



SECURITY COUNCIL II PRESIDENT'S LETTER

Lake Erie International Model United Nations

Lake Erie Conference XVIII
November 3-6, 2011

CHAIRING STYLE

Hello Delegates!

I am very pleased to be the first to welcome you to the upcoming Lake Erie Conference. The purpose of this letter is to introduce you to my chairing style, and to give you a brief overview of some of the topics that might come up. However, before I begin, I would like to give you a brief background of my Model UN experience. I have been highly involved with Model UN, both as a delegate and as a member of staff, for over six years. Furthermore, during this six year period, I have spent the large majority of my time in the Security Council. Therefore, when it comes to Model UN, I consider the Security Council my area of expertise.

Now, to introduce you to my chairing style, I believe that it is the chair's responsibility to facilitate debate, not to direct debate. As the delegates, responsibility for the direction and quality of the debate largely falls on your shoulders. I will typically only intervene under the following circumstances: 1) a delegate is being rude, malicious, or behaving in any manner deemed inappropriate by the chair, 2) the body is grossly out of the jurisdiction of the Security Council. With that in mind, I must note that I will also intervene if/when the rules are in violation; however, I do not like to do this and would much rather see the delegates point out rule infractions themselves.

Along those lines, I must note that the LEIMUN Rules of Procedure are an invaluable tool when it comes to debate. As a chair, one of the most frustrating things to deal with is a committee that does not know the rules. Moreover, often times it is strong knowledge of the rules that can make an average delegate exceptional. With that in mind, it is not simply enough to know procedure; you have to demonstrate this knowledge to the chair. I strongly encourage every delegate to read the Rules of Procedure ahead of time; a copy of the document, as well as a short form version, can be found on the LEIMUN website in the Research section (http://leimun.com/nhc_research.html).

To continue, I would like to stress the importance of professionalism and its relation to portrayal of country. As a participant in Model UN, you are acting as a delegate to the UN. Therefore, for all intents and purposes, you are a delegate to the UN for the duration of the conference, and should act as such. This means that you should maintain professionalism at all times. In other words, speak professionally (no slang!), treat others with respect and diplomacy, and maintain decorum at all times. As a chair, I do not tolerate horseplay or inappropriate behavior.

Finally, there are many beneficial things that you can get out of this conference, including new friends, more knowledge, a pretty awesome award, and a very fun time. However, there is one practically guaranteed way to ensure that you won't get any of these: not participating. I understand that many delegates come to this conference as an entirely new experience with no almost idea what to expect and it can be quite daunting. In fact, I've been there myself. That doesn't mean that

you can't participate. In my opinion, the best way to learn something is to do it; you learn to swim by jumping in, not watching other people swim. Therefore, I would rather see delegates participate and struggle than not participate at all.

The next portion of my letter is a brief overview of several topics that may be discussed during the conference. Before I begin this portion, I must note three very important points. First, as the Security Council, we have an open agenda. This gives you the opportunity to discuss any issues that fall under the purview of the Security Council. What's more, I encourage you to do so. Second, this section is simply an introduction to these few topics. These, along with all other world issues, are very complex and multifaceted. Therefore, it will be necessary for you to do much more research than simply reading the following overviews. Third, Security Council topics are typically rapidly evolving conflicts, with new developments occurring on a day-to-day basis. Thus, it is important that you follow them somewhat meticulously so that you don't miss important developments. That being said, I look forward to seeing all of you in the spring!

The agenda for the Security Council is open. Please review the following topics areas we have covered. Please be aware, however, that this list is not meant to be exhaustive. Any issue within the Security Council's purview is a potential agenda topic.

More detailed information on the evaluative process, rules of procedure, and conference policies can be found on our conference website, www.leimun.com.

THE TOPICS

The Situation in Darfur

The conflict in Darfur, a region in western Sudan, is widely considered to be the world's worst crisis today. Moreover, the conflict received that title several years ago, and very little change has occurred. In order to familiarize you with this issue, I will discuss the origins of the conflict, several involved parties, and where the conflict stands today.

