

## Southern Regional Model United Nations, Charlotte 2013

*Establishing Global Partnerships: Investing in the Present to Prepare for a Sustainable Future*

April 11-13, 2013 – Charlotte, NC

Email: [sc\\_charlotte@srmun.org](mailto:sc_charlotte@srmun.org)



Greetings Delegates,

Welcome to the Southern Regional Model United Nations Conference (SRMUN) and the United Nations Security Council (UNSC). We are excited to welcome you to the committee and conference this year. I will be your Director for this challenging, exciting, and rewarding committee. This is in my fourth year participating with the conference and second year on staff. In the past I have served as the Chair for the SRMUN Atlanta General Assembly Plenary committee, Assistant Director for World Food Programme, Director of Economic Commission for Africa and now Director of UNSC for Charlotte. I am a graduate of Kennesaw State University with a Master of Business Administration in Management and Marketing. Serving as my Assistant Director for this committee is Mr. Alan Hooper. Alan graduated from Clemson University with Bachelors in Economics and is currently pursuing a Masters in Economics from Clemson University as well. Alan has previously served as Assistant Director for Commission on Narcotics and Drugs and also for General Assembly Plenary for SRMUN Atlanta.

The Security Council of the United Nations was established under Article III of the United Nations Charter. Among its primary functions are to maintain international peace and security, maintain friendly relations among Member States, and solve international problems with respect to human rights. Keeping in mind the primary function of the Security Council and the conference theme as such, we have chosen the following topics to discuss at this year's conference:

Topic I: Assessing International Security with the Political Change in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea

Topic II: Addressing the Humanitarian Situation in Sudan

Topic III: Examining the Use of Sanctions during Conflict

This background guide will serve as a strong foundation for your research, yet it should not be utilized as a complete means for these selected topics. The background guides are provided to ensure that the delegates have a resource to guide them in their initial research, but it is expected that delegates will go beyond the background guide when researching each topic in order to ensure strong position papers and to ensure that you are prepared for discussion at the conference in March.

Each delegation is required to submit a position paper that covers three topics of their choosing. This can include topics from the list provided above, or a topic that is of great importance to your Member State. It should be no longer than two pages in length (single spaced) and demonstrate your country's position, policies and recommendations. For more information regarding the position papers, please visit the SRMUN website at <http://www.srmun.org>. **Position papers MUST be submitted by March 29, 2013 at 11:59 pm EST to the SRMUN website. Instructions for uploading your position paper can be found on the SRMUN website.**

Alan and I send you our best regards as you prepare for the 2013 SRMUN Charlotte Conference.

Punit Patel  
Director  
[sc\\_charlotte@srmun.org](mailto:sc_charlotte@srmun.org)

Alan Hooper  
Assistant Director  
[sc\\_charlotte@srmun.org](mailto:sc_charlotte@srmun.org)

Cortney Moshier  
Director-General  
[dg\\_charlotte@srmun.org](mailto:dg_charlotte@srmun.org)

## Committee History for the United Nations Security Council

The Security Council (SC) was created under Article V of the United Nations Charter, in 1945<sup>1</sup> with the unique ability to pass resolutions that are binding on the Member States of the United Nations (UN). The SC is charged with the responsibility of maintaining international peace and security and must be ready at a moment's notice to take action and protect the international community from harm that may come from conflict or perceived threats around the world.<sup>2</sup> While many organs within the UN can make recommendations and suggest actions, the Security Council has the power to enforce the decisions they come to and demand actions from Member States to prevent or to react to an international crisis.<sup>3</sup>

### *Membership*

As defined in the Charter, there are fifteen Member States on the Security Council at any one time, consisting of five permanent members and ten non-permanent members that are elected by the General Assembly every two years.<sup>4</sup> The five permanent members are China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom and the United States.<sup>5</sup> The ten non-permanent members at this time are Argentina, Australia, Azerbaijan, Guatemala, Luxembourg, Morocco, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Rwanda and Togo.<sup>6</sup> Each member of the Security Council has one representative and is expected to be available at all times in case of an international crisis.<sup>7</sup> In specific instances, Member States that are not on the SC have been invited to speak to the Security Council and participate in discussions that “specifically affect” their interests.<sup>8</sup>

### *Special Procedures/Rules*

The Security Council determines and operates under its own set of rules of procedure.<sup>9</sup> Additionally, the Presidency of the Security Council rotates monthly with each Member State taking a turn that is chosen alphabetically.<sup>10</sup> This does complicate the process of representing a Member State for our simulation. On the SRMUN website ([www.srmun.org](http://www.srmun.org)) we have provided an addendum to the Security Council, located in the delegate resource section of the website. Included are all special procedures and idiosyncrasies that make this committee so different from any other at our conference. Please become aware of them in your preparations.

### *Voting*

Voting is an aspect of the Security Council that is like no other body in the United Nations. In all other organs of the UN, Member States are given an equal voice, but in the Security Council the five permanent members are given “the great Power unanimity” which is often known as the veto.<sup>11</sup> If one of the five permanent Member States on the Security Council veto a decision made by the body, the resolution or decision is void, even if there were pro votes on the issue.<sup>12</sup> On both procedural and substantive matters, there is a requirement of 9 pro votes to pass anything.<sup>13</sup> Calls for reform have been addressed for many years.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Charter of the United Nations*. The United Nations. June 26, 1945.

<sup>2</sup> “Background” The Security Council. [http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/unsc\\_background.html](http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/unsc_background.html)

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> *Charter of the United Nations*. The United Nations. June 26, 1945.

<sup>5</sup> “Members” The Security Council. <http://www.un.org/sc/members.asp>

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

<sup>8</sup> *Charter of the United Nations*. The United Nations. June 26, 1945.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

<sup>11</sup> “Members” The Security Council. <http://www.un.org/sc/members.asp>

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

<sup>13</sup> *Charter of the United Nations*. The United Nations. June 26, 1945.

## *Powers and Duties*

The primary goal of the Security Council is to “maintain international peace and security in accordance with the principles and purposes of the United Nations.”<sup>14</sup> When facing the need for potential action, the first function performed by the Security Council is to determine whether or not a threat to peace exists. If the Security Council should determine the presence of conflict they: first, investigate the situation; second, recommend methods of reaching settlement; third, establish a system to regulate armaments; fourth, call upon Member States to use economic sanctions or force to end the aggression; and finally, take necessary military action against the aggressors.<sup>15</sup>

Additionally, the Security Council serves to “recommend the admission of new Members, exercise the trusteeship function of the United Nations in ‘strategic areas,’ and recommend to the General Assembly the appointment of the Secretary-General and, together with the GA, elect the Judges of the International Court of Justice.”<sup>16</sup> The Security Council issues cease-fires in cases of dispute, deploys peacekeeping forces to help reduce tensions in troubled areas, keeps opposing forces apart to create conditions of calm in which peaceful settlements can be made and decide on any enforcement measurements deemed necessary to resolve conflict, including economic sanctions or military action.<sup>17</sup>

The Security Council’s role in maintaining peace and security was put to the test in 2003 during the Iraqi crisis, when former U.S. President George W. Bush asked, “Will the UN serve the purpose of its founding...or will it be irrelevant?”<sup>18</sup> The Security Council soon after passed Resolution 1441, which stated that “Iraq shall not take or threaten hostile acts directed against any representative or personnel of the United Nations or the IAEA or of any Member State taking action to uphold any Council resolution.”<sup>19</sup>

The Security Council has also been a part in insuring the protection of women, especially women in armed conflict. In 2000 the council passed Resolution 1325, a landmark decision about the world’s role in protecting women and children.<sup>20</sup> In the resolution the Security Council “reaffirms its readiness, whenever measures are adopted under Article 41 of the Charter of the United Nations, to give consideration to their potential impact on the civilian population, bearing in mind the special needs of women and girls in order to consider appropriate humanitarian exemptions.”<sup>21</sup>

The Security Council is an integral body within the UN system tasked with the readiness to be called upon at a moment’s notice and be prepared to effectively and quickly solve the greatest threats to the international community.

The Members of the Security Council are:

AZERBAIJAN, CHINA, COLOMBIA, FRANCE, GERMANY, GUATEMALA, INDIA, MOROCCO, PAKISTAN, PORTUGAL, RUSSIAN FEDERATION, SOUTH AFRICA, TOGO, UNITED KINGDOM, UNITED STATES.

---

<sup>14</sup> “Functions and Powers” The Security Council. [http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/unsc\\_functions.html](http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/unsc_functions.html)

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid.

<sup>17</sup> “Background” UN Security Council. [http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/unsc\\_background.htm](http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/unsc_background.htm)

<sup>18</sup> “UN Security Council Profile” BBC News. 21 Feb. 2012. <http://m.bbc.co.uk/news/world-11712448>

<sup>19</sup> S/RES/1441. *Resolution 1441*. United Nations Security Council. 8 Nov. 2002.

<sup>20</sup> S/RES/1325. *Resolution 1325*. United Nations Security Council. 31 Oct. 2000.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid.

## Topic I: Assessing International Security with the Political Change in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea

*"A man who dreads trials and difficulties cannot become a revolutionary. If he is to become a revolutionary with an indomitable fighting spirit, he must be tempered in the arduous struggle from his youth. As the saying goes, early training means more than late earning.."*<sup>22</sup>

Kim Jong-il

### Introduction

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) was founded under the trusteeship of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) on September 9, 1948, formalizing the partition of the Korean Peninsula following World War II.<sup>23</sup> In 1950, the DPRK launched a war to reunify the peninsula; that war that ended in an armistice in 1953 that divided the DPRK from the southern portion of the Korean Peninsula, now recognized as the Republic of Korea (ROK), along the 38th parallel.<sup>24</sup> Modeled initially on USSR communism, the DPRK developed its own communist state ideology called Juche, or "self-reliance."<sup>25</sup> Today, the DPRK is one of the most repressive, closed, and internationally isolated Member States in the world and is consistently viewed to be among the worst violators of human rights in Freedom House's annual Freedom in the World survey.<sup>26</sup>

With a population of approximately 23 million, the DPRK was the 45th most populous Member State in the world in 2006, but little is known about its economic status, though many believe it to be in a deteriorating condition due to heavy economic sanctions by the Security Council.<sup>27</sup> Since the mid-1990s, it is believed that close to two million individuals have died because of diminished food supplies, poor economic conditions, mismanagement of economies, and natural disasters throughout the region.<sup>28</sup> While the DPRK has received considerable amounts of outside food assistance over the past decade, the DPRK's government determines how food is distributed, as well as how much of its annual budget is spent on the military and an aggressive pursuit in developing nuclear weapons.<sup>29</sup>

The DPRK's economic and political record differs starkly with that of the ROK, which emerged from a period of authoritarian rule to become a stable democracy and in 2006 and was the world's 13th-largest economy in terms of gross domestic product (GDP).<sup>30</sup> Yet in 2009, it was discovered that the DPRK's economy has had a negative growth rate of 0.9 percent and in 2010 it had a negative growth rate of 0.5 percent.<sup>31</sup> Due to its extreme foreign policies, international sanctions and limited humanitarian aid, the DPRK relies heavily on the Chinese economy for support.<sup>32</sup>

As the news of Kim Jong-il's passing reached the international community, the question many Member States were faced with was: who will be the new leader of the DPRK and how will the people survive with a diminishing economy? As soon as the succession of Kim Jong-un became apparent, it attracted the interest of the international

---

<sup>22</sup> Kim Jong Il Quotes, Sayings, Remarks, Thoughts and Speeches." *Kim Jong Il Quotes, Sayings, Remarks, Thoughts and Speeches*. Nut Quote, n.d. Web. 17 Dec. 2012. [http://www.nutquote.com/quote/Kim\\_Jong\\_Il](http://www.nutquote.com/quote/Kim_Jong_Il)

<sup>23</sup> "Human Rights and Freedom from State Tyranny: Country Studies - North Korea." *Democracy Web: Comparative Studies in Freedom*. N.p., n.d. Web. 06 Dec. 2012. <http://www.democracyweb.org/rights/northkorea.php>

<sup>24</sup> Ibid.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid.

<sup>26</sup> Puddington, Arch. "FREEDOM IN THE WORLD 2012: THE ARAB UPRISINGS AND THEIR GLOBAL REPERCUSSIONS." *Freedomhouse*. N.p., n.d. Web. 15 Dec. 2012. [http://www.freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/inline\\_images/FIW%202012%20Booklet--Final.pdf](http://www.freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/inline_images/FIW%202012%20Booklet--Final.pdf)

<sup>27</sup> "Human Rights and Freedom from State Tyranny: Country Studies - North Korea." *Democracy Web: Comparative Studies in Freedom*. N.p., n.d. Web. 06 Dec. 2012. <http://www.democracyweb.org/rights/northkorea.php>

<sup>28</sup> Ibid.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid.

