

## History of the Security Council

The Security Council (SC) is one of the six main organs of the United Nations (UN) and the principle organ responsible for maintaining international peace and security. In its more than 65 year history, the Council has acted on widely differing topics, adapting to the changing nature of threats to international peace and security. Given the SC's role, it is important to understand the structure, rules, and governing principles that define its unique responsibilities and mandate. These are contained in Chapters V to VII of the *Charter of the UN*.

Chapter V refers to the organization and functioning of the Security Council. The Council is composed of 15 Member States; five of the seats on the Council are permanent, and the remaining ten seats are rotating. The permanent members of the Council are the Member States that emerged victorious from World War II: China, France, the Russian Federation (formerly the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), the United States, and the United Kingdom. Rotating members are elected by the General Assembly for non-renewable two-year terms. According to the General Assembly (GA) Rules of Procedure 52/Rev.17, each year the GA elects five new non-permanent members of the SC based on equitable geographic distribution, the contribution of the Member State to the maintenance of international peace and security, and its contribution to the other purposes of the Council. The current geographic distribution in members is as follows: five from African and Asian States, one from Eastern European States, two from Latin American States, and two from Western European and other States. The next elections will be held during the 68th Session of the GA in October 2013.

According to Article 24 of the *UN Charter*, Member States confer to the SC the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international security. Thus, Member States “agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council” in these regards. This means that, unlike those of other UN organs, the decisions of the Council are legally binding. According to Article 27 of the *UN Charter*, SC decisions on procedural matters are taken by the affirmative vote of any nine members, while decisions on all substantive matters are taken by the affirmative vote of nine members, including no negative votes by the permanent members. This principle is known as “great power unanimity” or the “veto power” and ensures that the SC will not take action contrary to the interests of the five permanent members. As the structure of the SC has changed very little since its founding, there is an ongoing debate about Security Council reform including the size of the Council, regional representation, and the question of the veto, among others.

Chapter VI of the *UN Charter* contains provisions related to the peaceful settlement of disputes. While it provides that every Member State should attempt to solve any international dispute or situation by peaceful means, it also empowers the SC to call on the parties to settle it by any such means it deems appropriate. The Council can also take the initiative to investigate

any dispute or situation that it believes might lead to an endangerment of international peace and security. Likewise, Member and Non-Member States can bring any situation to the attention of the SC, including when parties to a dispute fail to settle it by peaceful means. The SC can then recommend appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment for the solution being utilized, refer the case to the International Court of Justice, or recommend other terms of settlement. The Council has historically also dispatched military observers or peacekeeping forces to reduce tension, prevent violence from breaking out, and create the right conditions for the achievement of peaceful settlements.

Furthermore, under Chapter VII, if the Council identifies the existence of any breaches of peace, threats to the peace, or acts of aggression, it can dictate provisional measures to the parties or act. The Council can call on Member States to apply measures not involving the use of force, such as “complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations.” Article 42 of the *UN Charter* gives authority to the SC, if it finds that measures under Article 41 are inadequate, to take any action “necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of Members of the United Nations.” Further, the SC can encourage the pacific settlement of disputes through regional arrangements and utilize them for enforcement action under its authority.

The SC usually exercises its powers by adopting resolutions. Alternatively, presidential statements are used to present the view of the Council regarding a certain topic without the formality of a resolution. Likewise, it is common practice for the Council to request a Report of the Secretary-General in order to deepen its understanding, and that of the international community, on any given topic.

While the Security Council was initially conceived to address controversies between states, the nature of the threats to international security have changed dramatically since the *UN Charter* was drafted. During the first years of the 21st century, the Security Council increasingly began discussing thematic topics, as opposed to country-specific issues. For example, in 2000, there was a debate on “the impact of AIDS on peace and security in Africa,” and, in 2003, a briefing on Africa’s food crisis. By 2011, the Council had already placed broad topics such as HIV/AIDS; women, peace and security; the interdependence between security and development; organized crime; and climate change on its agenda. Notably, in November 2011, a debate was held on “New Challenges to International Peace and Security” where the interconnectedness of these issues was discussed.

Though the SC is not a perfect institution, it remains indisputably relevant as a powerful force in the international community. With over 15 years of peacekeeping in Sierra Leone, having

concluded in March 2014 after regaining peace following the civil wars of the early 1990s, quick responses to poaching threats in central Africa, and its position as the international leader of the ICC's International Criminal Tribunals, the SC continues to make positive substantive impacts on the international community. Furthermore, its increased focus on thematic issues, as well as the movement towards its increased transparency, has ensured that the SC continues to involve itself in the most current state of global affairs. Amidst intense global pressures, cooperation and diplomacy are still of the utmost importance in the SC's dealings and are reflected throughout its work of protecting the world's population in the pursuit of international peace and security.