The conflict in Darfur officially began in 2003. Leading up to this, countless reports began to surface of organized violence and attacks on civilians, specifically on non-Arab tribes. As a result of this, several rebel groups, namely the Sudan Liberation Movement/Army (SLM/A) and the Justice and Equality Movement (JEM), began fighting with the Sudanese government. The rebel groups accused the government of committing genocide.

The Darfur conflict is mainly composed of vicious guerrilla warfare between several groups. First off, the rebel groups include the aforementioned SLM/A and JEM, and several other minor groups. These rebel militias are generally composed of rural farmers who are non-Arab Muslims. On the other side of the conflict, the Sudanese government sponsored militia and police forces are fighting against these rebel groups. However, it is the Janjaweed who are the main opposition to the rebel forces. The Janjaweed is mostly composed of Arab Muslims, who are also mostly rural farmers. The Sudanese government denies any support for the Janjaweed; however, it is widely believed that the Sudanese government has been supporting the Janjaweed since the onset of the conflict by supplying them with weapons and other resources. Furthermore, it is also important to recognize the role of the Sudanese President Omar Hassan al-Bashir in the conflict. In 2008, Luis Moreno-Ocampo, Chief Prosecutor for the International Criminal Court (ICC), made it known to the public that he was seeking an arrest warrant for al-Bashir. In 2009, the ICC issued an arrest warrant for the Sudanese President, accusing him of war crimes and crimes against humanity. Since then, the President has yet to be arrested or to turn himself in.

As it stands today, the situation in Darfur is widely considered to be genocide. While reports vary greatly, the conflict is generally believed to have claimed the lives of as many as 300,000 people, and displaced as many as 2,000,000. In 2007, the UN-AU Hybrid Mission in Darfur (UNAMID) was created by the Security Council. However, UNAMID has still not reached its full capacity, which greatly decreases its effectiveness. The Sudanese government and the JEM agreed to a ceasefire and to enter into negotiations in February of 2010. However, large-scale violence and fighting still continues. The situation in Darfur will also be impacted by the recent changes to the makeup of Sudan. Please investigate how things have changed with respect to the creation of South Sudan.

Questions to consider while researching:

1. What is my country's relationship to Sudan?
2. How has my country responded to the crisis in Darfur?
3. Where does my country stand on the issue of genocide?
4. Where does my country stand on the issue of the ICC arrest warrant?
5. What is my country's position regarding UNAMID?

Research Links:

<http://www.crisisgroup.org/en/key-issues/preventing-implosion-in-sudan.aspx>

<http://www.hrw.org/news/2011/01/08/sudan-deteriorating-situation-darfur>

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-14019051>

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/War_in_Darfur

<http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/sudan/index.html>

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/world/interactives/sudan/>

Sudan: Darfur and the Failure of an African State, by Richard Cockett

Darfur: A 21st Century Genocide, Third Edition (Crises in World Politics), by Gérard Prunier

Nuclear Non-Proliferation

Toward the end of World War II, a horrific new weapon was unleashed on the world by the United States. The weapon was the atomic bomb, and it resulted in the deaths of hundreds of thousands of innocent civilians. The necessity of the attacks on Japan can be debated; but, one thing that is certain is the devastation that can be caused if these weapons are ever used again. With that in mind, the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) was signed on July 1st of 1968. The treaty was drafted in an attempt to limit the spread of nuclear weapons. Furthermore, the treaty was also made with the desire of a future in which nuclear weapons might be eliminated entirely. However, the treaty has fallen short thus far, and there are still several key threats to international security posed by means of nuclear development. Therefore, it is essential that the Security Council address these threats. In order to familiarize you with this topic, I will give you a brief overview of two of the countries that pose these threats.

The Issue of Iranian Nuclear Proliferation:

When one hears the phrase "nuclear non-proliferation," chances are that it brings to mind one of two states; one of these states is almost definitely Iran. Labeled a rogue country by some, Iran kept its nuclear program hidden from the international community for twenty years before the program became public knowledge in August of 2002. Since then, Iran has maintained that its nuclear program is solely for peaceful purposes, specifically energy, agricultural and medicinal purposes. However, many countries point toward certain acts of non-compliance with the IAEA and Security Council as signs that this is untrue. With this in mind, it is important to remember that Iran is a

signatory of the NPT, and therefore, does have a right to a peaceful nuclear program, under the safeguards and protocols of the Treaty.