<sup>31</sup> "2012 Index of Economic Freedom." *North Korea Economy: Facts, Data, & Analysis on Economic Freedom*. N.p., n.d. Web. 15 Dec. 2012. <http://www.heritage.org/index/country/northkorea>

<sup>32</sup> Ibid.

community.<sup>33</sup> As of the publishing of this guide, it has been a little over year since Kim Jon-un took the title of supreme leader of the DPRK, yet the international community still speculates as to what type of regime the people of the DPRK face. Many believe that Kim Jon-un will lead the nation in a similar style as his father, while many hope that he will change the country's extreme foreign policies.<sup>34</sup>

## *History*

With a centralized government under the communist control of the Korean Workers Party (KWP), Kim Il-sung was the founder and the first supreme leader of the DPRK, ruling from 1948 through 1994 and representing both the Secretary General of the KWP and President of the DPRK.<sup>35</sup> Kim Il-sung's positions were later abolished after his death and replaced with the title of Eternal President of the Republic.<sup>36</sup> Little is known about the actual lines of power and authority in the DPRK's government, despite the formal structure set forth in its constitution.<sup>37</sup> Kim Jong-il was named the supreme leader of DPRK after the passing of his father Kim Il-sung and given the title of General Secretary of the KWP in October 1997.<sup>38</sup> In September 1998, the Supreme People's Assembly (SPA) reconfirmed Kim Jong-il as Chairman of the National Defense Commission (NDC) and declared that position as the "highest office of state;" however, the President of the Presidium of the SPA, currently held by Kim Yong-nam, serves as the nominal head of state.<sup>39</sup>

On December 17, 2011, Kim Jong-il's seventeen-year rule came to an end when he died of a heart attack.<sup>40</sup> Nearly fifty hours after his passing, the North Korean propaganda apparatus sprang into action, informing the world of Kim's passing and proclaiming Kim Jong-un, twenty-nine years old, the "great successor."<sup>41</sup> The transition of power came at a rapid pace for Kim Jong-un, but many believe the transition to have been smooth as he quickly received the titles of supreme leader and supreme commander of the armed forces and an entirely different set of signals has highlighted what appears to be a collective leadership that will advise him and facilitate his consolidation of power.<sup>42</sup> It is important to note the three key entities that control the government of the DPRK: the cabinet, formerly known as the State Administration Council (SAC), which administers the ministries and has a significant role in implementing policy;<sup>43</sup> the Politburo of the Central People's Committee, which is the top policymaking body of the KWP and which plays a role as the dominant social institution in North Korea;<sup>44</sup> and the Supreme People's Assembly, the highest organ of state power.<sup>45</sup>

## *Actions taken by the DPRK in the last 20 years*

In 2006, the DPRK tested long-range missiles to the alarm of the international community. The UN Security Council unanimously supported a resolution to block the shipment of missile parts to the DPRK,<sup>46</sup> and the United States urged the DPRK to discontinue its nuclear development program. In the summer of 2008, the DPRK agreed and destroyed one of its nuclear reactors; in return, the United States began an aid program and removed the DPRK from its "state sponsors of terrorism" list.<sup>47</sup> These developments followed a 2007 announcement by DPRK that it would disable its nuclear program and are the result of an ongoing process of reaching a diplomatic solution to the controversy, which

---

<sup>33</sup> Dürkop, Colin, and Min-II Yeo. "North Korea after Kim Jong-il: Political And Social Perspectives Ahead of the Expected Change of Power." *KAS INTERNATIONAL REPORTS*. N.p., Aug. 2011. Web. 05 Dec. 2012. [http://www.kas.de/wf/doc/kas\\_23605-1522-2-30.pdf?110811143245](http://www.kas.de/wf/doc/kas_23605-1522-2-30.pdf?110811143245)

<sup>34</sup> Ibid.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid.

<sup>40</sup> Gause, Ken. "Leadership Transition in North Korea: Current Issues in U.S.-ROK Relations." *Council on Foreign Relations*. N.p., Jan. 2012. Web. 04 Dec. 2012. <http://www.cfr.org/north-korea/leadership-transition-north-korea/p27071>

<sup>41</sup> Ibid.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid.

<sup>46</sup> "North Korea claims nuclear test: North Korea says it has carried out its first test of a nuclear weapon" *BBC News*. Oct. 9, 2006. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/6032525.stm>

<sup>47</sup> Ibid.

accompanied DPRK's prior declarations of intent to resume its nuclear program and withdraw from the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty.<sup>48</sup> There is still a high level of concern that DPRK may again threatens the international community and resume its nuclear program unless it becomes more comfortable with its relationship with the U.S. and other Member States.<sup>49</sup>

In early 2009, the DPRK returned to its aggressive foreign policy, which is marked by weapons tests and threats that have led to volatile tensions between the DPRK and the Republic of Korea since the mutual signing of the 1953 armistice agreement.<sup>50</sup> The UN has criticized the continued testing of missiles and heavy economic sanctions have been placed on the DPRK as a result.<sup>51</sup> Tensions increased when the DPRK announced that it had carried out a nuclear weapons test on the 25<sup>th</sup> May, 2009.<sup>52</sup> The DPRK then threatened to leave the Six Party Talks for de-nuclearization of the Korean peninsula, to cancel the armistice of 1953 one-sided, and to cease its ongoing dialogue with the United States.<sup>53</sup> The international community reacted to the DPRK's action on June 12, 2009 with a uniform decision of the UN Security Council, which extended the existing weapons embargo against the DPRK and its ships in international waters.<sup>54</sup>

The occurrence of military action taken by the DPRK armed forces have increased in quantity and intensity since 2009: on November 10<sup>th</sup> 2009, there was an exchange of fire between DPRK and ROK forces near the South Korean island of Daechong after a DPRK patrol boat crossed a disputed border, though no losses were reported.<sup>55</sup> On January 27, 2010 DRPK military fired repeatedly into ROK territorial waters, and the ROK responded to the fire.<sup>56</sup> Lastly, the DPRK fired at the ROK island of Yeonpyeong on November 23, 2010, to which locally stationed troops responded.<sup>57</sup>

On December 12, 2012, the DPRK successfully tested a long-range missile, which the Republic of Korea reported as having traveled 10,000 km (6,200 miles), a distance that expanded the reach of the DPRK to the western coast of the United States.<sup>58</sup> The DPRK justified the launch by stating that the launch put a weather satellite in orbit, but many Member States have asserted that the launch was intended to maintain nuclear technology, which would allow the DPRK to successfully develop nuclear warhead or a long-range missile.<sup>59</sup> The DPRK was previously banned from testing missile and further developing nuclear energy under the UN Security Council resolution after its missile testing in 2006 and 2009.<sup>60</sup>

### *Economic Actions Taken by the United Nations*

The economic sanctions placed on the DPRK by the UN Security Council have been controversial, due to the impact on neighboring Member States, including China, Japan, and the Republic of Korea, which account for 78.7% of DPRK's exports.<sup>61</sup> In 2005, the trade between the DPRK and the ROK exceeded over \$1 billion and trade with China, Thailand, and Japan account for 48.4% of DPRK's imports.<sup>62</sup> Trade between China and DPRK nearly doubled

---

<sup>48</sup> Ibid.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid.

<sup>50</sup> Dürkop, Colin, and Min-II Yeo. "North Korea after Kim Jong- il: Political And Social Perspectives Ahead of the Expected Change of Power." *KAS INTERNATIONAL REPORTS*. N.p., Aug. 2011. Web. 05 Dec. 2012. [http://www.kas.de/wf/doc/kas\\_23605-1522-2-30.pdf?110811143245](http://www.kas.de/wf/doc/kas_23605-1522-2-30.pdf?110811143245)

<sup>51</sup> Ibid.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid.

<sup>54</sup> Ibid.

<sup>55</sup> Ibid.

<sup>56</sup> Ibid.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid.

<sup>58</sup> Park, Ju-min. "North Korea Could Have U.S. within Missile Range, Says South." *Reuters*. N.p., 23 Dec. 2012. Web. 25 Dec. 2012. <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/12/23/us-korea-north-missile-idUSBRE8BM01720121223>

<sup>59</sup> Ibid.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid.

<sup>61</sup> Rennack, Dianne E. "CRS Report for Congress: North Korea: Economic Sanctions." *Federation of American Scientists*. N.p., 17 Oct. 2006. Web. 23 Dec. 2012. <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL31696.pdf>

<sup>62</sup> Ibid.

between 2002 and 2004, to \$1.39 billion and trade between DPRK and Russia climbed sharply from \$80.7million in 2002 to \$218.4 million in 2004.<sup>63</sup>

Economic sanctions have been imposed against the DPRK for four main reasons by the U.S.: (1) the DPRK is seen as posing a threat to U.S. national security; (2) the DPRK is designated by the Secretary of State as a state sponsor or supporter of international terrorism; (3) the DPRK is a Marxist-Leninist state, with a Communist government; and (4) the DPRK has been found by the State Department to have engaged in proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.<sup>64</sup> Maintaining with U.S. law and policies, U.S has limited trade, denies trade in dual-use goods and services, limits foreign aid, and opposes entry into or support from international financial institutions that deal with DPRK.<sup>65</sup> At the U.S. President's discretion, the DPRK would also be subject to the economic sanctions pursuant to the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998, under which the administration has identified the DPRK as a "country of particular concern" since 2001, and pursuant to the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, under which the administration has classified DPRK in the category of most severe offender (Tier 3) since 2003.<sup>66</sup>

On June 28, 2005, President George W. Bush, started taking steps to increase the financial sanctions against the DPRK and on September 12, 2005, during the last day of the six party talks, the U.S. treasury department found that Banco Delta Asia; a bank in which the DPRK has substantial holdings, was investigated for money laundering and aiding the DPRK in laundering money through its institution with reports showing that the DPRK gained approximately \$500 million annually in counterfeiting and another \$100 to \$200 million annually from narcotics trafficking.<sup>67</sup> On October 8, 2006, the DPRK carried out nuclear missile testing and in response to DPRK's action, the UN Security Council unanimously adopted SC/8853 to condemn the test and call on the DPRK to return to the six-party talks.<sup>68</sup>

### ***1994 Agreed Framework***

On October 21, 1994 the U.S. and the DPRK entered into the Agreed Framework, which stated that the DPRK pledged to postpone its nuclear program.<sup>69</sup> In exchange, for abandoning their nuclear program, the DPRK wanted two proliferation-resistant nuclear power reactors.<sup>70</sup> The U.S. also agreed to supply the DPRK with fuel, pending construction of the reactors.<sup>71</sup> Under the terms of the Framework, the U.S. and the DPRK vowed to stabilize economic and political relations, by "reducing barriers to investment, opening liaison offices, and ultimately exchanging ambassadors."<sup>72</sup>

Under President Clinton's second term, the administration started fulfilling conditions of the Framework and in June of 2000, they eased the longstanding sanctions against the DPRK under the Trading with the Enemy Act, the Defense Production Act, and the Export Administration Act, clearing the way for increased trade, financial transactions, and investment.<sup>73</sup> In October 2002, a report released by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) confirmed that the DPRK was indeed pursuing nuclear enshrinement program and found DPRK in a direct violation of its 1994 Agreed Framework drafted by the U.S. and the DPRK.<sup>74</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup> Ibid.

<sup>64</sup> Rennack, Dianne E. "CRS Report for Congress: North Korea: Economic Sanctions." *Federation of American Scientists*. N.p., 17 Oct. 2006. Web. 23 Dec. 2012. <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL31696.pdf>

<sup>65</sup> Ibid.

<sup>66</sup> Ibid.

<sup>67</sup> Ibid.

<sup>68</sup> "SECURITY COUNCIL CONDEMNS NUCLEAR TEST BY DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF KOREA, UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTING RESOLUTION 1718 (2006)." *UN News Center*. UN, 14 Oct. 2006. Web. 25 Dec. 2012. <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2006/sc8853.doc.htm>

<sup>69</sup> Kimball, Daryl, and Kelsey Davenport. "The U.S.-North Korean Agreed Framework at a Glance." *Arms Control Association*. N.p., Aug. 2004. Web. 03 Jan. 2013. <http://www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/agreedframework>

<sup>70</sup> Ibid.