As the organ entrusted with the maintenance of international peace and security, the Security Council has the complex task of addressing both traditional and evolving threats, all while keeping within its decades-old mandate. Conflict mediation, the establishment of peacekeeping operations, the application of sanctions, and the authorization of military force are a few of the tools it has used throughout its history to fulfill this responsibility. In this context, the Council has allowed itself to innovate and evolve in a certain degree by addressing "new threats." In the future, it will surely face issues multidimensional in nature and of growing complexity.

This section is reproduced, with permission, from the NMUN SC Background Guide, available at [http://nmun.org/dc\\_archives.html](http://nmun.org/dc_archives.html)

### **I. Addressing the Situation in North Korea**

- Beyond sanctions, what are other measures that exist to bring the Democratic People's Republic of Korea into compliance with existing Security Council resolutions?
- What can the Security Council do to improve conditions for citizens of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea?
- What are the most effective actions that can attempt to bring about sustainable peace on the Korean peninsula?

Since its creation, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) has repeatedly ignored United Nations (UN) Security Council (SC) resolutions on issues related to acts of aggression and the creation of a non-peaceful nuclear program. The Security Council has suggested talks and implemented sanctions regarding the DPRK's pursuance of a non-peaceful nuclear weapons program, both ideas that have proven to be ineffective. Today's situation is also complex because beyond disregarding international norms and threatening other states, the DPRK has committed human rights abuses against its citizens. Taken together, the DPRK's pursuance of a nuclear weapons program threatens international peace and security, and human rights abuses question the role of the international community in their prevention. Therefore, it is necessary to understand the history of the situation and the current issues related to the

DPRK to understand why this issue has become a critical issue on the SC's agenda that must be resolved immediately.

At the end of World War II, the Korean Peninsula was split into two countries, the DPRK and the Republic of Korea (ROK), at the 38th Parallel. On June 25, 1950, the DPRK, under the leadership of Kim Il-Sung, crossed over the 38th Parallel and invaded the ROK, inciting the Korean War. Acting swiftly, the SC passed its first resolution, UN SC Resolution 82 (1950), about the DPRK on the same day as the attack. In SC Resolution 82, the Council demanded that the DPRK end its invasion of the ROK. Within a month of passing SC Resolution 82, the Council then passed Resolutions 83 and 84. Resolution 83 (1950) established a UN Command force to aid the ROK in resisting the DPRK's forces. Before 1950 was over, the Council passed two subsequent resolutions about the DPRK: SC Resolutions 85 and 88. In Resolution 85, the Council determined that the DPRK had "breached the peace" by crossing over the 38<sup>th</sup> Parallel. The lasting effects of DPRK's actions in 1950 continue to impact the Korean Peninsula today, and have resulted in the SC passing a total of 14 resolutions about the DPRK. The Korean War ended with an armistice agreement signed on July 27, 1953, by the Commander-in-Chief of the UN Command, the Supreme Commander of the Korean Army, and the Commander of the Chinese People's volunteers. However, tensions between the DPRK and ROK have remained to this day as the agreement was simply an armistice and not an agreement to end the war. Most recently, tensions have worsened due to the DPRK's insistence on having a nuclear weapons program.

The current situation in the DPRK has largely revolved around the nuclear weapons program that the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and the SC believe the DPRK is pursuing. Little is known about this program except that any potential non-peaceful nuclear action by the DPRK could result in the destabilization of the Korean Peninsula. Moreover, the SC has viewed the DPRK's nuclear weapons program as further destabilizing the Asian continent and threatening international peace and security. The DPRK's first dispute with the SC regarding the DPRK's nuclear weapons program was in 1993. On March 12, 1993, the Foreign Minister of the DPRK drafted a letter to the President of the SC stating the DPRK's intention to withdraw from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), which resulted in the SC passing Resolution 825 (1993). The main concern was that if the DPRK withdrew from the NPT, non-proliferation measures on the peninsula, in the region, and around the world would be disrupted. The SC also expressed its worry over the DPRK's inability to comply with the IAEA safeguards and protocols as mandated by the NPT. The situation remained somewhat tense until October 1994 when the United States (US)- North Korea Agreed Framework was adopted. The agreement, along with international encouragement for the DPRK to keep its nuclear non-proliferation obligations, resulted in some peace in the region for approximately eight years, until a new US president was elected. Former US President George W. Bush changed the US policy in regard to the DPRK, resulting in a 2002 crisis between the DPRK, the SC, the IAEA, and the US.