On December 22nd, 2010, Russian President Dmitry Medvedev called Iran's nuclear policies "unreasonably tough," in reference to their opposition to IAEA inspections. Moreover, these comments came following his comments earlier in 2010, in which he claimed that Iran was close to achieving nuclear weapons capability. On June 9th, 2010 the Security Council adopted Resolution 1929, which decided that Iran had yet to fully comply with previous SC resolutions, and increased sanctions on Iran. In a recent development, Iran agreed to hold negotiations with the P5+1 (United States, United Kingdom, Russian Federation, France, China, and Germany) on December 7th of 2010. These negotiations showed signs of promise, lasting for several days. However, widespread concerns about their nuclear program persist.

Questions to consider while researching:

1. What are my country's relations with Iran?
2. How does my country view Iran's nuclear program?
3. Where does my country stand on the issue of sanctions?
4. What are my countries views on Iranian non-compliance?
5. How much of a legitimate threat to international peace and security is Iran's nuclear program?

The Issue of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and its Nuclear Weapons Program:

In the previous section, I noted that Iran is probably one of two states that come to mind when "nuclear non-proliferation" is being discussed; almost undoubtedly, the other would be the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK). The DPRK, more commonly referred to as North Korea, began its nuclear program in 1962 as a non-signatory of the NPT. After years of international pressure, the DPRK ratified the NPT in December of 1985. However, the DPRK, in direct violation of the NPT, refused to sign a safeguards agreement. The DPRK maintained this violation of the NPT until January of 1992, in which they finally signed a safeguards agreement. The DPRK remained a signatory of the NPT until January of 2003, when it made public its intentions to withdraw from the Treaty. The following statements are excerpts from the official announcement made by the government:

"As it has become clear once again that the U. S. persistently seeks to stifle the DPRK at any cost and the IAEA is used as a tool for executing the U.S. hostile policy towards the DPRK, we can no longer remain bound to the NPT, allowing the country's security and the dignity of our nation to be infringed upon."

"Though we pull out of the NPT, we have no intention to produce nuclear weapons and our nuclear activities at this stage will be confined only to peaceful purposes such as the production of electricity."

"If the U. S. drops its hostile policy to stifle the DPRK and stops its nuclear threat to the DPRK, the DPRK may prove through a separate verification process between the DPRK and the U.S. that it does not make any nuclear weapon."

Since the DPRK's withdrawal from the NPT, the nuclear situation has rapidly been deteriorating. In April of 2003, the DPRK declared that they were in possession of nuclear weapons. The DPRK made this claim again in February of 2005, and on October 9th, 2006 it announced that it had successfully tested a nuclear weapon. The Six-Party Talks, discussions between the DPRK, US, China, Russian Federation, Republic of Korea and Japan that began in 2003, have often seemed

promising in idea. However, in reality, the Talks have done very little to slow the DPRK down. As a result of the Security Council's Resolution 1718, which condemned the DPRK's launch of a missile over the Sea of Japan, the DPRK withdrew from the Six-Party Talks on April 14th, 2009. As of September of 2011, the Talks have yet to resume. Moreover, the DPRK continues to virtually disregard the Security Council, including the SC's more recent Resolution 1874.

Questions to consider while researching:

1. What are my country's relations to the DPRK?
2. How does my country view the DPRK's nuclear program?
3. Where does my country stand on the issue of sanctions?
4. What are my country's views on the DPRK's non-compliance?
5. How does my country view the recent military actions in the Korean Peninsula? How do these affect the issue of nuclear non-proliferation regarding the DPRK?

