sudan refused to fully agree to the transition. Pressure from the Security Council is likely if Sudan fails to cooperate at the AU summit of summer 2006.²¹² The AU plays an important role, especially in light of the current Security Council challenges. AU members are expected to place further pressure on Sudan and emphasize on the results of the June AU/UN assessment mission.²¹³

Currently, there are a number of options the Security Council may pursue in making further decisions. The Council is placing emphasis on the role of the African Union. Members are hoping that the current stalemate on the issue of

¹⁹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁹⁸ SC/1556. United Nations Security Council Resolution. http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/unscl_resolutions04.html

¹⁹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰⁰ "Comprehensive Agreement in Sudan Stands Firm but more International Support Needed, Security Council Told." United Nations Information Service. <http://www.unis.unvienna.org/unis/pressrels/2006/sc8607.html>

²⁰¹ "SC/1590." United Nations Security Council. <http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N05/284/08/PDF/N0528408.pdf?OpenElement>

²⁰² Ibid.

²⁰³ SC/1591. United Nations Security Council. http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/unscl_resolutions05.htm

²⁰⁴ SC/1593. United Nations Security Council. http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/unscl_resolutions05.htm

²⁰⁵ "February 2006 Forecast." Security Council Report http://www.securitycouncilreport.org/site/c.gIKLeMTIsG/b.1387815/k.1DE3/February_2006BRSudan.Darfur.htm

²⁰⁶ Ibid.

²⁰⁷ Ibid.

²⁰⁸ "Peace and Security Council: Communique." Security Council Report. [http://www.securitycouncilreport.org/atf/cf/{65BFCF9B-6D27-4E9C-8CD3-CF6E4FF96FF9}/Sudan%20%20PSCPRComm\(XLV\).doc](http://www.securitycouncilreport.org/atf/cf/{65BFCF9B-6D27-4E9C-8CD3-CF6E4FF96FF9}/Sudan%20%20PSCPRComm(XLV).doc)

²⁰⁹ Ibid.

²¹⁰ "July 2006 Forecast." Security Council <http://www.securitycouncilreport.org/site/lookup.asp?c=gIKWLeMTIsG&b=1816667>

²¹¹ Ibid.

²¹² Ibid.

²¹³ Ibid.

military transition in Darfur will end with AU pressure on Sudan.²¹⁴ Failure of the Summit will likely result in firm Security Council action, in the form of a balanced approach between both pressure and incentives. Khartoum's refusal to officially recognize a UN take over of the AU mission proves to be a major obstacle in the Council's initiatives to effectively handle the crisis in Darfur. Members are working towards a diplomatic approach with support from African Union and Arab Countries. Aside from considering this issue of consent, the Council may also authorize the UN to strengthen the logistic capabilities of AMIS during the transition period. In light of Sudan's refusal to give consent on the transition and moreover, its failure to disarm the Janjaweed by 23 June, sanctions are also prominent on the list of possible options. Although the option has not been ruled out, it is likely to face strong opposition from permanent members China and Russia. Another possibility that has been taken into account is the Sanction Panel's recommendations for a no fly zone as well as extending the arms embargo to all of Sudan.²¹⁵

An additional issue of concern is the timing of the transition as well as when and how to elaborate on the mandate of a UN operation in Darfur. Logistics must also be taken into complete consideration while assessing and implementing the proposals for transition. There are numerous concerns on this matter including troop generation, identifying the lead nation(s), and maintaining an "African Character" in the mission.²¹⁶ Without a mandate, generating an adequate force is also a great challenge. This leads to an underlying desire among some members to quickly develop a draft resolution with a clear mandate for the transition and the UN mission. While talks of transition continue, strengthening AMIS in the mean time is also a matter of great importance along with furthering progress of the Darfur Peace Agreement (DPA). While the situation in Darfur is increasingly becoming international in nature – with unofficial agreements to provide troops from a number of countries – it is still regional at its core and this aspect must be given full consideration when addressing the current situation. Chad and the Central African Republic are both share similar vulnerabilities as Darfur and are in danger of spill over effects in the event of failures to fully implement the DPA.²¹⁷

Committee Directive

Today, there is no hiding from the interconnected facets of society, economics and politics that created conflict. Therefore, all are at risk. In order to address these issues, there must be consensus on what each security threat entails and what actions are to be taken. Nonetheless, this is exceedingly hard as many actors bring their own concerns and goals to the bargaining table. It must be maintained, however, that "the security of developed countries is only as strong as the ability of poor states to respond to and contain a new deadly infectious disease."²¹⁸ This point, while about HIV/AIDS, illustrates an important lesson; we are only as strong as our weakest link. It would seem that there is a need to recommit to the founding ideals of the United Nations. However, this will require a number of fundamental changes. The significance of reform can not be overstated enough given its importance. Most agree that a comprehensive strategy needs to be devised so that United Nations Security Council may find new ways to bring member states and any affiliated organizations back together in hopes of preventing or deterring conflict, not only including traditional war or conflict issues in border disputes but the newer emerging security issues.

In this background guide, and the forthcoming updates, you have been provided with the knowledge that will provide the foundation for your own research and the debate that you will experience within the committee. However, as the Security Council of the Southern Regional Model United Nations Committee you will be asked to perform to a higher level than all other committees. Therefore, you should use your time between now and the conference wisely by researching further issues. You should be extremely familiar with your countries foreign policy and its most important international affairs questions. These will form the basis for your position papers and the topics that you will address during committee.

²¹⁴ Ibid.

²¹⁵ Ibid.

²¹⁶ Ibid.

²¹⁷ Ibid.

²¹⁸ Kofi Annan, "Courage to fulfill our responsibilities," *Economist*, 373, no. 8404 (Dec. 4, 2004).