In 2002, the US government charged the DPRK for violating the 1994 US-North Korea Agreed Framework because the US believed that the DPRK had begun a uranium enrichment program. As a result, the DPRK retaliated by sending a letter to the IAEA on December 14, 2002, stating that they intended to reopen the nuclear facilities closed in accordance with the Agreed Framework. They further asked the IAEA to remove both the individuals placed to inspect the facilities and the monitoring equipment as well as the tamper-proof seals that were placed in the facilities. The IAEA refused to do so, and as a result the DPRK cut the seals and disrupted the monitoring equipment the IAEA had in place eight to ten days later. Once this was done, the DPRK ordered all IAEA individuals to leave the DPRK, which they did on December 31, 2002. Exactly 10 days later, the DPRK announced its formal withdrawal from the NPT, effective January 11, 2003. These actions resulted in the first set of talks, which the SC hoped would bring peace to the region.

The first talks that occurred were trilateral talks between the US, the DPRK, and China in April of 2003, followed by the first Six-Party Talks held in August 2003 between the US, the DPRK, China, the ROK, Japan, and the Russian Federation. The Six-Party Talks allowed for peace in the region for a short period of time, until the talks disintegrated in 2006. In 2006, the DPRK launched seven missiles, which was perceived by the Western powers to be an act of provocation. The SC, discouraged by the lack of compromise coming from the Six-Party talks, adopted SC Resolution 1695 (2006), demanding that the DPRK suspend its nuclear weapons program. The Six-Party Talks, did not result in any fruitful action until 2007, when the DPRK agreed to shut down its nuclear weapons facilities in return for the lifting of some of the financial sanctions that were placed on the DPRK. This was short-lived, however, as the DPRK reopened these facilities and launched the Unha-2 long-range ballistic missile in 2009. The Unha-2 missile launch resulted in the first portion of its payload falling into the Sea of Japan, and the other two segments falling into the Pacific Ocean. This was the last missile launched until the 2012 Unha-3 missile launch. In response to the Unha-2 missile launch, SC Resolution 1718 was passed, condemning the launch. As a result, the DPRK withdrew from all talks and refused to comply with any SC resolutions or agreements that the DPRK had signed and refused to allow IAEA investigators to enter into the country. With no IAEA investigators, the DPRK continued to pursue its nuclear weapons program against the wishes of the SC and other international actors.

The DPRK, now under the rule of Kim Jong-Un (the grandson of Kim Il-Sung), launched the Unha-3 missile in December 2012. In response to this launch, the SC passed SC Resolution 2087, condemning the DPRK for the Unha-3 missile launch. Following the Unha-3 missile launch was the February 2013 nuclear test. This nuclear test was condemned by S/RES/2094 in 2013, which was passed unanimously. Considering the DPRK's recent missile activity, it is clear that the nuclear situation is a problem that needs to be tackled.

As noted on March 4, 2015 in S/RES/2207, the Security Council states that the DPRK's "proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons, as well as their means of delivery, continues to constitute a threat to international peace and security." Then, on January 6, 2015, the DPRK conducted a nuclear bomb test underground. The United Nations Security Council President Elbio Rosselli of Uruguay released a statement saying, "The members of the Security Council strongly condemn this test, which is a clear violation of Security Council resolutions." The Security Council has promised "further significant measures" if another test were performed. Rosselli also stated that Member States "will begin to work immediately on such measures in a new Security Council resolution." However, in addition to the nuclear situation, repeated human rights violations by the DPRK are another vital area for concern for the Security Council.

According to Navi Pillay, the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, there is great concern that all the attention regarding the DPRK's nuclear regime is detracting from the need to address human rights abuses in the country. Because these abuses are so extreme and widespread, it is important to consider the DPRK's impact on each civilian. Although the government of the DPRK has ratified multiple human rights treaties including the *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)*, the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR)*, and the *International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (ICESCR)*, the DPRK has perpetually violated these international agreements. The *2013 Human Rights Watch Report* on the DPRK discusses how "arbitrary arrest, detention, lack of due process, and torture and ill-treatment of detainees remain serious and pervasive problems." Other problems include "collective punishment for various anti-state offenses, for which it enslaves hundreds of thousands of citizens in prison camps, including children." Anti-Socialist crimes are also prosecuted while the government has "continually subjected North Koreans to food shortages and famine." These human rights violations by the DPRK have resulted in multiple human rights organizations petitioning the UN Human Rights Council to create a committee to investigate the human rights violations and potential crimes against humanity committed by the DPRK against its citizens, further making this an international concern.