Research Links:

<http://www.un.org/Depts/dda/WMD/treaty/>

http://i.cfr.org/content/publications/attachments/Nonproliferation_CSR54.pdf

<http://www.foreignaffairs.com/features/readinglists/what-to-read-on-nuclear-proliferation-0>

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-middle-east-11709428>

http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/iran/nuclear_program/index.html

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-pacific-11813699>

http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/northkorea/nuclear_program/index.html

<http://www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/dprkchron>

"The Dangers of a Nuclear Iran: The Limits of Containment," *Foreign Affairs*, January/February 2011

The Rise of Nuclear Iran: How Tehran Defies the West by Dore Gold

Strategic Thinking about the Korean Nuclear Crisis: Four Parties Caught between North Korea and the United States (Strategic Thought in Northeast Asia) by Gilbert Rozman

Security Council Reform

The set-up of the Security Council was decided in the United Nations Charter when it was drafted in 1945, following WWII. The Security Council was to consist of five permanent members, the US, UK, USSR, China, and France, and five nonpermanent rotating members. As it grew, some minor changes were made. In 1965 in response to decolonization, a Charter amendment was enacted increasing the nonpermanent seats on the Council to eleven and the overall membership to fifteen. Since then, the political landscape of the world has drastically changed, and the flaws of the Security Council set-up have been brought to the forefront of many political debates. The G4, a group composed of Germany, Brazil, India, and Japan vehemently insist that they have earned a right to permanent membership to the Security Council, citing such factors as monetary contributions to the UN, population, and geographical roles. Furthermore, the Islamic community is adamant on seeing the addition of a primarily Muslim country to the permanent membership. Similarly, the African countries see the lack of an African country with permanent membership as a travesty, as Africa is the second largest continent in terms of area and population.

While almost all countries strongly support reform of the Security Council, the major issue has always been how exactly to change it. In March of 2005, Kofi Annan, who was the UN Secretary General at the time, released his “In Larger Freedom” plan. This plan called for the UN to expand the Security Council to 24 members. Annan proposed that this be done through one of two ways: 1. Adding six new permanent members and three non-permanent members, or 2. Adding eight members who would serve four year terms with the option of renewal, as well as one additional non-permanent member. In July of the same year, a group called Uniting for Consensus, led mainly by Italy, Spain, Argentina, Canada, Mexico, South Korea, and Pakistan, proposed an alternate plan for Security Council reform. In their proposal, the number of permanent members of the Security Council would remain the same; however, the number of non-permanent members would rise from 10 to 20.

Another major issue when dealing with Security Council reform is the question of which countries, if any, will receive permanent membership. As mentioned before, the G4 wishes to see their four countries gain permanent membership to the Security Council. However, they have strong opposition from the countries of Uniting for Consensus. Moreover, the US and China both do not support all of the G4 countries being added to the Security Council. Additionally, the African and Islamic groups oppose the G4 if only because they would leave entire demographics unrepresented.

Questions to consider while researching:

1. What are my country's views on Security Council reform?
2. How does my country view the In Larger Freedom proposition?
3. How does my country view the Uniting for Consensus groups plan?
4. What is my country's stance on the G4? What relations does my country have to the individual countries of the G4?
5. How specifically, if at all, does my country wish to see the Security Council reformed?
6. Can the Security Council actually reform itself? What is the proper way for this to be done?

Research Links:

<http://www.centerforunreform.org/node/23>

<http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=38390>

<http://www.un.org/ga/president/63/issues/screform.shtml>

<http://www.un.org/largerfreedom/>

<http://www.ony.unu.edu/The%20Illusion%20of%20UN%20Security%20Council%20Reform.pdf>

“Proposals for UN Security Council Reform,” by Yehuda Z. Blum, *The American Journal of International Law*, Vol. 99, No. 3, Jul., 2005

UN security council reform and the right of veto: a constitutional perspective, by Bardo Fassbender

The Situation in Somalia

Labeled as the “worst country on Earth” by *The Economist*, Somalia is a lawless country whose problems have recently been exported overseas. It is a country racked by civil war, terrible poverty, terrorism, a toothless central government, and piracy.

Since the fall of President Siad Barre in 1991, Somalia has been in the midst of a violent and prolonged civil war. After the clan-based tribes from northern Somaliland overthrew Barre, they turned on themselves. Rather than being governed by a central government, clans and warlords ruled sections of the country and waged violent attacks against each other in order to gain territory, power, and resources. The United Nations attempted to encourage peace by sending peacekeepers into Somalia, but several clans believed the peacekeepers were a threat to their power and attacked. As a result, the peacekeepers were removed.