<sup>71</sup> Ibid.

<sup>72</sup> Ibid.

<sup>73</sup> Ibid.

<sup>74</sup> Kimball, Daryl, and Kelsey Davenport. "The Six-Party Talks at a Glance." *Arms Control Association*. N.p., May 2012. Web. 03 Jan. 2013. <http://www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/6partytalks>

## *Six Party Talks*

The Six-Party talks were initiated in August of 2003, after DPRK withdrew from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) with the hopes that the DPRK would abandon its nuclear program via peaceful manner and re-join the NPT.<sup>75</sup> The DPRK, Republic of Korea, United States, Russia and China were the six Member States involved in the talk and have stake in the Korean peninsula.<sup>76</sup> The talks are hosted in Beijing and chaired by China; DPRK's long-standing ally with five rounds of talks conducted between the involved Member States from 2003 to 2007.<sup>77</sup>

The first round of talks took place on August 27, 2003 with the DPRK wanting stabilization between its relationships with the U.S. and a non-aggression pact from the Americans, without which the DPRK would not stop pursuing its nuclear program.<sup>78</sup> On day two of the talks, the DPRK Deputy Foreign Minister Kim Yong Il vowed that DPRK would soon test a nuclear weapon to showcase its ability.<sup>79</sup> Chinese Vice Foreign Minister Wang Yi also outlined the six points of consensus which were reached by the six Member States; these included a commitment to work to resolve the nuclear issue through peaceful means and dialogue, pursuing a nuclear-free Korean peninsula while bearing in mind the security of DPRK, and avoiding acts that would aggravate the situation further.<sup>80</sup>

In 2003, Japan, the United States and the Republic of Korea met separately to discuss the progression of the Six-Party talks and later China insisted that all Member States come together and resume the discussion. After much convincing, China was able to get Kim Jon-il to allow the DPRK to re-join the Six-Party talks in October of 2003.<sup>81</sup> However, the U.S. at the time did not allow any diplomats to converse with the DPRK, and demanded unilateral allowances be granted; the U.S. wanted verification that DPRK had irreversibly dismantlement its nuclear plants.<sup>82</sup> The second round of talks officially began on February 25, 2004, during which both China and Russia were in favor of the DPRK destroying its nuclear weapons program, yet they were in favor of allowing the DPRK to pursue its nuclear energy development program; but the U.S, Japan and Republic of Korea were against the DPRK using nuclear energy for positive advancement.<sup>83</sup> They believed that it was a front by the DPRK to conduct illegal activities.

On June 23, 2004, the third round of talks reconvened.<sup>84</sup> Prior to the talk, both the U.S. and Republic of Korea circulated a similar step-by-step plan as to how the DPRK should dismantle its nuclear program within three months.<sup>85</sup> No real progression was made during the third round of the talks and over a year passed between the third and fourth rounds, during which time the DPRK announced that it was in possession of a nuclear weapon in February of 2005 and refused to attend the Six-Party talks due to comments of then Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice's calling the DPRK an "outpost of tyranny."<sup>86</sup> On July 25, 2005, a meeting in Beijing between the U.S. and the DPRK was scheduled by China. During the meeting the U.S. recognized the DPRK as a sovereign state and noted that it had no intentions of invading them.<sup>87</sup> On September 19, 2005, the six Member States were able to reach a consensus and released a joint statement, which stated that the DPRK would abandon its nuclear weapons program and re-commit to the NPT and IAEA inspections.<sup>88</sup> The fifth and sixth round of talks yielded limited actions and involved back and forth mainly between the U.S. and the DPRK.<sup>89</sup>

---

<sup>75</sup> Kimball, Daryl, and Kelsey Davenport. "The Six-Party Talks at a Glance." *Arms Control Association*. N.p., May 2012. Web. 03 Jan. 2013. <http://www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/6partytalks>

<sup>76</sup> Ibid.

<sup>77</sup> Ibid.

<sup>78</sup> Ibid.

<sup>79</sup> Ibid.

<sup>80</sup> Ibid.

<sup>81</sup> Ibid.

<sup>82</sup> Ibid.

<sup>83</sup> Ibid.

<sup>84</sup> Ibid.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid.

<sup>86</sup> Ibid.

<sup>87</sup> Ibid.

<sup>88</sup> Ibid.

<sup>89</sup> Ibid.



## **Conclusion**

Since the passing of Kim Jong-il, many have wondered how the DPRK would move forward and what role it would play in the international community. The speculations were laid to rest with the succession of Kim Jong-un as the supreme leader of DPRK in 2011.<sup>90</sup> Various reports have indicated that the human rights violations that took place under the Kim Jong-Il regime are continuing under Kim Jong-un.<sup>91</sup>

Due to his young age and lack of experience, many believe that the actions of Kim Jong-un are not truly his own, but those of his advisors who also advised his father.<sup>92</sup> The DPRK has also made it very clear that under Kim Jon-un, there would be no change in “military-first policy,” a feature of his father’s ruling style that makes the military the main pillar of support for the regime.<sup>93</sup> Furthermore, the foreign policy of the DPRK under Kim Jong-un appears to be a continuation of previous policies. The regime has also said “there would be no deviations in its policy toward the ROK as long as the ROK’s President Lee Myung-bak is in power.”<sup>94</sup> On December 30, 2011, a statement was released on the DPRK’s media outlet by the National Defense Commission, which stated that “the foolish politicians” in the world “should not expect any change from us.”<sup>95</sup> Though the DPRK has a new leader, it seems that many of its national and international policies remain the same.

## **Committee Directive**

Delegates should be well versed with all of the Security Council resolutions dealing with the DPRK and its sanctions. The delegates should also be knowledgeable of its Member States foreign policy and relationship with the DPRK. They should also re-visit the 1994 Agreed Framework and see what actions may be taken from the agreement to get the Korean peninsula denuclearized. Furthermore, delegates need to review all six rounds of the Six-Party talks and be prepared to discuss ways to encourage the DPRK to re-join the Six-Party talks under the leadership of Kim Jong-un, or alternatively, other solutions for re-opening dialogue with the DPRK. Delegates need to address the current economic state of the DPRK and its effects on the on-going Humanitarian crisis. Lastly, delegates should come up with an action to entice the DPRK to freeze its nuclear weapons development program.

## **Topic II: Addressing the Humanitarian Situation in Sudan**

*“I remain very concerned at the increase in violence in Darfur and the tens of thousands of people displaced by conflict in recent months. All parties to the conflict should put down their arms and engage with the peace process. Now is the time to step up our encouragement to the parties, to advise them that there will be rewards for peace, and consequences for further conflict.” –*

*United Nations Secretary General Ban Ki-moon.<sup>96</sup>*

## **Introduction**

The Republic of Sudan (Sudan) has witnessed a crippling series of crises including corruption, famine, land disputes, refugees, sexual abuse, terrorism, and weaponry.<sup>97</sup> These crises have in turn led to a larger humanitarian crisis

<sup>90</sup> Dürkop, Colin, and Min-II Yeo. "North Korea after Kim Jong- il: Political And Social Perspectives Ahead of the Expected Change of Power." *KAS INTERNATIONAL REPORTS*. N.p., Aug. 2011. Web. 05 Dec. 2012. [http://www.kas.de/wf/doc/kas\\_23605-1522-2-30.pdf?110811143245](http://www.kas.de/wf/doc/kas_23605-1522-2-30.pdf?110811143245)

<sup>91</sup> "UN General Assembly Slams Pyongyang's Human Rights Record." *Www.ChinaPost.com.tw*. N.p., 21 Dec. 2011. Web. 02 Jan. 2013. <http://www.chinapost.com.tw/asia/korea/2011/12/21/326591/UN-General.htm>

<sup>92</sup> Dürkop, Colin, and Min-II Yeo. "North Korea after Kim Jong- il: Political And Social Perspectives Ahead of the Expected Change of Power." *KAS INTERNATIONAL REPORTS*. N.p., Aug. 2011. Web. 05 Dec. 2012. [http://www.kas.de/wf/doc/kas\\_23605-1522-2-30.pdf?110811143245](http://www.kas.de/wf/doc/kas_23605-1522-2-30.pdf?110811143245)

<sup>93</sup> Aoki, Naoko. "Korea's Third Kim: Will Anything Change?" *World Affairs Journal*. N.p., n.d. Web. 03 Jan. 2013. <http://www.worldaffairsjournal.org/article/korea's-third-kim-will-anything-change>

<sup>94</sup> Ibid.

<sup>95</sup> Ibid.

<sup>96</sup> UN News Centre: Ban Ki-moon’s speeches: “Remarks at high-level meeting on Sudan.”

January 31, 2011. [http://www.un.org/apps/news/infocus/sgspeeches/statments\\_full.asp?statID=1062#.UN-z6Kk2\\_II](http://www.un.org/apps/news/infocus/sgspeeches/statments_full.asp?statID=1062#.UN-z6Kk2_II)

<sup>97</sup> United Nations and Country of Origin Information: “Republic of Sudan.”

complicated by economic, environmental, governmental, and social variables. As a result, the current conditions in Sudan have been called the worst humanitarian crisis in the world today,<sup>98</sup> and the country has become the world's leading recipient of humanitarian aid, having accepted U.S. \$7.7 billion between 2001 and 2010.<sup>99</sup>

Sadly, crisis is not a new concept in Sudan, which has been stricken with conflict since its colonial days. The country only achieved political independence in 1956, and has since suffered through recurring civil war with its southern region, now known as the Republic of South Sudan (South Sudan). Sudan is particularly notorious for the ongoing conflict in the region of Darfur in Western Sudan, as well as for ongoing skirmishes with South Sudan following its independence in 2011. To complicate the situation, UN Peacekeeping forces and other international aid that have been sent to Sudan has either been insufficient or has come under attack.<sup>100</sup>

## **History**

The history of man first inhabiting Sudan has been traced back at least nine million years ago along the Nile River.<sup>101</sup> The Sudanese population has since been dealing with crises during and following its declaration of independence from the United Kingdom and two civil wars, culminating in the deaths of over two million people.<sup>102</sup>

Sudan came under the joint rule of Egypt and the United Kingdom on January 19, 1899<sup>103</sup>, via an agreement in which Sudan was to be administered jointly by both Member States.<sup>104</sup> Under the agreement, Sudan saw its revenue increase seventeen fold, expenditures tripled, and a balanced budget that lasted until 1960.<sup>105</sup> Despite this economic success, however, peace was not secured as violence in the form of intertribal warfare, banditry, or revolts occurred.<sup>106</sup> As Egypt gained independence in 1922, nationalism increased among the Sudanese, who opposed the indirect rule by the United Kingdom and advocated a centralized government in the capital of Khartoum. Sudan finally became independent in 1956, but its newly formed government was toppled by coup led by General Ibrahim Abboud soon after in 1958.<sup>107</sup>

Sudan is currently controlled by the National Islamic Front, which was installed through a coup led by Omar al-Bashir in 1989.<sup>108</sup> This political faction is extremely conservative, having incorporated Shari'a (Islamic Law) into the Sudan penal code in the 1980's. Shari'a law allows for an extremely conservative interpretation of the Qu'ran, which is viewed by many international bodies as contrary to fundamental human rights. The National Islamic Front has become notorious for actively aiding and harboring Islamic extremists such as Osama bin Laden, who set up the headquarters of his organization al Qaeda within Sudan in 1991.<sup>109</sup> The Al-Bashir government has also supported extreme Islamic activism in neighboring states such as Algeria and Iraq, and al-Bashir was a known supporter of the Iraq invasion of

---

September 11, 2012.

<http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/pdfid/505192fe2.pdf>

<sup>98</sup> United Nations Information Centre Khartoum, History of Sudan: Independence.

<http://unic.un.org/imucms/khartoum/36/497/history-of-sudan.aspx>

<sup>99</sup> Global Humanitarian Assistance: Sudan – Humanitarian Response.

<http://www.globalhumanitarianassistance.org/countryprofile/sudan>

<sup>100</sup> UN News Centre: "Shelling forces relocation of UN staff in Sudanese city of Kudugli."

October 9, 2012.