The DPRK situation is of international concern because of the combination of significant human rights violations and the destabilization threat that nuclear weapons in the DPRK creates in Asia. The destabilization threat is a result of the DPRK acting irrationally in the past, and one of the most pressing concerns today is that the DPRK could use a nuclear weapon against regional and international powers. Such concerns have largely been the rationale behind not taking more aggressive action on the part of the international community to enforce international laws and end the human rights violations. The DPRK thus remains at the top of the Security Council's agenda with reoccurring themes such as the DPRK as a UN Member State of questionable legitimacy, the DPRK's continued choice to invest its money and infrastructure into its security while neglecting the conditions of its people, and its pursuit of a nuclear weapon's program. The DPRK's nuclear weapons program not only has the

potential to destabilize the Korean Peninsula, but also threatens the efforts of the Security Council to create sustainable international peace and security in the entire region.

## **II. Enhancing International Cooperation on the Implementation of Counter-Terrorism**

- Without a clear definition of terrorism or counter-terrorism, how should the United Nations Security Council effectively engage in combating terrorism?
- Given the many treaties, protocols, instruments, and international and regional bodies involved in the issue of counter-terrorism, what is the best way for the United Nations Security Council to encourage collaboration and communication amongst all of the groups that have similar ambitions?
- With an ongoing threat of terrorist networks like al-Qaeda and ISIL, how will the international community work collaboratively to prevent future attacks without infringing on the sovereignty of Member States?

In January 2013, Ambassador Masood Khan of Pakistan was the acting President of the Security Council and focused his presidency on terrorism and United Nations (UN) peacekeeping. Khan recognized that over the past 12 years, the UN Security Council (SC) had increasingly attempted to address terrorism as the SC had increasingly begun to identify terrorism as a threat to international peace and security. Today especially, terrorism increasingly threatens citizens and creates challenges for actors to respond to as individual terrorists are replacing terrorist organizations and cells. Therefore, the ever-changing face of counter-terrorism is important to understand because it shows which solutions have aided the UN in combating terrorism, and which have not. Further, it is necessary to understand the large number of counter-terrorism organizations and why there is a need to enhance international cooperation between them. It is also important to understand the main impediments to international cooperation, as there are many. The recent bombings at the Boston Marathon identified why counter-terrorism efforts were so necessary. It is believed that, had there been better cooperation between the governments of the United States and the Russian Federation prior to the attack, then it may have been thwarted. This is a prime example of why and how cooperation between Member States is necessary, of the new types of terrorist threats many Member States are now facing, and the need to shift the focus of counter-terrorism efforts to new, perhaps untraditional areas.

The evolution of counter-terrorism efforts has been necessary to combat the ever-changing face of terrorism. Terrorist networks, like al-Qaeda, are fading, and the international community is now faced with having to deal with individuals committing acts of terrorism. The Center on Global Counterterrorism Cooperation, in its document *Reshaping United Nations Counterterrorism Efforts* suggests that, “the emphasis of multilateral counterterrorism efforts is shifting steadily, expanding from a focus on interdiction, the investigation and prosecution of terrorists, and protection of communities and infrastructure toward a more

evenly distributed preventive and response capacity, with an increasing emphasis on resilience.” This is because individual actors, with weak ties at best to large networks, as opposed to organized terrorist networks like al-Qaeda who committed the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, have perpetrated most of the terrorist attacks in recent history. Further, this suggests that efforts focused on reform at the global, UN level; intergovernmental collaboration based on rule of law; and even potential economic activity can be utilized and empowered as counter-terrorism strategies.

Prior to the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, terrorism was an issue addressed solely by sanctions and was characterized by small-isolated incidents (similar to what has again become the face of terrorism). Post-September 11, 2001, however, a clear intensification regarding counter-terrorism strategy occurred. Shortly after September 11, 2001, the SC established a subsidiary body, the Security Council Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC). This committee was established through UN SC Resolution 1373 (2001), and is charged with monitoring the implementation of the resolution. In 2004, through SC Resolution 1535, the Council also created the Counter-Terrorism Executive Directorate (CTED) to aid in the work of the CTC. Both organizations have been tasked with upholding and maintaining the directorate provided to them by SC Resolutions 1373 (2001) and 1624 (2005). These resolutions are the two most relevant counter-terrorism resolutions impacting the debate today along with the existence of multiple organizations with the same goal of combating terrorism.

