



SECURITY COUNCIL III PRESIDENT'S LETTER

Lake Erie International Model United Nations

**Northcoast High School Conference XXXI
March 30 - April 1, 2010**

CHAIRING STYLE

Let me be the first to welcome you to North Coast XXXI and Security Council III, I will be your president for this upcoming conference. As for my chairing style, I consider myself somewhat laid back. This is not to be confused with someone who is a pushover; I believe in order and respect in my council. While Model UN is a chance for spirited and sometimes heated debates, I ask that you maintain respect for your fellow delegates and chairs, and in return, I expect the same from my chairs to you. I will not tolerate personal attacks in either the verbal form or written form, i.e. derogatory note passing. If we are able to maintain respect and order, I believe in having fun as well. While I do expect you to take seriously the task at hand of representing your nation, I do not expect you to be so serious as to not have fun. I love to laugh in session and fully expect to as well.

I am a firm believer in the educational purpose of this conference. I do not expect you all to walk into the council as perfect delegates. I do, however, expect you to walk out of the council a better delegate than you came in. As I am here to facilitate your debate, I want to correct a statement I made earlier; this is not MY council, it is YOURS. It will be run in the direction that YOU as a body decide to go with it. YOU will set the tone for the debate, and YOU will create papers that are as simple or as all encompassing as YOU see fit. Our job as chairs is to make sure that you do so while following the Rules of Parliamentary Procedure and while maintaining respect. I will not steer your council in any particular direction. I will only correct the direction if I feel it that the council has lost its focus, or that it is educationally beneficial to do so.

My other job as chair is to evaluate you as delegates. As I am evaluating you on your knowledge of the topics, your nations' policies, and rules of debate, I will not answer any questions regarding these to individual delegations. If there is a question that you feel you would like me to answer, it must be brought up using the appropriate parliamentary procedure at the appropriate time.

My expectation is that all delegates do each of the following.

1. Substantial research should be conducted concerning the Security Council (its goals and principles), the delegate's individual country (including history, government, resources, allies and enemies, and foreign policy), and the assigned topics.
2. Know the Rules of Procedure and know how to use them. Failure to know and use the rules properly will cause delegations' to receive lower evaluations.
3. Know the Conference Handbook and the Conference Policies therein. Failure to adhere to these policies will cause delegations' evaluations to suffer.
4. Come to the conference prepared. Arrive at each session on time. Be ready to debate at the beginning, middle, and end of each and every session.

5. Treat one another, as well as the conference staff, with respect and common courtesy.
6. Learn from and teach one another.
7. Have Fun!!

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

Included in this letter is a research guide for a few of the topics that may come up in our council. However, for the Security Council, there is no specific set of topics, as our agenda is open. This means that any pressing security matter may be discussed before the body. I encourage delegates to read not only those topics discussed in my president's letter, but to also utilize those written by other committee presidents that may be relevant. Additionally, SC delegates should be paying attention to developing international security issues in the current news between the publishing of this letter and the start of the conference.

Outside of these common expectations, I have two pet peeves that I would like to address prior to conference. The first of which is making points, motions, or rights of reply. If we are in formal debate, and you wish to make one of the following, do not just raise your placard quietly, say nothing, and expect that I will call on you simply because the placard is in the air. If I see this, I will assume that your placard has decided that the rules of gravity no longer apply to it, and that your outstretched arm is simply trying to pull it back down to the table. If you have a motion, put up your placard and **authoritatively** state, "**Motion.**" I will then call upon you and ask which motion you intend to make. The same goes for the remaining two. While this is covered in the rules, I often find that its wording confused delegates as to what is actually proper, and I wanted to clarify this ahead of time. Now that I have clarified this rule for you, it is now expected that you will all be able to do the above in the appropriate manner. The second pet peeve is really not something I expect from you, but something I request. Since we are all representatives of different parts of the world, respect not only covers what you say to people, but also in how you pronounce their countries name. The western media has influenced us with improper pronunciations of both the nations of Iraq (Eye-rack) and Iran (Eye-ran). While we expect that other people pronounce the United States correctly, and not some twisted jumble, it is only respectful that we pronounce their names appropriately as well. Iraq is properly pronounced "EE – rock", and Iran is properly pronounced "Ear – on". Forgive me if these are confusing, I hope that you understand how they are pronounced. Again, this is not something I expect from you, but I appreciate any effort you make to correct this, as I am very aware how difficult this transition can be.