[http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=43245&Cr=sudan&Cr1=#.UOT2q7Q2\\_II](http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=43245&Cr=sudan&Cr1=#.UOT2q7Q2_II)

<sup>101</sup> United Nations Information Centre Khartoum, History of Sudan

<http://unic.un.org/imucms/khartoum/36/497/history-of-sudan.aspx>

<sup>102</sup> The Library of Congress: Congressional Research Service; Sudan: Humanitarian Crisis, Peace Talks, Terrorism, and U.S. Policy. April 12, 2006. <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/IB98043.pdf>

<sup>103</sup> Sudan Profile. *BBC News*. Oct. 31, 2012. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-14095300>

<sup>104</sup> United Nations Information Centre Khartoum, History of Sudan

<http://unic.un.org/imucms/khartoum/36/497/history-of-sudan.aspx>

<sup>105</sup> Ibid.

<sup>106</sup> United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs: Partnership for Humanity. February 2006.

[http://www.unsudanig.org/new\\_gateway/sudan/data/history/European%20Colonialism.pdf](http://www.unsudanig.org/new_gateway/sudan/data/history/European%20Colonialism.pdf)

<sup>107</sup> United Nations Information Centre Khartoum, History of Sudan: Independence.

<http://unic.un.org/imucms/khartoum/36/497/history-of-sudan.aspx>

<sup>108</sup> Ibid.

<sup>109</sup> Peter L. Bergen, Jr., "Holy War, Inc.: Inside the Secret World of Osama bin Laden," 53-54, 62, 80-81, 98-99 (2002) (cited in *International Law*, Carter and Trimble (2003) p.64-67.

Kuwait.<sup>110</sup> In 1995, the Sudanese government organized an ‘Islamic People’s Congress,’ which brought together many radical Islamic leaders and recognized terrorist organizations.

### *Sudan in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*

Sudan continues to be plagued by multiple problems. The current armed conflict and human rights crisis in Darfur, Sudan is one that remains constantly on the forefront of both the international news and the public conscience. Moreover, while the declaration of independence by South Sudan has been lauded by the international community, the secession has done little to curb fighting along the border of the now-distinct two countries.

The humanitarian aid in Sudan has been a topic of contention within the Security Council noting the rate of malnutrition and food insecurity levels namely in the Southern Kordofan and Blue Nile States.<sup>111</sup> Council President Kodjo Menan of Togo stated the members of the Security Council called upon the Government of Sudan and the Sudan People’s Liberation Movement-North (SPLM-N) to allow immediate access to the UN’s personnel including access to conduct a needs assessment.<sup>112</sup>

The lack of humanitarian aid is extremely problematic, as multiple UN agencies have halted humanitarian operations in Sudan. The United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF),<sup>113</sup> has warned that if life-saving assistance by the UN agencies is not restored, then “immediate, lasting, and profound impact” will occur for millions of Sudanese.<sup>114</sup> UNICEF Director of Emergency Programmes Louis-Georges Arsenault stated, “It’s a humanitarian crisis which will expand by leading to certain death for children and women if we are not able to sustain these operations.”<sup>115</sup>

Moreover, conflicts in Sudan have resulted in the displacements of tens of thousands of people, fleeing to South Sudan and Ethiopia.<sup>116</sup> According to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the internally displaced persons (IDPs) numbers are approximately 2.4 million in Sudan, due to violence in various regions.<sup>117</sup> The UN Special Rapporteur on the human rights of IDPs, Chaloka Beyani, urged the Government of Sudan to improve efforts in regards to IDPs in all regions within the Member State.<sup>118</sup> “A key step in this direction is addressing the very dire situation of IDPs in terms of safety, and their basic rights to adequate food, shelter, health, education, water, and livelihoods,” said Beyani, following a nine-day mission to Sudan.<sup>119</sup>

Efforts to ease the IDPs and regain access to distribute humanitarian aid came with the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA), which was set in 2005.<sup>120</sup> The CPA, under the mediation of the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD), the Sudan People’s Liberation Army (SPLM/A), and the Government of Sudan, involves six agreements: The Protocol of Machakos, the Protocol on security arrangements, the Protocol on wealth-sharing, the Protocol on the resolution in southern Kordofan/Nuba Mountains and the Blue Niles States, and the Protocol on the resolution in Abyie.<sup>121 122</sup> The CPA states that all levels of the Sudanese government shall comply fully with its

---

<sup>110</sup> State Department, *supra*.

<sup>111</sup> United Nations Security Council: SC/10543, AFR/2335. “Security Council Press Statement on Sudan’s Southern Kordofan, Blue Nile States.” February 14, 2012. <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs//2012/sc10543.doc.htm>

<sup>112</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>113</sup> UNICEF: UN agencies express concern over humanitarian aid crisis in Sudan. March 9, 2009. [http://www.unicef.org/emerg/sudan\\_48502.html](http://www.unicef.org/emerg/sudan_48502.html)

<sup>114</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>115</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>116</sup> UN News Centre: Sudan: Security Council alarmed by humanitarian crisis in conflict-hit states.”

February 12, 2012. [http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=41237&Cr=sudan&Cr1=#.UNaat6k2\\_IK](http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=41237&Cr=sudan&Cr1=#.UNaat6k2_IK)

<sup>117</sup> UN News Centre: Sudan must find durable solutions for internally displaced persons – UN expert. November 26, 2012.

[http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=43598&Cr=Sudan&Cr1=#.UNafh6k2\\_IL](http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=43598&Cr=Sudan&Cr1=#.UNafh6k2_IL)

<sup>118</sup> United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights: Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of Internally Displaced Persons. <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/IDPersons/Pages/IDPersonsIndex.aspx>

<sup>119</sup> UN News Centre: Sudan must find durable solutions for internally displaced persons – UN expert. November 26, 2012.

[http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=43598&Cr=Sudan&Cr1=#.UNafh6k2\\_IL](http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=43598&Cr=Sudan&Cr1=#.UNafh6k2_IL)

<sup>120</sup> United Nations Mission in Sudan: The background to Sudan’s Comprehensive Peace Agreement.

<http://unmis.unmissions.org/Default.aspx?tabid=515>

<sup>121</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>122</sup> United Nations Mission in Sudan: The Comprehensive Peace Agreement Between The Government of the Republic of The

obligations under the international human rights treaties to which it is or becomes a party.<sup>123</sup> These international treaties include the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees and the Related Protocol, and the African Charter on Human and People's Rights.<sup>124</sup>

In addition to the human rights treaties, the Government of Sudan has to abide by sixteen rights and freedoms including the right to life; right to liberty and security; right to a fair trial; no slavery nor torture; unlawful interference with privacy; freedom of thought, conscience, and religion; freedom of expression, freedom to assembly and association, freedom from discrimination; freedom of movement; right of men and women of marriageable age to marry; equality before law; equal rights of men, women, and children; and the right to vote.<sup>125</sup>

Security Council has been in "increased engagement" with the African Union (AU) and League of Arab States (LAS) in providing humanitarian aid to conflict areas.<sup>126</sup> A joint proposal by the AU, LAS, and UN for access to provide and deliver humanitarian assistance to war-affected civilians in South Kordofan and Blue Nile states has been under consideration, stressing the urgency of addressing the humanitarian needs of war-affected civilians, including Government and SPLM-N affected areas that have been cut off from external assistance until now.<sup>127</sup>

Sudan has opposed reports of impeding humanitarian aid, stating that the humanitarian situation in the Blue Nile and in Southern Kordofan is "normal" and that the Government of Sudan is cooperating with UN agencies in channeling relief materials to people in areas captured from rebels by the Sudanese Armed Forces.<sup>128</sup> Susan Rice, the U.S. Ambassador to the UN, has said that Khartoum could see famine conditions in parts of Sudan if humanitarian access continues to be obstructed.<sup>129</sup>

The UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA) reported the UN and its partners sought US\$1,065.8 million in humanitarian aid for Sudan in 2012.<sup>130</sup> Food security and the livelihood of the Sudanese population required the most funding with US\$449.02 million, followed by water, sanitation, and hygiene with US\$93.98 million.<sup>131</sup> The cost for the aid represented a 4.8 percent decrease compared to 2011 figures.<sup>132</sup> The majority of the 2011 funding was concentrated in Darfur, Khartoum, and parts of Eastern Sudan.<sup>133</sup>

## **Case Studies**

### *The Situation in Darfur*

The current armed conflict and human rights crisis in Darfur, Sudan is one that remains constantly on the forefront of both the international news and the public conscience. Resulting from ethnic, economic, political tension, and competition over resources,<sup>134</sup> the situation in Darfur has been sustained through the actions of three key groups: the Sudanese government and the two major rebel groups, the Sudan Liberation Movement/Army (SLM/A) and the Justice and Equality Movement (JEM). In 2003, rebellion broke out, led by both SLM/A and the JEM. These two rebel groups,

---

Sudan and The Sudan People's Liberation Movement/Sudan People's Liberation Army.  
<http://unmis.unmissions.org/Portals/UNMIS/Documents/General/cpa-en.pdf>

<sup>123</sup> Ibid.

<sup>124</sup> Ibid.

<sup>125</sup> Ibid.

<sup>126</sup> Ibid.

<sup>127</sup> United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA): Sudan: Weekly Humanitarian Bulletin. February 6-12, 2012.

<http://www.unsudanig.org/docs/OCHA%20Sudan%20Weekly%20Humanitarian%20Bulletin%206%20-%2012%20February%202012.pdf>

<sup>128</sup> Reuters: Sudan dismisses fear of looming humanitarian crisis. January 17, 2012.

<http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/01/17/us-sudan-un-idUSTRE80G22I20120117>

<sup>129</sup> Ibid.

<sup>130</sup> Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs: Sudan: UN and Partners Work Plan 2012:

[http://www.unsudanig.org/docs/Sudan\\_Humanitarian%20Work%20Plan\\_2012.pdf](http://www.unsudanig.org/docs/Sudan_Humanitarian%20Work%20Plan_2012.pdf)

<sup>131</sup> Ibid.

<sup>132</sup> Ibid.

<sup>133</sup> Ibid.

<sup>134</sup> United Nations Mission in Sudan: The UN role in Darfur.<http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/unmis/background.shtml>

which have since fractured into many more, largely represented the interests of the rural population of Darfur, which is largely African (and non-Arab) and Muslim.<sup>135</sup>

The Sudanese Government responded to the 2003 uprisings by deploying the Sudanese military to Darfur and by arming local Arab tribes and militias, now known as “Janjaweed,” to put down the rebellion. The methods employed by these militias have been horrific and have been labeled by the global community as extreme violations of international human rights—air raids and bombings of Darfur villages have been accused of being indiscriminate between the rebel forces and innocent civilian populations.<sup>136</sup> From 2003 to 2008 alone, the Janjaweed, along with other components of the Sudanese military, burned some 2,700 villages and executed approximately 2,000 Masalit tribal leaders, in addition widespread rape, beatings and murder.<sup>137</sup>

The United Nations Department of Public Information has estimated that more than 4.2 million people in Darfur have been affected, with 200,000 dead and over two million displaced.<sup>138</sup> The Sudanese government disputes these estimates.<sup>139</sup> The UN further estimates that more than half a million people across Darfur have been cut off from humanitarian assistance.<sup>140</sup>

The African Union (AU) initially sought to solve the crisis in Darfur by launching the inter-Sudanese peace talks with the three parties involved in the region, known as the Abuja talks.<sup>141</sup> The AU has deployed sixty AU military observers and 310 protection troops in Darfur to monitor and observe the compliance of the parties to the Humanitarian Ceasefire Agreement signed in N’Djamena on April 8, 2004.<sup>142</sup> The Government of the Sudan, SLM/A and JEM had signed the ceasefire agreement.

In 2004, as a result of the escalating violence in Darfur, the Security Council passed Resolution 1547, through which it established the United Nations Advance Mission in the Sudan (UNAMIS) to additional tasks in the region.<sup>143</sup> The Security Council established UNAMIS to facilitate contacts of the Sudanese parties involved in the conflict and introduce UN peace support operations.<sup>144</sup> In July of 2004, the Security Council took action under its Chapter VII powers to pass Resolution 1556, demanding that the Sudanese government fulfill its standing obligations of the Joint Communiqué and endorsing the African Union’s deployment of monitoring bodies to the region, and reiterating the need for implementation of an arms embargo against the Janjaweed and all other “non-governmental entities and individuals” in Darfur.<sup>145</sup>

On September 18, 2004, the Security Council again asserted Chapter VII authority through Resolution 1564, which established an international commission to investigate the Darfur situation in addition to calling for the Sudanese government and rebel forces to work together to achieve a “political solution.”<sup>146</sup> In March 2005, in response to the signing of a Comprehensive Peace Agreement between Sudan and the region now known as South Sudan, the Security Council passed Resolution 1590, establishing a United Nations Missions in Sudan (“UNMIS”). The Security Council also passed Resolution 1591, calling “all Sudanese parties . . . to take immediate steps to achieve a peaceful settlement to the conflict in Darfur and to take all necessary action to prevent further violations of human rights and international humanitarian law . . . .”<sup>147</sup> and placing a travel ban on and freezing the assets of any and all individuals identified as

---

<sup>135</sup> State Department, *supra*.