In recent years, attempts have continued to establish a central government. A transitional government was established in 2004 and currently resides in the capital of Mogadishu. However, the transitional government is in a very tenuous situation. The government controls only a small section of the capital and a stretch of land across the middle of the country; Islamists control the majority of the capital and all of southern Somalia. The government depends on the forces provided by the African Union to maintain order in the small territories it controls.

Meanwhile, Islamists in the south have increased their attacks against the government. The Islamists demand that a strict form of Sharia law replace the current civil law code. Countries like the United States consider one of the Islamist groups, al-Shabab, to be an ally of al-Qaeda. Al-Shabab has adopted some of al-Qaeda's tactics, including suicide bombing. The group claimed responsibility for a suicide bombing in Mogadishu last year that killed 17 and went international when their suicide bombers attacked a large group of soccer fans watching the World Cup final in Kampala, Uganda, killing 80 people. African leaders are concerned about the high risks of al-Shabab suicide bombers targeting other countries like Kenya and Ethiopia. In response, the AU announced the addition of 2,000 soldiers to the 6,000 currently in the country. In the absence of law and order, piracy has flourished. Somalis have found a bountiful source of cash by commandeering ships in the Gulf of Aden and the Indian Ocean. The International Maritime Bureau estimates that off the coast of Somalia, there were 40 successful hijackings in 2008 and in 2009, there were 47 hijackings. Somali pirates took 361 sailors hostage and kidnapped 13 in the first six months of 2011. A multinational naval force is patrolling the waters off the coast of Somalia, but danger still exists.

Potentially complicating the situation is the status of Somaliland, the northern part of the country bordering Ethiopia and Djibouti. Somaliland has been nearly free from the problems that plague the south and around Mogadishu. A government has been able to form and a presidential election was recently conducted. There is discussion that Somaliland may succeed from Somalia, but the Islamist groups of the south are opposed and have dispatched suicide bombers in order to intimidate those that may want independence.

With the weak central government, the increasing risk of regional terrorism originating from Somalia, and the threats to international commerce posed by piracy, the Security Council needs to consider how to ensure that peace and security in the horn of Africa is assured. In addition, how should the world treat Somaliland? Should Somalia stay one broken country, or should the region that has some form of stable government go it alone and receive international recognition?

Questions:

1. Has your country been victim to terrorism caused by Islamist groups? How did your country respond?
2. Has your country suffered hijackings by pirates? How has it reacted?
3. What is your country's position in regards to secessionist movements?

Research Links:

<http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/somalia/index.html>
<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-14094503>
<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/africaandindianocean/somalia/>
http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/country_profiles/1072592.stm
<http://www.securitycouncilreport.org/site/c.qIKWLeMTIsG/b.2400725/>
<http://english.aljazeera.net/programmes/insidestory/2010/06/2010623123754251181.html>

Humanitarianism Under Fire: The US and UN Intervention in Somalia by Ken Rutherford

Understanding the Somalia Conflagration: Identity, Islam and Peacebuilding by Afyare Abdi Elmi

Understanding Somalia and Somaliland: Culture, History, Society by I. M. Lewis

Global Threats to Security from Cyberwar

Throughout the centuries, the methods and means of war have dramatically evolved. New technologies have supplanted the old, often with increasingly deadly results. In the past century, aviation dramatically changed how battles were fought. Air superiority is key to provide protection and support for ground forces, and most naval battles are fought by aircraft launched from aircraft carriers or missiles fired from ships. A decade into the 21st century, military leaders across the world are now closely playing attention to a fifth domain for war, cyberspace. As more and more information is digitized and we, as a society, become increasingly dependent on computers, we become more susceptible to cyber attacks. Some experts describe a cyber attack causing similar damage to a nuclear bomb. Computer hackers can bring down military email systems, a key part of the military communication system. Oil refineries and pipelines can explode and financial data would be lost. Logistic systems, such as rail signals and supply information for food delivery, could be severely disrupted.