In 2004, Member States concluded that it would be necessary to have a united front to combat terrorism, and to address it was best done through a panel. Therefore, to further enhance international cooperation on the implementation of counter-terrorism, in December 2004, the UN High-Level Panel of on Threats, Challenges, and Change specifically addressed the issue of having various counter-terrorism organizations. They believed it was necessary to consolidate the various organizations within the UN dealing with counter-terrorism issues into a “common framework.” This framework is the UN Action to Counter Terrorism. This organization is currently the leading organization within the UN system dealing with counter-terrorism; however, the issue remains that there are multiple other organizations dealing with the same subject matter that do not cooperate with one another. As such, it is important to review the vast number of counter-terrorism organizations and how each organization plays a role in the international community, and why enhancing international cooperation is necessary to have effective counter-terrorism operations worldwide.

In 2005, then UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan proposed a five-pillar strategy to combat terrorism, the first major pillar strategy ever created to combat terrorism, and helped frame the issue. This five-pillar strategy included dissuading groups from resorting to terrorism; denying terrorists the means to carry out an attack; deterring states from supporting terrorist groups; developing state capacity to prevent terrorism; and defending human rights in the context of terrorism and counter-terrorism. Further, Annan developed strategies within each of these five pillars to combat these issues within three different levels. These pillars are similar to the pillars used by the UN community today. During the same 2005 speech, Secretary-General Annan also proposed a definition to terrorism that would read as, “any action constitutes terrorism if it is intended to cause death or serious bodily harm to civilians and non-combatants, with the purpose of intimidating a population or compelling a Government or an international organization to do or abstain from any act.” Following his speech, also in 2005, the UN Action to Counter Terrorism recommended this same definition for terrorism.

The Report of the Secretary-General on the Implementation of Decisions from the 2005 World Summit Outcome for Action, a High-Level Plenary Meeting of the UN General Assembly (GA), discussed the creation of the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force (CTITF). Secretary-General Annan created the CTITF in the hope that efforts could be coordinated amongst UN bodies to combat terrorism. In 2005, SC Resolution 1624 asked Member States to assess whether or not the CTITF was working. Twelve months later, in 2006, the UN GA endorsed the CTITF in the UN Global Counter-Terrorism strategy. Resolution 1624 also encouraged states to enhance cooperation in counter-terrorism, prohibit terrorism by law, and to deny safe haven to anyone “with respect to whom there is credible and relevant information giving serious reasons for considering that they have been guilty of such conduct.”

The CTITF’s membership includes many international organizations that play a role in maintaining global peace today such as the CTED, the International Atomic Energy Agency, the UN Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, the UN Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute. The organizations of CTITF must work together to combat terrorism in spite of terrorism’s evolving nature and the growing number of counter-terrorism organizations. The responsibility of the CTITF’s is to uphold what are now considered the four-pillars for combatting terrorism; these changed from five-pillars to four when the Secretary-General updated his strategy after the 2005 September Summit Outcome. The four pillars for combat terrorism are: measures to address the conditions conducive to the spread of terrorism; measures to prevent and combat terrorism; measures to build states’ capacity to prevent and combat terrorism and to strengthen the role of the UN system in that regard; and measures to ensure respect for human rights for all and the rule of law as the fundamental basis for the fight against terrorism.

The CTITF is further broken down into eight sub-groups, while the UN has also created 14 other elements within subcommittees and related organizations that also focus on counter-terrorism. In addition, and in response to this growing international need to combat terrorism, the UN created 13 different conventions and 16 universal, legal instruments. Moreover, fellow intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) also have their own subcommittees to combat terrorism, just like the CTITF and the UN system. Such IGOs include the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, and the Organization of American States/Inter-American Committee Against Terrorism, amongst others. Additionally, beyond IGOs, the international system cannot overlook the fact that most governments have departments and organizations dedicated to combatting terrorism as well. The vast number of actors, particularly organizations, makes it clear that efficient cooperation is necessary to enhance international cooperation, but how best to do so has continually remained a problem that must be solved.

A key focus of debate today is the reform of the counter-terrorism system, with several unique proposals already presented by Member States. Most significantly, the Report of the Secretary-General on the Implementation of Decisions from the 2005 World Summit Outcome for Action – a High-Level Plenary Meeting of the GA – discussed a previously unconsidered strategy. This strategy, which still has not been put into effect, was the creation of a global, comprehensive terrorism convention. The convention would put the ideas related to counter-terrorism into one document with the hopes that it would enhance cooperation between Member States and international organizations.