So with that, I conclude my introduction. I look forward to meeting all of you and look forward to facilitating your debate.

POTENTIAL TOPICS

International Piracy

The civilized world has long attempted to deal with the pirate threat though with few real results. Going back to Roman times, the great Cicero defined piracy as a "crime against civilization itself." This was later interpreted by English jurist Edward Coke as, "*hostis humani generis*" – enemies of the human race. This declared that pirates were enemies of all countries making them the burden of all states to bear. This definition is reiterated in both British and American trial law as well as numerous treaties including the United Nations Conventions on the High Seas where a pirate is defined as one who uses methods of homicide and destruction, "for private ends."

Today, Somalia is a hub to pirate life. In the fall of 2008, a crew of pirates emanating out of Somalia hijacked a Saudi oil tanker containing approximately 2 million barrels of crude oil – equal to one-quarter of Saudi Arabia’s daily output. This attack was about 450 nautical miles southeast of Mombasa, Kenya, the farthest attack offshore to date. In addition to this, pirates in the Gulf of Aden have held 13 vessels (included are the Saudi oil tanker as well as a Ukrainian vessel carrying tanks and other weapons) with nearly a dozen navies circling helplessly. With the upsurge of recent pirate activity, this region is being likened to a modern day Barbary Coast, which was the name given to the middle and western coastal regions of Northern Africa from the 16th until the 19th century. This region was often a haven for pirates and slave traders. Not coincidentally, this same region is what we today refer to as the “Horn of Africa.” Today’s pirates differ from those of yesteryear, though, in that they do not typically enslave their captives but return them upon receipt of ransom. The issue of ransom is also a mighty one; this year alone the ransom enterprise has brought in over US\$30 million to Somalia. In 2007, the International Piracy Center stated that “many more” than 26 pirate attacks were formally reported with hijackings becoming more and more frequent. While in 2008, 102 ships have been attacked and 40 have been hijacked in the Gulf of Aden alone.

A large amount of effort is being focused in the “Modern Barbary” at the time being and quite specifically on Somalia. Right now, Somalia is a staging ground for many piratical activities. This is in large part due to Somalia’s economy and political situation. Somalia is (for all intents and purposes) a state with neither government nor law enforcement being run by rival clans. Somalia is a very impoverished, very corrupt society that is run on anarchy. This leaves people few options other than the criminal life. Fishermen, for instance, can simply change their industry from fish to piracy by acquiring a few guns. Behavior such as this is typical in states with such a ramshackle economy where people are forced to fend for themselves and take the illegal route in substitution of nothing else; it goes without saying that Somalia is terribly unstable. To worsen the matters, some Somali pirates are getting intelligence about shipping routes and cargo from Europe to help them plan their attacks. Events have gotten to the point that UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon has called for a multinational stabilization force to help pave the way for peacekeepers. Hopes are that the introduction of peacekeepers will deny a safe haven for the pirates.

The world, though, is making only baby steps in the right direction. The European Union has initiated EU Naval Force – ATALANTA (EUNAVFOR ATALANTA) to aid in pirate patrols over the next year in the Gulf of Aden, which lies between Yemen, Djibouti and Somalia on the Horn of Africa. Also, the UN Security Council passed a resolution in early December allowing navies to break the 12-mile territorial limit to enter Somali waters in pursuit of pirates. The United States, also, has recently proposed taking the battle to the pirates. A US-led Security Council resolution is currently bolstering support to allow foreign forces to attack pirate bases on land with the permission of Somalia’s government. These small steps are the beginning of something bigger. Piracy is a problem that has haunted the world for millennia in varying forms and means, but has always had the elements of being stateless actors as well as unpredictable. What will the future hold?