These concerns are not theoretical; twice before, countries have been brought to their knees as a result of a cyber attack. Estonia was briefly forced to essentially cut itself off from the internet because of a denial-of-service attack against the Estonian government, media, and bank servers. The series of attacks, alleged to have been orchestrated by the Kremlin, was of a sophistication never seen before and virtually shut down the country. Additionally, in 2008, in coordination with the Russian invasion of South Ossetia, cyber attacks jammed Georgian telephone lines and brought down Georgian government and media websites. As a result, communications within Georgia and from the embattled country to the outside world were disrupted.

As a result, countries have taken keen notice of the need to orchestrate and defend themselves from cyber attacks. President Barack Obama has declared the United State's digital infrastructure as a "strategic national asset." NATO has established the Cooperative Cyber Defense Center of Excellence to improve cyber defense and coordinate research into the subject. Countries all around the world have dedicated billions of dollars toward their cyberwar divisions, with Russia and China amongst the leaders.

In addition, cyber espionage is rampant. China has been accused of attacking computers belonging to US defense contractors in order to discover plans for weapon systems. One cyber spy, sitting at a computer half a world away, can hack into or infect a computer with malware and be able to steal and read a library full of information.

Finally, the actual infrastructure of the internet creates unique security risks. Senator Ted Stevens once described the internet as "a series of tubes," but in reality, information is transmitted around the world via a system of undersea fiber-optic cables. These cables are dangerously grouped together in a few choke points that can be vulnerable to attack by a country or terrorist organization. These choke points include the Luzon Strait, the Persian Gulf, and the Sea of Aden. If these cables are damaged or destroyed, global communication and the transfer of data will be substantially slowed, if not completely disrupted.

Questions:

1. Is your country vulnerable to a cyber attack? What kind of damage can be caused in a cyber attack?
2. What defenses do you have for cyber attack?
3. Do you consider a cyber attack to be the same as an armed attack? Are you party to a treaty that requires your country to respond if any other country in the treaty organization is victim of an armed attack?

4. What does your country believe should be done to reduce the effect or likelihood of a cyber attack?

Research Links:

<http://www.securityaffairs.org/issues/2009/16/mazanec.php>

http://www.cio.com/documents/whitepapers/Tripwire_Cyberwar_Threats_white_paper%5B1%5D.pdf

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/technology/2010/feb/03/cyber-warfare-growing-threat>

<http://www.cfr.org/technology-and-foreign-policy/confronting-cyber-threat/p15577>

The Situation in Côte d'Ivoire

Since 2002, when fighting first broke out in the wake of the polls, which were meant to reunite a country split by civil war in 2002 into a Government-held south and rebel-controlled north, the United Nations has taken an active interest in the affairs of Côte d'Ivoire (Ivory Coast). In 2004, the Security Council adopted Resolution 1528, having determined that the situation in Côte d'Ivoire continued to pose a threat to international peace and security in the African coastal region. The U.N. Operation in Côte d'Ivoire (UNOCI) took over for the U.N. Mission in Côte d'Ivoire on April 4, 2004; the mission was originally designed to facilitate Ivorian implementation of the peace agreement signed by conflicting parties in January 2003.

Côte d'Ivoire held a presidential election on October 31, 2010, and a runoff election between the two primary contenders on November 25, 2010. However, after final election results named challenger Alassane Ouattara the victor, President Laurent Gbagbo's refusal to concede defeat has plunged the country into further turmoil. Since the election, a number of events have occurred:

- Incumbent President Gbagbo has sought support from Zimbabwean President Robert Mugabe, and has sent a delegation to Nigeria in an effort to explore "non-military" solutions to the issue;
- The Ivorian Independent Electoral Commission (CEI) has declared Ouattara the victor, while the Constitutional Council has declared Gbagbo the victor;
- Ambassadors from the United Kingdom and Canada have been expelled from Côte d'Ivoire by President Gbagbo after the respective governments accepted ambassadors sent by challenger Ouattara;
- Supporters of each contender have incited violence against supporters of the other;
- Ivorians along the Ivorian/Liberian border have sought refuge in Liberian border villages to escape local skirmishes, causing food and safe water shortages.