In order to proclaim his support for continuing to enhance counter-terrorism measures, Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon delivered remarks to the SC for the open debate on threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts. In this January 15, 2013, speech to the SC, Secretary-General Ban addressed the main concerns that the UN believes face counter-terrorism organizations. Similar to his predecessor, Secretary-General Ban also endorsed a comprehensive counter-terrorism convention. In addition to a new potential convention, Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon continued to move the debate on the issue forward. In his remarks he focused on the first pillar of the UN Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy, the pillar aimed at creating measures to address the conditions conducive to the spread of terrorism. Currently, Secretary-General Ban suggests that the best measures to address this pillar include removing conditions that cause terrorism, improving dialogue and understanding amongst Member States, determining how information technology, specifically social media, has aided terrorist and extremist networks. These ideas are necessary to develop a comprehensive counter-terrorism strategy. He further stated the steps going forward would require international cooperation amongst Member States in order to address a situation that he believes is important for sustainable peace.

More recently, the Security Council has been faced with an ongoing threat of ISIL and other Al-Qaida affiliates. On November 20, 2015, the Security Council again met regarding prevention measures on the territories under the control of terrorism networks. In S/RES/2249, Member States are called upon to “redouble and coordinate their efforts to prevent and suppress terrorist acts” as well as urged to “intensify their efforts to stem the flow of foreign terrorist fighters in Iraq and Syria and to prevent and suppress the financing of terrorism.” On December 18, 2015, the Security Council unanimously adopted S/RES/2254. This resolution was marked as the first to focus on a political solution to the ongoing crisis in Syria and reiterated the council’s previous remarks from November. Four days later, S/RES/2258 was passed, allowing for renewed authorization for cross-border aid delivery for civilians in Syria. Member States were also urged to “prevent and suppress the flow of foreign terrorist fighters in and out of Syria.”

In conclusion, the Security Council and the international community have made it clear that counter-terrorism is an extremely important issue that must be addressed in order to protect the maintenance of international peace and security. However, the Security Council along

with other UN bodies and Member States, has been unable to determine the best method for consolidating counter-terrorism measures and increasing international cooperation, nor has it decided how best to take the next steps in addressing the new era of terrorism. While it is still unclear how to best collaborate on these efforts, the strategies of Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon must be included as outlined in his January 2013 speech on addressing the conditions conducive to the spread of terrorism. As shown through the recent response from the Council on the ongoing threat in Syria and neighboring regions, counter-terrorism and international cooperation will continue to remain one of the Security Council's most important topics while fighting for sustainable international peace and security.

### **Annotated Bibliography**

#### ***History of the Security Council***

United Nations. (1945, June 26). *Charter of the United Nations*. Retrieved May 21, 2012, from: <http://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/index.shtml>.

*The Charter of the United Nations is the most important document for understanding how the organization works. It outlines the rights and responsibilities of Member States as well as the mandates of each of the main organs of the UN. Chapters V, VI, and VII outline the main responsibilities and specific powers of the SC.*

United Nations. (N.D.). *UN Documentation: Security Council*. Retrieved July 1, 2013, from: <http://research.un.org/sc>.

*This is a very useful resource for finding everything related to the work of the SC since 1946. This Web site contains all available meeting records, every adopted resolution, decision and presidential statement, as well as all reports of the SC to the GA, of the Secretary-General and of subsidiary bodies. It also contains a repertoire of the practice of the SC where researchers can see how the Council has applied the UN Charter throughout the years. This resource provides an idea of the evolution of SC discussions on various topics and demonstrates how thematic discussions have become increasingly important in the last few years.*

United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations (2012). *Peacekeeping Factsheet*. Retrieved June 12, 2013, from: <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/resources/statistics/factsheet.shtml>.

*This is a quick reference document containing information about UN peacekeeping operations around the globe. The factsheet includes data on personnel numbers and types, geographic distribution, and financial aspects. It is also a useful and fast way of referencing the acronyms used by the different*

*operations.*

### ***I. Addressing the Situation in North Korea***

Arms Control Association. (2013). *Chronology of the U.S. – North Korean Nuclear and Missile Diplomacy.*

Retrieved May 22, 2013, from: <http://www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/dprkchron>.

*The Arms Control Association has written a timeline of all of the events regarding nuclear and missile diplomacy between the United States and the DPRK. This*

*timeline begins in 1985 and covers all of the events up until today, including the situation surrounding the 2012-2013 nuclear missile launches and tests. This timeline will be helpful for delegates to understand how events escalated and how these events reached the SC.*

Arms Control Association. (2013). *UN Security Council Resolutions on North Korea*. Retrieved April 26, 2013, from: <http://www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/UN-Security-Council-Resolutions-on-North-Korea>.