Questions

1. With pirates being lawless and stateless actors, what could a reasonable solution to the problem be?
2. With its similarities to terrorism, piracy has begun to be referred to as “Maritime Terrorism.” When dealing with the problem of pirates, should its solution come from or lead to a solution to terrorism? Or neither?
3. What is your state’s policy on pirates, hijackings, ransom and negotiating with such actors?
4. In the case of a state such as Somalia, what can the world do with restraints such as

sovereignty?

5. Even though piracy is most prevalent in the Horn of Africa, it exists in quantity across the world most notably along trade routes through South East Asia. What solutions can be achieved that addresses piracy worldwide?

Research Links:

- Live Piracy Map 2008 –
(http://www.iccccs.org/index.php?option=com_fabrik&view=visualization&controller=visualization.googlemap&Itemid=89)
- NY Times Topics – Piracy at Sea
(http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/p/piracy_at_sea/index.html?scp=1-spot&sq=piracy%20at%20sea&st=cse)
- International Maritime Organization –
(http://www.imo.org/facilitation/index.asp?topic_id=362)

Global Interorganizational Cooperation

From 1618 until 1648 Europe was wracked and ravaged by the Thirty Years War. This war perished a large fraction of the German population, redrew the map of Europe and brought about a new international order. The effects of The Treaty of Westphalia of 1648 were two fold: First, it established the groundwork for national sovereignty - empowers the national ruler as the dominant form of governance within a state. Second, the Westphalian documents also established the concept of independent “nation-states” in Europe whereby a state (and further, an individual) could have both religion and nationality; a man could be both a Frenchman *and* a Catholic, for instance. This as well evolved over time in both Europe and the world at large to be later amended by certain liberal ideals such as freedom of religion, thus pushing states into the completely political/secular realm. This further destroyed the careful political-religious balance sought by those in the Thirty Years War; however, it was able to put an end to religious conflict.

Over time the nation-states and the concept of sovereignty grew making states more independent of one another and consequently in greater need of cooperative forces between them without the bonds of religion. The first breed of this was the Concert of Europe in 1814 putting an end to the Napoleonic Wars and presenting as the first example of what has come to be known as “concert diplomacy” – the diplomatic method of states working together (“in concert”) towards a common end, which is the basis of our own United Nations. The Concert of Europe was an informal collection of the European powers working together on an ad hoc basis coming together whenever called upon. This method was not perfected until the creation of the UN in 1945 when the powers and fellow members came together in a formal body under formal agreement.

Following the creation of the UN other transnational bodies came to be: the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, African Union, European Union and Association of South East Asian Nations to name a few. No two of these organizations are exactly alike, as well no two of them have the same jurisdictional power. With such organizations – with varying degrees of overlap – each one has its own strengths and weaknesses there should be a more effective way of them cooperating. Much as the states of nineteenth century Europe worked together “as needed” in an ad hoc manner, these organizations do much the same. This, however, is perhaps not the

most beneficial manner. More often than not each organization needs the aid and powers of the other organizations but without the structure in place to facilitate it on anything more than an ad hoc basis taking more time and energy. Of all these organizations, the UN is the most far reaching with the most capabilities and members; so it would be only appropriate for this organization to make the first step in these efforts. With such power, jurisdiction and membership the UN is most capable of facilitating the efforts for inter-organizational cooperation. For these reasons, could the UN facilitate a more efficient and effective method of these organizations working together to make the world a better place?

Questions:

1. With the UN at the helm, what could each other organization (i.e. NATO, EU, AU) provide?
2. Would such cooperation at all interfere or inhibit sovereignty?
3. How does your state feel about the use of transnational organizations as a method of problem solving?
4. Of what other intergovernmental organizations is your state a part?
5. Would this method in fact be more effective and efficient?