<sup>136</sup> “Sudan—UNMIS—Background,” <http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/missions/unmis/background.html>

<sup>137</sup> Andrew S. Natsios, Why I think We Can Still Save Darfur. *The Washington Post*, Feb. 24, 2008.

<sup>138</sup> United Nations Department of Public Information: Peace and Security: The United Nations and Darfur. August 2007. [http://www.unis.unvienna.org/pdf/UN-Darfur\\_fact\\_sheet.pdf](http://www.unis.unvienna.org/pdf/UN-Darfur_fact_sheet.pdf)

<sup>139</sup> United Human Rights Council: Genocide in Darfur. <http://www.unitedhumanrights.org/genocide/genocide-in-sudan.htm>

<sup>140</sup> United Nations Department of Public Information: Peace and Security: The United Nations and Darfur. August 2007. [http://www.unis.unvienna.org/pdf/UN-Darfur\\_fact\\_sheet.pdf](http://www.unis.unvienna.org/pdf/UN-Darfur_fact_sheet.pdf)

<sup>141</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>142</sup> United Nations Mission in the Sudan: UNMIS Background. <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/unmis/background.shtml>

<sup>143</sup> United Nations Security Council: S/RES/1556 (2004). [http://www.un.org/ga/search/view\\_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1556\(2004\)](http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1556(2004))

<sup>144</sup> United Nations Security Council: S/RES/1547 (2004). [http://www.un.org/ga/search/view\\_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1547\(2004\)](http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1547(2004))

<sup>145</sup> UN S/Res/1556 *Security Council Demands Sudan Disarm Militias in Darfur* Security Council 30 July 2004.

<sup>146</sup> UN S/Res/1564 (2004). 18 September 2004.

<sup>147</sup> S/RES/159. Security Council. 29 March 2005.

those who “impede the peace process, constitute a threat to stability in Darfur and the region” and who “commit violations of international humanitarian or human rights law.”

The Security Council additionally referred the situation in Darfur to the International Criminal Court (ICC) in 2005 via Resolution 1593.<sup>148</sup> The ICC has issued arrest warrants to individuals, including President al-Bashir, charging him of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide. The Sudanese government has refused to cooperate with the ICC.<sup>149</sup>

In 2006, the Security Council authorized the expansion of UNMIS directly into Darfur through Resolution 1706. UN Security Council Resolution 1706 transformed AMIS into a more extensive peace keeping operation. International talks were held (employing former Secretary-General Kofi Annan) to break the peace keeping operation into three phases, including a ‘Light Support Package’ and a ‘Heavy Support Package,’ and concluding with an end phase that would create a united UN/AU operation.<sup>150</sup> The resolution’s expansion of UNMIS, which was predicated upon receiving permission from the Sudanese Government, furthermore called for an increase in UNMIS of another 17,300 military personnel, and for negotiations to commence with the AU to transition AMIS into a UN peacekeeping operation.<sup>151</sup> Resolution 1706 mandated UNMIS to help implement and monitor the ceasefire and peace agreements and to establish peacekeeping forces in key areas of Darfur—notably in and around displaced person camps—with the purpose of regaining the confidence of the civilian population. The Sudanese government has consistently refused to allow the entrance of the UN peacekeeping forces into Darfur. The mandate of UNMIS has been repeatedly extended by the Security Council.<sup>152</sup>

Efforts by the AU culminated with the Darfur Peace Agreement (DPA) in May 5, 2006.<sup>153</sup> Under the DPA, the Government of Sudan, SLM/A, and the JEM accepted to refrain from jeopardizing humanitarian operations in Darfur.<sup>154</sup> The parties of the DPA agreed to create security measures for the distribution of humanitarian assistance and goods.<sup>155</sup> Article 26 of the DPA devotes most attention to the humanitarian process, with the signed parties agreeing to respect the rights of the IDPs, create a conducive environment for the IDPs and refugees, provide special protection for children, women, and the disabled, and not obstructing the free movement of humanitarian vehicles or goods in Darfur.<sup>156</sup>

The DPA has not provided a final solution to peace as government-led attacks on populated areas in late 2010 and early 2011 displaced more than 70,000 and injured and killed others, notably the Zaghawa and Fur communities with alleged ties to rebel groups.<sup>157</sup> In addition, much of Darfur has remained off limits to the AU and UN missions and humanitarian groups, which is a violation to the DPA.<sup>158</sup>

The Darfur crisis remains the UN’s largest relief effort in the world. Former UN Secretary General Kofi Annan said, “A stable Sudan requires a peaceful Darfur”—therefore collaboration between the work of the UN and the AU in Sudan must be complementary.<sup>159</sup> While over 500,000 people are believed to be cut off from humanitarian assistance, this number shows some improvement over time—in February 2007, over 900,000 were unable to receive assistance.<sup>160</sup>

---

<sup>148</sup> Ibid.

<sup>149</sup> Ibid.

<sup>150</sup> UNSC Res. 1706; Dep’t of State, AMIS website ([www.amis-sudan/history.html](http://www.amis-sudan/history.html))

<sup>151</sup> S/RES/1706. Security Council. 31 August 2006.

<sup>152</sup> Resolutions 1709, 1714, 1755,

<sup>153</sup> United Nations Development Programme: Darfur Peace Agreement.

<http://www.sd.undp.org/doc/DPA.pdf>

<sup>154</sup> Ibid.

<sup>155</sup> Ibid.

<sup>156</sup> Ibid.

<sup>157</sup> Human Rights Watch: World Report 2012: Sudan.

<http://www.hrw.org/world-report-2012/world-report-2012-sudan>

<sup>158</sup> Ibid.

<sup>159</sup> Ibid.

<sup>160</sup> United Nations Department of Public Information: Peace and Security: The United Nations and Darfur.

August 2007. [http://www.unis.unvienna.org/pdf/UN-Darfur\\_fact\\_sheet.pdf](http://www.unis.unvienna.org/pdf/UN-Darfur_fact_sheet.pdf)

Humanitarian workers in conflict-affected populations through innovative and often expensive means attributed to the increase in aid distribution.<sup>161</sup>

### *Sudan and South Sudan*

As noted in the CPA, the Machakos Protocol signed in Kenya on July 20, 2002 states that Sudan is recognized as a multi-cultural, multi-racial, multi-ethnic, multi-religious, and multi-lingual country and religion should not be used as a decisive factor.<sup>162</sup> With the CPA, Sudan began to recognize the right to self-determination for the southern region of the country and allowed for a referendum on the matter.<sup>163</sup> The South Sudan referendum was in order between January 9 and 15, 2011 and on July 9, 2011, the country confirmed its independence with 98.83% of the vote.<sup>164 165</sup> The UN General Assembly admitted the Republic of South Sudan as the 193<sup>rd</sup> Member State on July 14, 2011, following the recommendation of the Security Council on July 13, 2011.<sup>166 167</sup> South Sudan was recognized as the African Union's 54<sup>th</sup> Member State.<sup>168</sup> UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon recognized the referendum vote but stated much more has to be done between Sudan and South Sudan.<sup>169</sup>

Although South Sudan's referendum was meant to be part of the peace agreement, violence still occurs. Refugees are coming by the thousands into South Sudan, overcrowding camps.<sup>170</sup> UN humanitarian Coordinator Lise Grande, then-deputy special representative of the UN secretary general, said the number of people in need of aid doubled due to unresolved issues between Sudan and South Sudan.<sup>171</sup> UNHCR estimated 170,000 Sudanese refugees have settled in camps across South Sudan's Unity and Upper Niles states and the health situation becoming an "increasing alarm" for the UNHCR, due to respiratory tract infections and malaria.<sup>172</sup>

The Abyei Area has also been contested by Sudan and South Sudan, was not included in the 2011 referendum.<sup>173</sup> Abyei has seen the displacement of more than 100,000 people and death of UN personnel.<sup>174 175</sup> Secretary General Ban Ki-moon has condemned the latest series of incidents in Abyei and remains "extremely concerned" with the lack of developments made by both Sudanese and South Sudanese parties.<sup>176</sup> The Security Council unanimously extended the mandate of the United Nations Interim Security Force for Abyei until May 31, 2013 and further follows the

---

<sup>161</sup> Ibid.

<sup>162</sup> United Nations Mission in Sudan: The Comprehensive Peace Agreement Between The Government of the Republic of The Sudan and The Sudan People's Liberation Movement/Sudan People's Liberation Army.  
<http://unmis.unmissions.org/Portals/UNMIS/Documents/General/cpa-en.pdf>

<sup>163</sup> Ibid.

<sup>164</sup> South Sudan Independence Declaration. July 10, 2011.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-sJugNxYVA8>

<sup>165</sup> South Sudan Sovereignty declared by Speaker Igga. July 2011.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v5m4JUyBW38&lr=1>

<sup>166</sup> UN News Centre: "UN welcomes South Sudan as 193<sup>rd</sup> Member State."  
July 14, 2011.

[http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=39034&Cr=South+Sudan&Cr1=#.UN-flqk2\\_IJ](http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=39034&Cr=South+Sudan&Cr1=#.UN-flqk2_IJ)

<sup>167</sup> UN Security Council: Adopting Resolution 1999 (2011) Without Vote, Security Council Recommends Admission of Republic of South Sudan as United Nations Member." July 13, 2011.  
<http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2011/sc10322.doc.htm>

<sup>168</sup> Voice of America: "South Sudan Becomes African Union's 54<sup>th</sup> Member." July 27, 2011.

<http://www.voanews.com/content/south-sudan-becomes-african-unions-54th-member-126320433/158563.html>

<sup>169</sup> Associated Press: "Over 99 pct in Southern Sudan vote for secession." Maggie Flick. January 30, 2011.

[http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/topstories/2011-01-30-2052877353\\_x.htm](http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/topstories/2011-01-30-2052877353_x.htm)

<sup>170</sup> Al Jazeera: "Q&A: The humanitarian crisis in South Sudan." Nazanine Moshiri. July 13, 2012.

<http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/features/2012/07/201271221451370886.html>

<sup>171</sup> Ibid.

<sup>172</sup> Press TV: "Sudan refugees face humanitarian crisis: UNHCR." August 25, 2012. <http://www.presstv.ir/detail/258123.html>

<sup>173</sup> UN News Centre: "Security Council extends mandate of UN peacekeeping force in Abyei."

November 16, 2012. [http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=43523&Cr=abyei&Cr1=#.UN-Foqk2\\_IJ](http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=43523&Cr=abyei&Cr1=#.UN-Foqk2_IJ)

<sup>174</sup> UN News Centre: "Secretary-General condemns incidents in Abyei, urges resolution of disputes through dialogue."

November 13, 2012. [http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=43486&Cr=Abyei&Cr1=#.UN-FfQk2\\_IJ](http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=43486&Cr=Abyei&Cr1=#.UN-FfQk2_IJ)

<sup>175</sup> United Nations Interim Security Force for Abyei.

<http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/unisfa/background.shtml>

<sup>176</sup> Ibid.

recommendation of the secretary general to constitute a police service and finalize the establishment of an administration for the area.<sup>177</sup>

### ***Conclusion***

For decades, Sudan has been driven by conflict, displacement, and vulnerability. According to the UNOCHA, 4.2 million people have been supported by humanitarian assistance in 2012.<sup>178</sup> The Sudanese population in Darfur remains critical where up to 1.9 million IDPs are living in camps.<sup>179</sup> Outbreaks of diseases have utilized much attention from UN organizations, recently with the yellow fever outbreak in Darfur affecting about 200,000 people.<sup>180</sup> The United Nations Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator Peter de Clercq stated the humanitarian community would continue to respond to the aid challenges Sudan is currently facing.<sup>181</sup> The political and security situation in Sudan remains challenging with tension with South Sudan driving the humanitarian crisis.<sup>182</sup> The UNHCR has referred to the displacement and population movement in Sudan as “extremely challenging,” and has set a budget of U.S. \$133.9 million for 2013.<sup>183</sup> The humanitarian situation in Sudan has involved fellow Member States and regional organizations such as the AU to provide the peace and security.<sup>184</sup>

### ***Committee Directive***

Delegates are expected to have an understanding of what their respective Member States have provided in humanitarian aid to Sudan. If not, what is the reason and could there be a mechanism to provide aid? Familiarity on UN missions in Sudan and latest reports will be beneficial. Delegates should understand the role of UN Peacekeepers’ efforts and research the works of NGOs in the Sudan. Delegates are to be familiar with their Member State’s stance on the Government of Sudan, as well as the position on the Darfur region and South Sudan’s independence. What about border issues? Recognizing South Sudan as an independent Member State is a point of contention, where does your country stand on the issue? Furthermore, delegates are to follow the developments the Security Council facilitated for Sudan, notably movements in Darfur and Abyei. What measures can and should the Security Council take to ensure UN Missions are providing the humanitarian aid needed to the Sudanese population?