*This Web site created by the Arms Control Association walks through every SC resolution passed regarding the DPRK. Entries on each resolution discuss the resolution's principal provisions and sanctions. This is a must read for all delegates in the SC because being aware of the past work done by the SC in reference to this topic will help delegates understand what efforts the SC has already pursued.*

Human Rights Watch. (2013). *World Report 2013: North Korea*. Retrieved June 12, 2013, from: <http://www.hrw.org/world-report/2013/country-chapters/north-korea>.

*This report created by the Human Rights Watch describes the human rights atrocities committed by various countries. The report discusses such atrocities as those that are occurring in the DPRK's labor camps to the lack of freedom of association, information, and movement of the DPRK people. Delegates will find this extremely helpful in order to fully understand the type of human rights violations that are being committed by the DPRK.*

North Korea Now. (2013). *International Law*. Retrieved June 12, 2013, from: <http://www.northkoreanow.org/international-law/>.

*North Korea Now is an international organization created to address the human rights situation in the DPRK. This Web site, in particular, discusses the various international human rights treaties that the DPRK has signed and ratified, and how the country is in violation of each treaty. It also goes further to discuss other important treaties that the DPRK has not signed (such as the Rome Statute), and how the DPRK is in violation of those treaties as well.*

United Nations Security Council. (1950, June 25). *Resolution 82 (1950)*. Retrieved June 25, 2013, from: [http://undocs.org/S/RES/82\(1950\)](http://undocs.org/S/RES/82(1950)).

*This SC resolution was the first SC resolution ever passed regarding the DPRK. It is important because it recognizes the ROK's sovereign right to exist, free of aggression, which is something the DPRK has seemed to recognize. Delegates will find it helpful because it shows the first measures the SC used to solve the situation in the DPRK.*

United Nations Security Council. (2013, January 22). *Resolution 2087 (2013)*. Retrieved April 26, 2013, from: [http://undocs.org/S/RES/2087\(2013\)](http://undocs.org/S/RES/2087(2013)).

*This is one of the two most recent UN SC resolutions passed regarding the DPRK, and it was drafted as a response to the Unha-3 missile launch. This resolution will likely steer debate on the topic, and delegates will need to look at this to help address what could potentially be debated during committee sessions. It is important to recognize what has already been addressed by the SC. This is so delegates can come up with new and creative ways to address the situation, and not to pursue something that the SC has already done.*

United Nations Security Council. (2013, March 7). *Resolution 2094 (2013)*. Retrieved April 26, 2013, from [http://undocs.org/S/RES/2094\(2013\)](http://undocs.org/S/RES/2094(2013)).

*This is the most relevant resolution passed by the SC in regards to the February 2013 underground nuclear test conducted by the DPRK. In it, SC Member States agreed to further sanctions to penalize the DPRK for the underground nuclear test. Delegates ought to understand this resolution because it will impact the debate on this topic.*

## ***II. Enhancing International Cooperation on the Implementation of Counter-Terrorism***

Annan, K. (2005, March 10). *Secretary-General's keynote address to the Closing Plenary of the International Summit on Democracy, Terrorism and Security - "A Global Strategy for Fighting Terrorism"*. Retrieved June 25, 2013, from: <http://www.un.org/sg/statements/?nid=1345>.

*Former Secretary-General Kofi Annan's speech is one of the most pivotal speeches regarding counter-terrorism. This speech introduced Annan's five-pillar strategy for counter-terrorism. This is the first "action plan" the UN had to combat terrorism, and thus delegates should be familiar with this speech.*

Ban, K. (2013, January 15). *Remarks to Security Council open debate on threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts*. Retrieved June 14, 2013, from: [http://www.un.org/apps/news/infocus/speeches/statments\\_full.asp?statID=1746#.Ubu2mfZ35 r0](http://www.un.org/apps/news/infocus/speeches/statments_full.asp?statID=1746#.Ubu2mfZ35 r0).