Research Links:

- New York Times Topics – Organizations
(<http://topics.nytimes.com/topics/reference/timestopics/organizations/index.html>)
- Peace of Westphalia
(http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Treaty_of_Westphalia)

Threats to International Peace and Security Caused by Terrorist Acts

Terrorism is indubitably one of the greatest threats to civilization and humanity today. Terrorists are a *hostis humani generis* – enemies of the human race – as Edward Coke once defined pirates. This new threat, though, cannot be found terrorizing the high seas and looting merchants. Terrorists are a much more reclusive and deadly group than pirates operating in stealth while hiding in plain sight so to strike when least expected with devastating force. At the present, the United Nations has taken great steps to fight terrorism: The creation of the Counter-Terrorism committee has been at the forefront of this endeavor. This organization collects and coordinates the efforts of numerous UN bodies in the fight against terrorism under coordination from the Security Council. The Security Council itself has, since 1963, passed over a dozen measures to help fight terror: such as the 1962 Aircraft Convention, the 1979 Hostages Convention, the 1997 Terrorist Bombing convention and the 2005 Nuclear Terrorism Convention. These conventions have helped to build the foundation for the war on terror, but are not very complete or pro-active.

On September 1, 2004 a group of terrorists seized a school in Beslan, Russia and held the school for 3 days. The crisis ended with the school being stormed by Russian Special Forces, and in the death of 334 hostages. Again in Russia on October 23, 2002 40-50 armed Chechens stormed and seized a crowded movie theatre in Moscow. On the third and final day of the crisis, 134 of the hostages were killed by a gas intended to subdue the attackers. On December 24, 1999 Indian Airlines Flight 814 was hijacked by five Pakistani nationals who held the plane for over a week across several borders. This crisis ended with the death of one and the injury of 17 hostages as well as the terrorists getting away. Each of these examples brought about change and discussion within the international community in a reactive manner.

The world as it is today woefully lacks a proactive response to terrorism. In each of the above

examples the world came together as the event unfolded and worked out a solution as time went on. This, however, is inefficient and no doubt resulted in the crisis escalating. A proactive response to terrorism would increase the efficiency and decrease time and fatalities in responding to these crises. This is, in fact, the Achilles Heel of the world's conflict against terrorists. The global community's inability to react quickly to crisis forces them to be drawn out instead of ended quickly costing greater resources and of course greater loss of life. The UN and the World should be better equipped to respond proactively to crises instead of letting them happen and going with the flow.

Questions:

1. Is there any proactive solution to deal with immediate acts of terror?
2. Of those available, what instruments are able to stop or subdue terrorism?
3. What is your country's policy on terrorism? State sponsored terrorism?
4. What has your country done to battle terrorism?
5. Is terrorism an international or domestic issue?

Research:

- Counter-Terrorism Committee Hierarchy (http://www.un.org/terrorism/pdfs/CT_organogram_Feb2009-3.pdf)
- UN Issues of Peace & Security (<http://www.un.org/en/peace/>)
- UN Counter-Terrorism Committee (<http://www.un.org/sc/ctc/>)
- Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force (<http://www.un.org/terrorism/cttaskforce.shtml>)
- International Instruments to Counter Terror (<http://www.un.org/terrorism/instruments.shtml>)

The Situation in Cyprus

The island of Cyprus, located in the Mediterranean Sea south of Turkey, gained independence and international recognition in 1960. While the population views itself collectively as Cypriots (thus recognizing itself as separate sovereign entity), the state finds itself composed of ethnically and religiously divided Turkish and Greek communities. These differences are further exacerbated because these communities identify strongly with their respective parent nations. Thus the history of Cyprus, before, during and after colonial occupation, is riddled with intense political infighting, violent riots, and brief descents into chaos. (CIA World Factbook; Library of Congress)