## **Topic III: Examining the Use of Sanctions in Conflict**

### ***Introduction***

When the international community is faced with a breach of peace and security, the United Nation’s (UN) Security Council is the international authority given the task of developing and enforcing the measures necessary to restore the balance of law and order. Granted this power under Chapter VII of the UN Charter, the Security Council must accomplish this task without the use of armed forces and conflict.<sup>185</sup> Instead, the Security Council must rely on more

---

<sup>177</sup> UN News Centre: “Security Council extends mandate of UN peacekeeping force in Abyei.”

November 16, 2012. [http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=43523&Cr=abyei&Cr1=#.UN-Foqk2\\_IJ](http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=43523&Cr=abyei&Cr1=#.UN-Foqk2_IJ)

<sup>178</sup> Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs: Sudan: UN and Partners Work Plan 2012:

[http://www.unsudanig.org/docs/Sudan\\_Humanitarian%20Work%20Plan\\_2012.pdf](http://www.unsudanig.org/docs/Sudan_Humanitarian%20Work%20Plan_2012.pdf)

<sup>179</sup> Ibid.

<sup>180</sup> UN News Centre: “Yellow fever outbreak in Sudan’s Darfur region kills 67 – UN health agency.

November 7, 2012. [http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=43431&Cr=Darfur&Cr1=#.UOTIArQ2\\_IK](http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=43431&Cr=Darfur&Cr1=#.UOTIArQ2_IK)

<sup>181</sup> Ibid.

<sup>182</sup> Al Jazeera: “Q&A: The humanitarian crisis in South Sudan.” Nazanine Moshiri. July 13, 2012.

<http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/features/2012/07/201271221451370886.html>

<sup>183</sup> United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees: UNHCR Global Appeal for 2013 Update.

<http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home/opensslPDFViewer.html?docid=50a9f822b&query=sudan%20humanitarian>

<sup>184</sup> UN News Centre: “In meeting, UN and African union officials flag need for engagement in Darfur for further progress.”

October 25, 2012. [http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=43375&Cr=Darfur&Cr1=#.UOTrjLQ2\\_IK](http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=43375&Cr=Darfur&Cr1=#.UOTrjLQ2_IK)

<sup>185</sup> “Security Council Sanctions Committee: An Overview.” United Nations Security Council. <http://www.un.org/sc/committees/>.



pragmatic political means to restore and maintain international peace and security. As outlined in Article 41 of the Charter, these measures “may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communications, and the severance of diplomatic relations.”<sup>186</sup>

These measures, known as sanctions, are the primary response taken by the Security Council to address any international entity (individual, non-state group, or country) identified as a disruptor of international peace and security.<sup>187</sup> There are a number of actions and circumstances that can lead to the implementation of sanctions, namely military action such as an invasion or civil war, political conflict over international statutes and agreements, and acts of terrorism. When faced with these situations, “the range of sanctions has included comprehensive economic and trade sanctions and/or more targeted measures such as arms embargoes, travel bans, financial or diplomatic restrictions.”<sup>188</sup>

Since the 1990s, the Security Council has turned to the targeting principle to refine the scope of sanctions in order to minimize the negative impact of sanctions on innocent parties.<sup>189</sup> Sanctions today now focus as much on individuals and organizations that disrupt international peace and security as they do on countries. As this “modern” era of Security Council sanctions enters its third decade, the UN sanctions framework remains riddled with inefficiencies and overlap of functions, important questions of legality, humanitarian issues, as well as how to accurately measure the impact that sanctions have.

Short of the use of armed forces, Security Council sanctions remain the UN’s optimal framework for addressing matters of international peace and security. As such, debate over the use of sanctions is now shifting towards reforming and augmenting the current framework to assist the Security Council in its role as international mediator and monitor. In the following, evidence from past and present sanction operations will highlight the strengths and weaknesses of the current system. Identifying successes and failures of the modern system will be important in guiding the debate on how to best reform the sanctions system to address the ever-changing face of international conflict.

### ***Security Council Sanctions in the 1990s***

The history of Security Council sanctions prior to the 1990s is sparse. Sanction committees were established concerning Southern Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe) in 1968 and Apartheid South Africa in 1977.<sup>190</sup> Evidence regarding the impact that these sanctions had on each country is conflicted. By many accounts, sanctions had a trivial impact on the outcome of events in Southern Rhodesia and South Africa.<sup>191 192</sup> Instead, the resolution of these conflicts has been attributed to actions taken outside of the UN.<sup>193</sup>

The 1990s marks the first period when Security Council-invoked sanctions were extensively and simultaneously used to address a number of different disruptions to international peace and security.<sup>194</sup> During this period, a wide variety of sanctions were implemented against Angola, Haiti, Iraq, Liberia, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, and Yugoslavia.<sup>195</sup> To synthesize this extensive history, the focus of this section will be on the sanctions imposed upon Iraq that precipitated the now-infamous Oil-for-Food program, as well as the sanctions levied against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya after the bombing of Pan Am Flight 103. The abject failure of the Iraqi sanctions and moderate success of those imposed upon Libya provide a suitable contrast to highlight the strengths and weaknesses of the Security Council’s approach to sanctions during this time period.

---

<sup>186</sup> *Charter of the United Nations*. United Nations. June 26, 1945. <http://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/chapter7.shtml>.

<sup>187</sup> “Security Council Sanctions Committee: An Overview.” United Nations Security Council. <http://www.un.org/sc/committees/>.

<sup>188</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>189</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>190</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>191</sup> Glenn V. Stephenson. “The Impact of International Economic Sanctions on the Internal Viability of Rhodesia.” *Geographical review*. July, 1975. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/213536.pdf?acceptTC=true>.

<sup>192</sup> Philip I. Levy. “Sanctions on South Africa: What Did They Do?” Economic Growth Center, Yale University. February, 1999. [http://www.econ.yale.edu/growth\\_pdf/cdp796.pdf](http://www.econ.yale.edu/growth_pdf/cdp796.pdf).

<sup>193</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>194</sup> Robert McMahon. “UN Sanctions: A Mixed Record.” Council on Foreign Relations. November 17, 2006. <http://www.cfr.org/un/un-sanctions-mixed-record/p12045>.

<sup>195</sup> “Security Council Sanctions Committee: An Overview.” United Nations Security Council. <http://www.un.org/sc/committees/>.

### *Case Study: Iraq Oil-for-Food Scandal*

The combination of a conflicted colonial past and disputes over slant drilling on a bordering oil field culminated in the seven-month Iraqi invasion of Kuwait that began 2 August 1990.<sup>196</sup> The Security Council, “mindful of its responsibilities under the Charter of the UN for the maintenance of international peace and security,” quickly sprang into action only four days after the invasion began with the passing of Security Council resolution 661.<sup>197</sup>

As the Security Council’s second resolution regarding the invasion, resolution 661 implemented a series of economic sanctions against the Iraqi government. The resolution called for a ban on all imports of commodities originating in Iraq, as well as a ban on the sale of any commodities to Iraq.<sup>198</sup> . Exceptions to the import and export bans were made for commodities intended for medical purposes and foodstuffs in humanitarian.<sup>199</sup> The list of sanctions also included a freeze on any funds or other financial and economic resources within Iraq and Kuwait.<sup>200</sup> This resolution also established a committee comprised of diplomats from each of the Member States sitting on the Security Council to examine the progress made in implementing the sanctions.<sup>201</sup>

Following Iraq’s continued claims of Kuwait’s annexation, among other provisions of resolution 661 ignored by Iraq, the Security Council expanded upon the sanctions already in place by passing three separate resolutions between 25 August and 25 September 1990. To ensure that the sanctions outlined in resolution 661, specifically the ban on all Iraqi imports and exports, were implemented effectively, Security Council resolution 665 called for Member States to halt all maritime shipping to Iraq.<sup>202</sup> Nearly three weeks after the passing of resolution 665, the Security Council passed resolution 666 to further refine the focus of the sanctions by elaborating upon the exceptions to the trade ban already in place. Wary of the humanitarian crisis that was beginning to afflict the Iraqi population, resolution 666 kept the distribution of foodstuffs by the UN and the International Red Cross under constant review to allow for a more flexible program as the humanitarian situation developed.<sup>203</sup> The resolution also called for more stringent monitoring of the medical supplies brought into the region to further staunch the flow of commodities banned by resolution 661.<sup>204</sup> The sanctions in place against Iraq were further expanded upon by Security Council resolution 670, which banned all non-humanitarian flights to or from Iraq or Kuwait.<sup>205</sup>

Following Iraq’s continued disregard of the first round of sanctions, the Security Council passed resolution 686 on 2 March 1991 and resolution 687 on 3 April 1991. In the first resolution, the Security Council stated that it holds Iraq liable for losses, damages, and injuries arising to all parties affected by the invasion.<sup>206</sup> The latter resolution called for the destruction of all chemical and biological weapons, as well as ballistic missiles, in Iraq.<sup>207</sup> Resolution 687 also extended the damages Iraq was liable for to include the depletion of natural resources.<sup>208</sup> In order to compensate all parties for this extensive list of damages, resolution 687 established a fund to compensate any and all claims made by afflicted parties.<sup>209</sup> Compensation would be funded by a percentage of exports of petroleum and petroleum products, which were placed under the control of the UN.<sup>210</sup>

The impact of these sanctions extended far beyond the architects of the invasion of Kuwait. In fact, the sanctions themselves did more to punish the Iraqi population than bring a timely end to the invasion. The end of the invasion has been credited to the United States-led Gulf War, while UN sanctions are often credited with the humanitarian crisis that

---

<sup>196</sup> “1990: Iraq invades Kuwait.” British Broadcasting Corporation. August 2 1990.

[http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/august/2/newsid\\_2526000/2526937.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/august/2/newsid_2526000/2526937.stm).

<sup>197</sup> S/Res/661. United Nations Security Council. August 2, 1990.

<sup>198</sup> Ibid.

<sup>199</sup> Ibid

<sup>200</sup> Ibid.

<sup>201</sup> Ibid.

<sup>202</sup> S/Res/665. United Nations Security Council. August 25, 1990.

<sup>203</sup> Ibid.

<sup>204</sup> Ibid.

<sup>205</sup> S/Res/670. United Nations Security Council. September 25, 1990.

<sup>206</sup> S/Res/686. United Nations Security Council. March 2, 1991.

<sup>207</sup> S/Res/687. United Nations Security Council. April 3, 1991.

<sup>208</sup> Ibid.

<sup>209</sup> Ibid.