The U.N. and some member states, as well as African regional bodies, have come out in support of Ouattara as the victor and are pushing for President Gbagbo to concede peacefully. The African Union, which did not endorse Gbagbo's reelection, has appointed Kenyan Prime Minister Raila Odinga to mediate the situation; Odinga has offered amnesty to President Gbagbo for his actions thus far if he will step down. The Economic Community for West African States (ECOWAS) has also called for Gbagbo to concede, and the United States has imposed sanctions on Côte d'Ivoire to encourage the same.

Earlier this year, the Security Council unanimously adopted Resolution 1975, which placed sanctions on Côte d'Ivoire. The humanitarian situation is certainly cause for continued concern. UNOCI, which continues to protect civilians during this period of increased fighting to the best of its abilities in line with its mandate, has also been targeted in recent fighting. This situation is rapidly developing, so you should keep up to date on the latest news reports.

Questions to consider:

1. Has your country supplied troops or other support to UNOCI?

2. What is your country's position regarding the election dispute?
3. How has the election dispute affected your country? Are you receiving refugees or request for aid?
4. What part, if any, is your country playing in the mediation process?

Research Links:

<http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=37949&Cr=ivoire&Cr1>

United Nations News Center

<http://www.un.org/apps/news/infocusRel.asp?infocusID=138&Body=Ivoire&Body1=>

United Nations Operation in Côte d'Ivoire

<http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/unoci/>

“Nigeria: Ivorian Crisis – Gbagbo Sends Delegation to the Country”

<http://www.allafrica.com/stories/201101070809.html>

AlertNet: “Fleeing unrest in Côte d'Ivoire”

<http://www.trust.org/alertnet/news/fleeing-unrest-in-cte-divoire/>

Xinhua: “U.S. imposes financial sanctions on Côte d'Ivoire’s Gbagbo and supporters”

http://news.xinhuanet.com/english2010/world/2011-01/07/c_13679729.htm

Washington Post: “U.S. imposes sanctions to press Ivory Coast leader to step aside”

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2011/01/08/AR2011010803665.html>

Situation in Libya

This recent conflict involving Libya is one of the most prominent and pressing among Security Council members. Although the country has faced myriad issues that can be tied into the newest conflict, this specific instance of violence started as a result of the Arab Spring in early 2011. The Arab Spring started in December 2010 with Tunisian protests, and gradually spread to other countries in the Middle East and Northern Africa such as Libya, Egypt, and Bahrain. The specific situation involving Libya really got started in February of 2011, with protests against the Ghadaffi regime. 1,000 people are reported to have been killed in the first week of protests.

By March of 2011, the UN Security Council passed Resolution 1973, enforcing a no-fly zone, arms embargo, and an asset freeze on key officials in the Libyan government. Around this time NATO got involved, taking over all military actions as a result of Resolution 1973, with its main mission being the protection of civilians and heavily populated cities. With the overthrow of Ghadaffi’s regime, and fighting continuing as of the writing of this letter, this is an issue that will change day to day. Please pay attention to current news reports and know where your country stands on the recognition of a new government.

Questions to consider:

1. What recommendations and/or legitimate actions can the Security Council take to alleviate the situation in Libya?
2. Has your country recognized a new Libyan government?
3. What is your country's position on Libya? What other positions exist?
4. Can a consensus be reached that reflects each of these different positions? Is that consensus consistent with the Security Council’s goals and principles?
5. Are there short-term and long-term solutions? Are they the same? Are they counter-intuitive?

Research Links:

<http://www.reuters.com/places/libya>

<http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/libya/index.html>

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/africaandindianocean/libya/>
<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-13755445>
<http://english.aljazeera.net/indepth/spotlight/libya/>

General Online Resources

CIA World Factbook

<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/index.html>

Security Council Report

http://www.securitycouncilreport.org/site/c.gIKWLeMTIsG/b.1071693/k.506A/Security_Council_ReportBRMonthly_Forecast_September_2011.htm

<http://www.whatsinblue.org/>

BBC News

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/>