While political and ethnic enmities go back for generations, the beginning of recent tensions finds its root in the Turkish military intervention of northern Cyprus in 1974. Military junta-led Greece incited a coup against the Cypriot president, suspected of being a communist sympathizer, and named a known terrorist leader as the new provisional president of Cyprus. Turkey mobilized forces in response to active involvement by a militaristic Greece. Despite the pleas of the usurped Cypriot president and the Turkish Prime Minister to the United Nations Security Council, the United States and the United Kingdom declined to apply pressure on the Greek government to restore the rightful president of Cyprus. Nevertheless, the US was concerned with keeping two NATO allies from resorting to military force and sent a junior statesman to facilitate a de-escalation of tensions. (Library of Congress)

During US-moderated negotiations, the Turkish forces secured the northern part of the island ostensibly in order to protect its diasporic population from a threatening Greek Cypriot president

until a political resolution could be reached. However, neither side was willing to make concessions leading to a stalemate. Negotiations became moot shortly thereafter though when Greece's military junta collapsed and the new provisional president resigned. Although in spite of the lack of real military threat to Turkish Cypriots, Turkey's forces remained in northern Cyprus, and even expanded their holdings and solidified their positions. All in all, Turkish territory amounted to 37% by the end of the intervention. In the midst of this second intervention, there were peace talks between Turkey and the Greek Cypriots aspired to re-unify Cyprus under a bi-zonal federal government. Unfortunately details surrounding representation and demarcation of territory could not be agreed upon. To this day no permanent resolution has been found. (Library of Congress)

Currently Cyprus is divided into 2 autonomous regions: the southern Greek portion (the Republic of Cyprus), which is the officially recognized government of Cyprus; and the northern portion (the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC)), which is only recognized by Turkey. These regions are divided by a UN peacekeeping mission (UNFICYP), acting as a buffer zone. Both regions enjoy largely democratic governments and the south benefits from a relatively stable economy, bolstered by the booming tourist industry. However, TRNC is dependent on the Turkish government for financial support. While violent flare-ups are less common in the last couple of years, drug trafficking, human trafficking (particularly sexual exploitation of women and children), and internally displaced persons continue to plague the island nation. (CIA World Factbook; UNFICYP website)

In 2004, the UN issued a peace plan that called for a federation of two states held together by a limited central government. However, when the plan was put before both communities, the Greek Cypriots voted against. With this setback, further progress was delayed until 2006 when the UN called again for more negotiations. Active discussions were taken up again in September 2008. Political leaders on all sides look to find a solution in the next year, almost all major points of contention remain to be agreed upon. (BBC New; Reuters)

While hostilities between the active parties are negligible at this time, it is important to remember that the Cyprus question affects many nations' geo-political interests in the Mediterranean and the Middle East. As the issue remains unresolved, so does progress lag in other arenas that do pose more immediate international security risks.

Questions to remember when researching this topic:

- What has your government said in official statements on the matter?
- How would a resolution to this issue benefit or harm your nations' interests in the region?
 - o Economic
 - o Military
 - o Politically
- What actions have been attempted in the past, both by relevant independent actors and the UNSC?
- What new and innovative steps could you take to resolve the issue?

Useful research tools:

CIA World Factbook <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/cy.html>

Library of Congress

“The Greek Coup and Turkish Invasion” <http://countrystudies.us/cyprus/15.htm>

“Developments Since 1974” <http://countrystudies.us/cyprus/16.htm>

Reuters.com

“Frustrated Turkey inches forward in EU talks” <http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSLDE5BK0Y0>

“Cyprus peace talks to intensify in January” <http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE5BK2PO20091221>

UNSC Home Page <http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/index.html>

Meetings (Resolutions and Meeting notes with rep speeches)

Press Releases

Members—Permanent Missions’ Websites

UNFICYP Website

UN documents and SC

resolutions http://www.unficyp.org/nqcontent.cfm?a_id=1495&tt=graphic&lang=l1

BBC World News

“How Crisis Unfolded” <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/1760565.stm>

“Q&A: Peace Process” <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/2839603.stm>

Situation in Iran

Concern about the Islamic Republic’s nuclear ambitions are nothing new. In fact, since it was founded after the 1979 Islamic Revolution, Iran has taken an openly hostile and combative position against the United States and other western allies in general. So it is no surprise that for the past thirty years the United States and Europe have used every tool short of military force to keep Iran from acquiring nuclear capabilities.