<sup>210</sup> Ibid.

followed.<sup>211</sup> The sanctions placed upon Iraq are credited with more than doubling the maternal and infant mortality rate, the deterioration of healthcare infrastructure in Iraq, the spread of communicable diseases such as malaria, and a substantial increase in the number of school dropouts.<sup>212</sup>

The humanitarian situation, coupled with the financial constraint placed upon Iraq due its liability for the damages caused by the invasion, spurred the Security Council to establish the Oil-for-Food program with the passing of resolution 989 on 14 April 1995.<sup>213</sup> The program was administered separately from the sanctions regime, but oversight of the program was tasked to the sanctions committee created by Resolution 661.<sup>214</sup> Under the program, Iraq was allowed to export \$2 billion worth of petroleum and related products every six months, allocating two-thirds of this amount to the humanitarian needs of the Iraqi population.<sup>215</sup>

During the seven-year lifespan of the program's operation, nearly \$37 billion in food, medicine, and equipment were purchased.<sup>216</sup> The sheer magnitude of this figure brings to light the unintended economic and social consequences of the sanction regime that began with resolution 661. Along with the Iraqi government's siphoning of program funds, the Oil-for-Food program is a strong example of a number of the weaknesses inherent to the UN's approach to sanctions during the 1990s. Not only did the comprehensive sanctions invoked by the Security Council fail to target those responsible for the sanctions, extreme mismanagement of the measures taken to correct for these issues further exacerbated the crisis faced by the Iraqi population.<sup>217</sup>

#### *Case Study: Post-Lockerbie Libya*

On 21 December 1988, Pan Am Flight 103 exploded over Lockerbie, Scotland, killing all 259 people onboard as well as another 11 on the ground.<sup>218</sup> Following a three-year investigation, two Libyan nationals linked to the Libyan government were charged with the bombing in Scotland and the United States.<sup>219</sup> After it was clear that Libya was unwilling to hand over the two individuals, the UN stepped in on 31 March 1992 with the passing of Security Council resolution 748. In this resolution, the Security Council voted to implement a ban on all air travel and arms sales to Libya.<sup>220</sup> Exemptions to the travel ban were made for emergency medical evacuations and trips for religious purposes such as the Hajj pilgrimage.<sup>221</sup> The resolution also placed restrictions on Libyan diplomats located abroad and established a sanction committee.<sup>222</sup>

After over a year where the sanctions in place did little to sway the actions of the Libyan government, the Security Council returned to action on the matter with resolution 883 on 11 November 1993.<sup>223</sup> Resolution 883 expanded upon the sanctions already in place, freezing the funds and financial resources located in foreign banks as well as banning the import of spare parts for the Libyan oil ministry.<sup>224</sup> After six years of political squabbling, Libya agreed to hand over the two suspects in large part because of the economic and social consequences the sanctions had caused.<sup>225</sup> In

---

<sup>211</sup> "The Human Rights Impact of Economic Sanctions on Iraq." Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. September 5, 2000. <http://www.casi.org.uk/info/undocs/sanct31.pdf>.

<sup>212</sup> Ibid.

<sup>213</sup> "Oil-for-Food." Office of the Iraq Programme Oil-for-Food. November 4, 2003. <http://www.un.org/Depts/oip/background/index.html>.

<sup>214</sup> Paul A. Volcker et al. "The Management of the United Nation Oil-for-Food Programme." Independent Inquiry into the United Nations Oil-for-Food Programme. September 7, 2005. [http://www.iic-offp.org/documents/Sept05/Mgmt\\_V1.pdf](http://www.iic-offp.org/documents/Sept05/Mgmt_V1.pdf).

<sup>215</sup> "Oil-for-Food." Office of the Iraq Programme Oil-for-Food. November 4, 2003. <http://www.un.org/Depts/oip/background/index.html>.

<sup>216</sup> Paul A. Volcker et al. "The Management of the United Nation Oil-for-Food Programme." Independent Inquiry into the United Nations Oil-for-Food Programme. September 7, 2005. [http://www.iic-offp.org/documents/Sept05/Mgmt\\_V1.pdf](http://www.iic-offp.org/documents/Sept05/Mgmt_V1.pdf).

<sup>217</sup> Ibid.

<sup>218</sup> "Lockerbie Bombing-Timeline." The Guardian. May 20, 2012. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2012/may/20/time-line-lockerbie-bombing-megrahi>.

<sup>219</sup> Ibid.

<sup>220</sup> S/Res/748. United Nations Security Council. March 31, 1992.

<sup>221</sup> S/2007/734. United Nations Security Council. December 13, 2007.

<sup>222</sup> S/Res/748. United Nations Security Council. March 31, 1992.

<sup>223</sup> "Lockerbie Bombing-Timeline." The Guardian. May 20, 2012. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2012/may/20/time-line-lockerbie-bombing-megrahi>.

<sup>224</sup> S/Res/883. United Nations Security Council. November 11, 1993.

<sup>225</sup> "Libya Profile." British Broadcasting Corporation. December 10, 2012. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-13755445>.

August of 2003, Libya also agreed to compensate victims of the bombing to the tune of \$2.7 billion and claimed responsibility for the bombing.<sup>226</sup>

Although the sanctions imposed upon Libya in 1992 and 1993 ultimately attained their goal, they left behind a legacy of substantial economic and social consequences for the Libyan population. Three years before the sanctions were suspended in 1999, the Libyan Mission to the UN outlined the true economic and humanitarian impact of these sanctions. At the time of the Mission's report in 1996, the ban on aerial travel to Libya had severely limited access to medicine in Libya, while the ban on spare parts also led to a rapid deterioration in Libya's medical infrastructure.<sup>227</sup> It was estimated that the losses to the health and social welfare sector were nearly \$181 million.<sup>228</sup> This figure pales in comparison to the economic losses reported. The Mission's report also estimated that Libya's agricultural sector had lost almost \$6 billion, the transportation and communication sector had lost almost \$1.2 billion, the industry and mining sector had lost \$1.1 billion, the finance and trade sector had lost \$4.2 billion, and the energy sector had lost \$3 billion.<sup>229</sup> Similar to the impact of comprehensive sanctions in Iraq, the impact of sanctions in Libya extended far beyond the government they were directed at. The Libyan population suffered tremendous economic and social losses during the period in which the UN sanctions were in effect.

### *Security Council Sanctions Today*

Upon noting the tremendous external costs associated with the comprehensive sanction approach used in the early 1990s, the Security Council shifted the focus to what are known as targeted sanctions. An example of a targeted sanction can be seen above, where Security Council resolution 883 banned the import of spare parts to the Libyan oil ministry. As the Libyan Mission's report noted, this ban had a spillover effect on Libya's medical infrastructure and imposed an unforeseen cost to the social welfare of the Libyan population.<sup>230</sup> In 1997, then-Secretary General Kofi Annan acknowledged that "it is increasingly accepted that the design and implementation of sanctions mandated by the Security Council need to be improved, and their humanitarian costs to civilian populations reduced as far as possible."<sup>231</sup> By moving towards targeted sanctions in the early 2000s, the UN began to focus the impact of sanctions on "leaders, political elites and segments of society believed responsible for objectionable behavior, while reducing collateral damage to the general population and third countries."<sup>232</sup> At the present, there are thirteen different sanction committees active under the jurisdiction of the Security Council.<sup>233</sup>

Given this shifting approach, the Security Council has increasingly identified individuals and groups that are at the source of disruptions to international peace and security such as Al-Qaida (see both resolution 1267 (1999) and 1987 (2011)) and the Taliban (see resolution 1988 (2011)).<sup>234</sup> The Security Council continues the practice of levying comprehensive sanctions against governments that act as disruptors of international peace and security. However, the Security Council has made a concerted effort to refine these sanctions, working in conjunction with targeted sanctions, to minimize the "collateral damage" imposed upon civilian populations by designing sanctions that target those responsible for the international disruption as much as possible. The following case study will elaborate upon this balance.

### *Case Study: The Islamic Republic of Iran*

The sanctions against the Islamic Republic of Iran regarding the development of its nuclear program best demonstrate the present-day approach towards sanctions employed by the UN. After Iran ignored the Security Council's plea to halt its uranium enrichment program in late July of 2006 (see resolution 1696), the Security Council implemented a set

---

<sup>226</sup> Ibid.

<sup>227</sup> "Sixth comprehensive report on damage caused by the implementation of Security Council resolutions 748 (1992) and 883 (1993) during the period from 15 April 1992 to 31 December 1995." Libyan Mission to the United Nations. December 31, 1995.

<sup>228</sup> Ibid.

<sup>229</sup> Ibid.

<sup>230</sup> Ibid.

<sup>231</sup> A/52/1. United Nations General Assembly. September 3, 1997.

<sup>232</sup> Gary Clyd Hufbauer and Barbara Oegg. "Targeted Sanctions: A Policy Alternative?" Peterson Institute for International Economics. February 23, 2000. <http://www.iie.com/publications/papers/paper.cfm?ResearchID=371>.

<sup>233</sup> "Security Council Sanctions Committee: An Overview." United Nations Security Council. <http://www.un.org/sc/committees/>.

<sup>234</sup> Ibid.

of targeted sanctions in resolution 1737 on 23 December 2006. The sanctions imposed included an embargo on all nuclear and ballistic missiles, a more general weapons import ban, and froze the assets of key individuals and companies related to the program.<sup>235</sup> After three months of continued defiance by Iran, the Security Council passed resolution 1747 on 24 March 2007, in which the list of individuals and entities subject to the asset freeze was expanded and a ban on the export of weapons from Iran was enacted.<sup>236</sup>

Nearly a year of continued resistance by Iran over its nuclear and ballistic missile program went by before the Security Council passed Resolution 1803 on 3 March 2008. This resolution expanded the asset freeze again and called upon Member States to monitor Iranian banks, inspect Iranian ships and aircraft, and to monitor the movement of individuals involved in the program through their territory.<sup>237</sup> The final set of sanctions enacted by the Security Council is enshrined in resolution 1929, which was passed on 9 June 2010. This resolution banned Iran from all ballistic missile-related activities, extended the asset freeze to include the Iranian Revolutionary Guard and the Islamic Republic of Iran Shipping Lines, prohibits the banks of Member States from entering into relationships with the Iranian bank if it might benefit the Iranian nuclear program, and prevents Member States' financial institutions from opening offices and accounts in Iran.<sup>238</sup> Further sanctions are unlikely at this point given the resistance of the Russian Federation and People's Republic of China, two of the five countries with veto power on the Security Council.<sup>239</sup> It is important to note at this juncture that the much discussed oil embargo in place against the Iran is a result of non-UN sanctions (namely sanctions originating in the United States and European Union), a topic that will be discussed in a later section.

Six years since the first set of sanctions were levied against Iran have led to few, if any, tangible results in halting ballistic missile program and evidence suggests that Iran continues to flaunt the sanctions in place. Iran has been able to evade some of the sanctions in place. For example, Iran has avoided much of the impact of the sanctions placed against its transport activities by repeatedly transferring ownership of shipping vessels to third party companies, renaming aircraft and ships, as well as reflagging shipping vessels.<sup>240</sup> It has also been reported that Iran was in violation of arms export ban, being a major party in supplying Syria with arms over the past year.<sup>241</sup>

However, the impact of sanctions is evident on other fronts. Outside experts and analysis of findings made by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) show signs that "sanctions are slowing the ability of the Islamic Republic of Iran to expand some aspects of its fuel cycle activities."<sup>242</sup> Additionally, Secretary General Ban Ki-Moon reported on 5 October 2012 "the sanctions imposed on the Islamic Republic of Iran have had significant effects on the general population, including an escalation in inflation, a rise in commodities and energy costs, an increase in the rate of unemployment and a shortage of necessary items, including medicine."<sup>243</sup> It is also reported that the \$150 billion in foreign currency reserves the Iranian government stockpiled in July of 2012 to balance out the dramatic rise in foodstuffs had fallen to \$110 billion by October.<sup>244</sup> The value of the Iranian currency, the rial, also fell by 80 percent between January and October of 2012, prompting Iran to "severely restrict currency trading."<sup>245</sup> According to the British Broadcasting Corporation, "economists say the rial's decline is one of the clearest signs the accumulated impact of sanctions has severely weakened Iran's economy."<sup>246</sup> As this situation remains unresolved at the writing of this guide, the true impact and results of the Security Council's sanction regime against Iran remains in the balance.

---

<sup>235</sup> S/Res/1737. United Nations Security Council. December 23, 2006.

<sup>236</sup> Ibid.

<sup>237</sup> Ibid.

<sup>238</sup> Ibid.

<sup>239</sup> "Q&A: Iran Sanctions." British Broadcasting Corporation. October 16, 2012. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-middle-east-15983302>.

<sup>240</sup> S/2012/395 United Nations Security Council. June 12, 2012. [http://www.un.org/ga/search/view\\_doc.asp?symbol=S/2012/395](http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/2012/395).

<sup>241</sup> Ibid.

<sup>242</sup> Ibid.

<sup>243</sup> Michelle Nichols and Louis Charbonneau. "UN Chief says sanctions on Iran affecting its people." Reuters. October 5, 2012. <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/10/05/us-iran-sanctions-un-idUSBRE89412Z20121005>.

<sup>244</sup> "Q&A: Iran Sanctions." British Broadcasting Corporation. October 16, 2012. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-middle-east-15983302>.

<sup>245</sup> Ibid.

<sup>246</sup> Ibid.