*This is the most recent speech by the Secretary-General regarding counter-terrorism efforts and the UN. The Secretary-General addresses the strides that the UN made throughout 2012, and the items that still need to be accomplished to combat terrorism. Delegates will find this helpful as it provides some solutions that the Secretary-General believes would aid counter-terrorism efforts, but delegates should also use this to help develop more creative solutions.*

Center on Global Counter-Terrorism Cooperation. (2012). *Reshaping United Nations Counterterrorism Efforts*. Retrieved April 24, 2013, from: [http://www.globalct.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/Reshaping\\_UNCTEfforts\\_Blue-Sky-Thinking.pdf](http://www.globalct.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/Reshaping_UNCTEfforts_Blue-Sky-Thinking.pdf).

*This document, created by a leading non-profit organization in the field, discusses potential solutions that the UN SC could use to help facilitate the debate on this topic. Although lengthy, this document provides an overarching view of how debate on this topic has evolved since the SC first addressed counter-terrorism in 2001. Delegates should read this document to help give them a full grasp of the topic.*

Cordesman, A. H. (2010). *International Cooperation in Counterterrorism: Redefining the Threat and the Requirement*. Center for Strategic and International Studies. Retrieved April 24, 2013, from: [http://csis.org/files/publication/100315\\_IntCoopinfightterror.pdf](http://csis.org/files/publication/100315_IntCoopinfightterror.pdf).

*This document provides another overarching view on the topic of counter-terrorism. Cordesman does a fantastic job of addressing all of the organizations that deal with counter-terrorism issues and how their cooperation is essential in combating this issue. Delegates will find this to be an extremely helpful tool in determining if their Member State is a participant in any other counter-terrorism organization and how their membership in that organization can help them play a role in the debate in the SC.*

Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force. (N.D.) *Main Page*. Retrieved June 25, 2013, from: <http://www.un.org/en/terrorism/ctitf/index.shtml>.

*This is the main page of the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force (CTITF), which, as explained in the main text of the background guide, is one of the UN's most important resources for combating terrorism. Delegates will find this resource extremely helpful because it branches out into all the ways that the UN has attempted to combat terrorism and how different organizations are attempting to work together to combat terrorism. This page also explains how the CTITF operates, something the delegates will need to know if this topic is chosen for debate.*

United Nations. (2013). *Security Council Counter-Terrorism Committee*. Retrieved April 26, 2013, from: <http://www.un.org/en/sc/etc/>.

*This organization created by the UN SC is the most important UN SC organization for fighting terrorism. Any issues related to counter-terrorism that the Security Council deals with will be easily researched through this Web site. Delegates should continue to monitor this Web site up until the conference.*

United Nations Action to Counter Terrorism. (2013). *Background*. Retrieved June 14, 2013, from: <http://www.un.org/terrorism/background.shtml>.

*The United Nations Action to Counter Terrorism is one of the most important organizations created by the UN to help develop important counter-terrorism measures. Delegates will find the background of the organization important as it discusses the pillars incorporated into the guide and shows how these pillars were created. The portion that delegates will find most interesting is the biennial review of the UN Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy as it shows the importance that this organization plays in international cooperation efforts.*

United Nations General Assembly. (2005, October 25). *Implementation of decisions from the 2005 World Summit Outcome for action by the Secretary-General*. Retrieved June 25, 2013, from: <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N05/545/06/PDF/N0554506.pdf?OpenElement>.

*The 2005 World Summit Outcome was a high-level plenary meeting of the GA. This document shows the goals of the summit, and how participants wanted to implement the outcomes from the World Summit. This document is extremely important because it established the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force, and focuses on counter-terrorism work already pursued by the UN.*

United Nations News Centre. (2013, January 3). *Security Council to give special focus to terrorism and UN peacekeeping, says President*. Retrieved June 25, 2013, from: <http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=43875#.Uc3smz535r2>.

*This article discusses the goals of the UN SC President for January 2013, Pakistani Ambassador Masood Khan. Ambassador Khan stated that he wanted the special focus of the SC for the month of January to be on counter-terrorism; this article also details his reasons for having this focus. The article is helpful for delegates as it shows how specific instances of terrorism can result in the SC refocusing their goals in order to address a situation they believe must be addressed immediately because of how it impacts international peace and security.*

United Nations Security Council: Department of Public Information. (2005). *Security Council Meeting of World Leaders Calls for Legal Prohibition of Terrorist Incitement, Enhanced Steps to Prevent Armed Conflict*. Retrieved June 25, 2013, from: <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2005/sc8496.doc.htm>.

*SC Resolution 1624 (2005) was one of the most important resolutions relating to counter-terrorism. This resource not only includes the text of the resolution, but also discusses how the SC Member States at the time felt about this specific resolution. Delegates should find this helpful as it shows the Member States*

*reasoning behind passing this resolution and why they believed the passage of this resolution was so incredibly important.*