Sources of today’s political tensions began following the execution of US Operation: Ajax, which was a military coup against Iran’s elected government jointly supported by the United States and United Kingdom. Ajax gave the Shah autocratic powers for the next two-and-half decades. Hatred of the West grew as the Shah’s secret police ruthlessly crushed dissent. Powerful religious fundamentalists and Islamic elites incited, organized and funded dissident groups in efforts to overthrow the monarchy. Everything finally boiled over in 1979, in the form of a revolution, ending when the Shah and his family fled in tacit response to the transfer of power to cleric-backed factions. The remnants of the Shah’s government attempted to maintain Iran as a secular state, but were forced to allow the return of Grand Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini. Within a week his forces had taken control of the country, and the provisional government dissolved itself and recognized the Islamic Republic of Iran as the legitimate authority. (Library of Congress)

The Islamic Revolution remains a defining moment in the international community’s struggle with fundamentalist Islam. Long before Al-Qaeda was even an idea, Iran has trained and supported terrorist organizations in the Middle East and abroad. Since its inception Khomeini’s regime has attempted to export not only Islamic revolution and terrorism, but supported anti-establishment movements such as the Hezbollah, Palestinian Liberation Organization, and the Anti-Apartheid movement of South Africa. Saddam Hussein launched the Iran-Iraq War in part because Khomeini was attempting to topple secular Arab governments, including his own. (Library of Congress; Byman, “Iran, Terrorism and Weapons of Mass Destruction”)

When researching this topic, the delegates would do well to have a firm understanding of the [Rational Actor Model](#) of International Relations. Most critics of the Islamic Republic argue that Iran is not a rational actor, due to its theocratic ideologies that hold it to the higher accountability of divine providence. For example, in 1988, after losing nearly a million Iranians

and over billions of US Dollars in the Iran-Iraq war, Khomeini negotiated a peace with Iraq. Despite these horrendous losses, he would not apologize, instead claiming the endgame was negligible compared to the glory of adhering to the will of God. Seemingly the head of state's chief concern is not necessarily self preservation or even victory. Conversely, his focus centers on fulfilling what he considers to be his duty to God. While Iran has yet to act out in a way that would risk its own self preservation, the rhetoric of its political elite, past and present, indicate the unpredictability of its future actions. This particularly would hold true if it perceives cultural, religious or political attacks that might threaten to erode the theocratic power-base.

The anti-government protests that erupted last year may prove to be the first true threat to the regime. While the protests began as a response to the rigging of the Presidential elections, they quickly targeted the Supreme Leader and his council as well. It is important to note that the President of Iran does not wield the same power as a president from another country. He does not in any way control Iran's military or defense policy. The Supreme Leader, now Grand Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, is the true head of state. When the demonstrators chant "DEATH TO THE TYRANT" it is Khamenei, not Ahmadinejad, they are denouncing.