## *Key Issues and Conclusions*

Five years after the Security Council began to pivot towards the use of targeted sanctions, the Security Council established the Informal Working Group on General Issues of Sanctions “to develop general recommendations on how to improve the effectiveness of United Nations sanctions.”<sup>247</sup> The Working Group’s year-long effort is synthesized in its letter to the Security Council from 22 December 2006. The Working Group focused on sanction design, implementation, and follow-up, offering recommendations that look to strike a balance between standard guidelines applicable to all sanction committees and the needed flexibility to craft situation-specific sanctions.<sup>248</sup>

The Working Group emphasized that when designing sanctions, the Security Council should make clear what behavior the sanctions are seeking to change, identify the critical actors involved, and account for the expected humanitarian, political, and economic impacts that the sanctions may impose.<sup>249</sup> Careful consideration of the first two points may offer the best path of minimizing the external costs discussed in the above case studies. Note, for instance, a number of the sanctions imposed on Iran only affect entities such as the Iranian Revolutionary Guard and the Islamic Republic of Iran Shipping Lines. Although these targeted sanctions may indirectly effect the Iranian population, the unintended implications will be minimal compared to the consequences of a sweeping sanctions regime that targets all facets of the population. Another key recommendation made by the Working Group emphasized the need for better oversight of sanctions, including calls for a period review and evaluation of the sanctions total impact.<sup>250</sup> By keeping the relevant sanction committee up-to-date on the impact imposed by the sanctions, it will be possible to adapt the sanctions regime to changes in political, economic, and humanitarian circumstances.

As sanctions have become more refined in scope, targeting individuals and non-state entities, the transparency of sanctions operations are of supreme importance. The Working Group called for increased transparency in sanction committees, specifically that the committees should identify the sources of information behind the decisions made in committee meetings whenever feasible.<sup>251</sup> As more individuals and non-state entities face sanctions, it will be important to consider the “the rights and standing of parties that might be listed wrongly.”<sup>252</sup> Prior to 2006, sanctions were administered without the possibility of judicial review to correct for any misidentifications of actors facing sanctions.<sup>253</sup> The lack of due process in sanctions proceedings posed complex legal questions to the UN system of sanctions. As a result, the Security Council adopted resolution 1730 on 19 December 2006 “as part of its commitment to ensure that fair and clear procedures exist for placing individuals and entities on sanctions lists and for removing them.”<sup>254</sup> To facilitate the implementation of this sanction, the Security Council adopted resolution 1904, creating the Office of the Ombudsperson to handle requests from individuals or entities seeking to be removed from a sanctions list.<sup>255</sup> Now, any individual or entity may submit a request to be de-listed through the focal point process as facilitated by the Office of the Ombudsperson or through their state of residence.<sup>256</sup>

The perspective in which the impact of sanctions is evaluated is another facet of the UN sanctions system that has evolved over time. How sanctions are evaluated is just as important as how they are implemented. Proper evaluation of a sanctions regime will assist the Security Council in better understanding the strengths and weaknesses of the approach employed. One perspective adopted by the UN towards this end is that “the effectiveness of sanctions should be measured not by whether targets comply immediately and completely with Security Council demands but by the impacts that occur in almost every case and that generate pressure for policy change.”<sup>257</sup> If all sanctions past and

---

<sup>247</sup> S/2005/841. United Nations Security Council. December 29, 2005.

<sup>248</sup> S/2006/997. United Nations Security Council. December 22, 2006.

<sup>249</sup> Ibid.

<sup>250</sup> Ibid.

<sup>251</sup> Ibid.

<sup>252</sup> Thomas J. Biersteker and Sue E. Eckert. “Strengthening Targeted Sanctions Through Fair and Clear Procedures. Watson Institute, Brown University. March 30, 2006. [http://watsoninstitute.org/pub/Strengthening\\_Targeted\\_Sanctions.pdf](http://watsoninstitute.org/pub/Strengthening_Targeted_Sanctions.pdf).

<sup>253</sup> Ibid.

<sup>254</sup> “Focal Point for De-listing established pursuant to Security Council resolution 1730 (2006).” United Nations Security Council. <http://www.un.org/sc/committees/dfp.shtml>.

<sup>255</sup> An Independent and Impartial Ombudsperson, Who Reviews Requests from Individuals, Groups Undertakings or Entities Seeking to be Removed from the Al-Qaida Sanctions List of the Security Council’s Al-Qaida Sanctions Committee.” United Nations Security Council. <http://www.un.org/en/sc/ombudsperson/>.

<sup>256</sup> “Focal Point for De-listing established pursuant to Security Council resolution 1730 (2006).” United Nations Security Council. <http://www.un.org/sc/committees/dfp.shtml>.

<sup>257</sup> S/2007/734. United Nations Security Council. December 13, 2007.

present were evaluated on the how quickly demands were met, the UN sanction system has failed in each and every instance. Instead, the political and social pressures, along with changing economic conditions, generated by sanctions serve as a better indicator of a sanctions efficacy.<sup>258</sup> In addition to acknowledging the impact that the sanctions were designed to have, it is also of utmost importance to consider any unintended consequences such as social welfare loss or widespread economic disruptions as has been previously discussed.

### ***Committee Directive***

When considering any reforms to the current mechanics of the UN sanctions system, it is essential to contemplate how the reforms will be influenced by the legal concept of due process discussed above. Have the reforms already made on this matter sufficiently addressed the legal questions previously discussed? If not, what more can be done to enhance the legal credibility of targeted UN sanctions?

Most importantly, any and all reforms proposed throughout the debate should allow for greater flexibility when developing, implementing, and adapting sanctions. Creating a more dynamic sanction system will allow present and future sanction committees to efficiently tailor situation-specific sanctions. Some additional questions that may help guide your research are below.

How should the UN evaluate the impact that sanctions have? How, if at all, does this differ from how the UN currently evaluates a sanction's impact? What is your country's voting record on sanction-related resolutions? Which sanctions did your country support? Which sanctions did your country disagree with? Why? Has your country been involved with the UN sanction reform process?

## **Technical Appendix Guide (TAG)**

### **Topic I: Assessing International Security with the Political Change in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea**

Carroll, Chad. "Resuming Six Party Talks - The Impact of Food Aid | The Peninsula." *Resuming Six Party Talks-The Impact of Food Aid*. The Peninsula, Mar. 2012. Web. 08 Jan. 2013.  
<http://blog.keia.org/2012/03/resuming-six-party-talks-the-impact-of-food-aid/>

This source will provide details on the current state of the Six-Party talks. The article will also discuss the recent actions taken by DPRK on its nuclear and long-range missile program. DPRK has taken concession in hopes of getting U.S. back to the table. Furthermore, the article covers the food shortage in DPRK and its effect on its population and actions of the regime during the transition.

Haenle, Paul, Lora Saalman, and Li Hong. "The DPRK and Six Party Talks After Kim Jong-Il - Carnegie Endowment for International Peace." *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*. N.p., 17 Jan. 2012. Web. 08 Jan. 2013. <http://carnegieendowment.org/2012/01/17/dprk-and-six-party-talks-after-kim-jong-il/9q6q>

The article covers the transition of the Six-Party talks after the death of Kim Jong-il. They cover the challenges that Kim Jong-un faces after the death of his father. The source will also inform readers about U.S. and China relationship in regards to the Korean Peninsula. Lastly, it mentions what it will take to get all parties back to the table for productive talks.

Laurence, Jeremy, and Jack Kim. "Transition of Power Going Relatively Smoothly in North Korea: South minister."

---

<sup>258</sup> Ibid.

*National Post News Transition of Power Going Relatively Smoothly in North Korea South minister Comments.* N.p., 16 Jan. 2012. Web. 08 Jan. 2013. <http://news.nationalpost.com/2012/01/16/transition-of-power-going-relatively-smoothly-in-north-korea-south-minister/>

This article covers the experience of Kim Jong-un as the supreme leader of DPRK. Many believed that the young leader would be inexperienced and have a struggle being the supreme leader. However, the source states otherwise, not only has the transition went smoothly, but the relationship with China is still strong. Furthermore, the source will cover the importance of developing DPRK's economy and the vital role that South Korea could play in DPRK's economic growth.

"Kim Jong-un." *The New York Times*. N.p., 02 Jan. 2013. Web. 08 Jan. 2013. [http://topics.nytimes.com/topics/reference/timestopics/people/k/kim\\_jongun/index.html](http://topics.nytimes.com/topics/reference/timestopics/people/k/kim_jongun/index.html)

This article provides information on Kim Jong-un the new supreme leader of DPRK. It informs the leader of his background and how he came onto the national scene in 2010. As the youngest of the Kim, many were not aware of Kim Jong-un. Furthermore, the article also covers the training he received by Kim Jong-il, his view on South Korea, improvements in education, relationship with China, his leadership style compared to his father, and his view on DPRK's military.

## **Topic II: Addressing the Humanitarian Situation in Sudan**

The UN Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons, Mr. Chaloka Beyani, concludes his country visit to Sudan. Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. November 22, 2012. <http://www.ohchr.org/en/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=12822&LangID=E>

Dr. Chaloka Beyani serves as the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons. Dr. Beyani has published works on the fields of human rights, international criminal and humanitarian law, and humanitarian assistance and IDP. He was appointed as the Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights Council in September 2010. In November 2012, Dr. Beyani published his report based on his nine day visit to the country. He calls for the Government of Sudan and other parties to continue to strengthen humanitarian efforts.

Sudan-South Sudan: Humanitarian crisis warning as thousands flee fighting. IRIN. December 9, 2011. <http://www.irinnews.org/Report/94431/SUDAN-SOUTH-SUDAN-Humanitarian-crisis-warning-as-thousands-flee-fighting>

The conflict between Sudan and South Sudan continues and aid agencies have been planning for humanitarian conditions to worsen as a result. In the six months after July 2011, an estimated 50,000 refugees have fled South Kordofan and Blue Nile states to South Sudan. UN Under Secretary General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator Valerie Amos commented on the conditions and upcoming dangers that could arise if humanitarian access continues to be denied.

Non-ratification of the revised Cotonou Agreement by Sudan FAQ (August 2009). European Commission. [http://ec.europa.eu/development/icenter/repository/sudan\\_final\\_non-ratification\\_faq\\_200908.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/development/icenter/repository/sudan_final_non-ratification_faq_200908.pdf)

The Cotonou Agreement has been considered to be the most comprehensive partnership agreement between the European Union and developing Member States. The agreement involved 79 African, Caribbean, and the Pacific Member States and has since been revised in 2010. Sudan's role in the Cotonou Agreement is vital in funding and the Government of Sudan chose not to ratify the agreement. The European Commission has since remained concerned for Sudan and has provided statements in the EC's stance on Sudan.



### Topic III: Examining the Use of Sanctions in Conflict

Louis Charbonneau. "Rebel groups hit with UN sanctions over eastern Congo." Reuters UK. December 31, 2012. <http://uk.reuters.com/article/2012/12/31/uk-congo-democratic-un-idUKBRE8BU0HS20121231>.

This source provides a better example of the Security Council's use of targeted sanctions in a situation different from those discussed in the Background Guide. The article includes a brief history of the situation, as well as the UN's rationale for implementing against two rebel groups. In discussing Rwanda's conflicting roles as a member of the Security Council and as an alleged supporter of the two sanctioned rebel groups, this article hints at how the composition of the Security Council may influence a sanction regime.

Jonathan Marcus. "Analysis: Do economic sanctions work?" British Broadcasting Corporation. July 26, 2010. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-middle-east-10742109>.

This article offers a good summary of the basic critiques of economic sanctions. Using historical evidence, the author's critique generally focuses on the unintended consequences of comprehensive economic sanctions. The author also discusses the strengths and weaknesses of "smart" (ie. targeted) sanctions imposed upon Iran.

Mark Hibbs. "Assessing UN Trade Sanctions on North Korea." Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. July 3, 2012. <http://carnegieendowment.org/2012/07/03/assessing-un-trade-sanctions-on-north-korea/cj1h>.

This source analyzes the findings of a report made by the panel of experts regarding Security Council sanctions imposed on the DPRK. The article provides a brief background of why UN sanctions were imposed as well as the impact that these sanctions have had since being implemented. The author also discusses China's unique role in the sanctions regime against the DPRK..

Peter Wallenstein and Helena Grusell. "Targeting the Right Targets? The UN Use of Individual Sanctions." *Global Governance*. March 15, 2012. [http://www.pcr.uu.se/digitalAssets/114/114889\\_05-gg182-wallenstein.pdf](http://www.pcr.uu.se/digitalAssets/114/114889_05-gg182-wallenstein.pdf).

This study focuses on the increased use of sanctions focused on individuals. The study examines the theory behind these individual sanctions and how they can be best utilized to attain their founding mandate. The authors look at eight cases of individual UN sanctions to guide their analysis. The study concludes with recommendations to create a more focused UN targeting strategy.