Western powers, in particular the United States, the United Kingdom, and France have worked tirelessly for decades in hope of preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. They have tried everything from diplomatic isolation to crushing sanctions. See UNSC resolutions 1696, 1737, 1747, 1803, and 1835. Despite credible evidence to the contrary, Iran repeatedly denies its pursuit of developing nuclear weapons, claiming its nuclear program is simply for energy and medical purposes. The United States saw a glimmer of hope in 2007, when the National Intelligence Estimate, a yearly report compiled by all sixteen American intelligence agencies, predicted with a "high degree of certainty" that Iran had suspended its nuclear weapons program in 2003. For the past two years the IAEA has had some breathing room, and mostly focused on making sure Iran did not restart a weapons program. (CNN; Reuters)

However, the sense of security was shattered in late 2009, when the British Secret Intelligence Service (MI6) produced documentation that Iran is developing a Neutron Initiator. This device is a trigger for a nuclear weapon, and has no civilian application. The documentation has been provided to the IAEA for review, though the organization maintains its position that there is no concrete evidence of an Iranian weapons program despite Iran's parliament authorizing the construction of over a dozen new nuclear facilities earlier this year. (CNN)

Questions to keep in mind while researching:

- What has your government said in official statements on the matter?
- What does your country stand to lose or gain not only from an armed or disarmed Iran, but from potential Western pressure and or intervention in general?
- Is your country a major trade or military partner of Iran?
- Does your government have a generally hostile or friendly history with the actors involved in the dispute?

Useful research tools:

Directory of Permanent Missions to the United Nations (sort of like an embassy to the UN):<http://www.un.org/en/members/index.shtml>

IAEA News Center, specifically articles pertaining to Iran:<http://www.iaea.org/NewsCenter/Focus/laeaIran/index.shtml>

CNN International's list of Iran related

articles: <http://www.cnn.com/search/?query=iran&primaryType=mixed&sortBy=date&intl=false>

Reuter's News Service list of Iran related articles: <http://www.reuters.com/search?blob=Iran>
<http://www.cnn.com/2009/WORLD/meast/12/22/iran.nuclear.program/index.html?iref=allsearch>
<http://www.cnn.com/2009/US/12/14/clinton.rights/index.html?iref=allsearch>
<http://www.cnn.com/2009/WORLD/meast/12/14/iran.nuclear/index.html?iref=allsearch>

Library of Congress

"Khomeini and Renewed Opposition" <http://countrystudies.us/iran/20.htm>

"The Revolution" <http://countrystudies.us/iran/23.htm>

"Government and Politics" <http://countrystudies.us/iran/80.htm>

"Political Dynamics" <http://countrystudies.us/iran/89.htm>

"The Secret CIA History of the Iran Coup,
1953" <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB28/>

US Council on Foreign Relations

"Iran: State Sponsor of Terrorism?" <http://www.cfr.org/publication/9362/>

"Iran, Terrorism and Weapons of Mass Destruction" by Daniel

Byman http://docs.google.com/viewer?a=v&q=cache:rY03pUw0FRkJ:www.brookings.edu/views/testimony/fellows/byman20050908.pdf+iran+sponsor+terrorism&hl=en&gl=us&pid=bl&srcid=ADGEEsgeh4Btf3sCVL5PUkXR9Ph5731dH5N7tEN7QluN2Tifo8ZlwL_piVGtRmi0hM96DC7mw-Zbh10hBAYMP779JoyaWK1-QE3nIDqHkgxEHtZyyO5_ryQI4ZVzZ2uLW9oLSPHmXIMu&sig=AHIEtbRZQjLZ8KxNRrhKVlqRv7zCVOknHQ

UNSC Home Page <http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/index.html>

Meetings (Resolutions and Meeting notes with rep speeches)

Press Releases

Members—Permanent Missions' Websites

Situation in Democratic Republic of Congo

Since 1997, a border war with Hutu rebels in the northeast as a result of the Rwandan genocide has ravaged what is now known as the Democratic Republic of the Congo. This war has been further complicated by continual uprisings of militant factions based on perceived ethnic differences. The constant blurring of factional lines combined with the brutal repression of a despotic government has led to a descent into chaos that inhibits political, economic and social development not only within the DRC but also in its neighbors. Forced conscription of young people, pillaging of resources, rape, and other humanitarian atrocities has created a sea of internally displaced persons and refugees that are welcome in neither the DRC nor surrounding regions. (Library of Congress; BBC News)

In response to the downward spiral of Africa's 3rd largest nation and purportedly one of the most mineral rich regions in the world, the international community has tried to cease the violence. In 1999, the UN Security Council established a peacekeeping mission to the DRC (MONUC) in Resolution 1279 and expanded upon in Resolution 1291. Subsequent SC resolutions have maintained and expanded MONUC's mandate, with peacekeeping troop numbers totaling to over 18,000. MONUC's mission is to support the sovereign government of the DRC under then-President Laurent-Désiré Kabila and his son, current President Joseph Kabila. Additionally, the International Criminal Court has issued indictments on several militia leaders for war crimes and crimes against humanity. In 2003 a peace accord was signed, however it appears to be abandoned as the fighting continues. (UN Website; Library of Congress; MONUC website)

MONUC's missions over the years have received mixed reviews, as oftentimes its peacekeepers are involved in direct conflict on behalf of the government, in an effort to establish peace instead of maintain it. The mission has served to be more of a black hole to send troops, as the mandate is expanded every year, yet peace seems no closer to being achieved. Moreover, in December 2009 major news sources report that MONUC has been an active party in committing war crimes against civilians, including brutal murders, rape and outright genocide. This is largely attributed to the fact that MONUC, DRC government, and de-militarized militia forces have been integrated and operate as a unified force, which leads to a breakdown in discipline on the field. (CNN)

Human rights organizations are calling for a suspension of MONUC's mandate and a reconsideration of the UN's role in de-escalating the conflict. Not only in the last 10 years has MONUC failed to bring peace to a worn-torn nation, but it has been found to be openly utilizing the same tools of war that they were sent to prevent. (CNN)

As of the publishing of this letter, the UN Security Council has yet to meet on whether to extend UNMOC's mandate. If the mandate is renewed for another year, what steps should be taken to make the mission more effective? If the mandate is suspended, how should the Security Council approach establishing peace in the region? These are just a few of the questions these disturbing new developments raise.

Questions to remember when researching:

- What has your government said in official statements on the matter?
- What kind of precedents is your government willing to permit concerning sovereignty and reacting to humanitarian crises?
- What new innovative ways are there to approach this issue?
- How is your nation benefited or harmed by a chaotic DRC? Peaceful DRC?
- What kind of commitments is your government willing to make to a new structure for the peacekeeping mission, if any? To extending the mandate?
 - oPolitically
 - oEconomically
 - oMilitarily
- What is your relationship with the government of the DRC? Rebel factions? Supporters of DRC? Detractors?

Useful research tools:

Reuters News Group:

- <http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE5BF4UH20091216>
- http://www.reuters.com/article/homepageCrisis/idUSN21254760.CH_.2400
- http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSLDE5BD1UR.CH_.2400

CNN Website:

<http://www.cnn.com/2009/WORLD/africa/12/14/congo.civilian.deaths/index.html?iref=allsearch>

UNSC Home Page <http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/index.html>

Meetings (Resolutions and Meeting notes with rep speeches)
Press Releases
Members—Permanent Missions' Websites

Library of Congress: <http://rs6.loc.gov/frd/cs/zrtoc.html>

CIA World Factbook www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/ir.html

BBC News http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/country_profiles/1076399.stm

The Situation in Afghanistan

Since the late 1970s Afghanistan has experienced a continuous state of civil war punctuated by foreign occupations in the forms of the 1979 Soviet invasion and the 2001 U.S.-led invasion that toppled the Taliban government. The UN Security Council did not authorize the U.S.-led military campaign in Afghanistan. In November of 2009, UNICEF described Afghanistan as the most dangerous place in the world for a child to be born.

As the country continues to rebuild and recover, it is still struggling against poverty, poor infrastructure, large concentration of land mines and other unexploded ordnance, as well as a huge illegal poppy cultivation and opium trade. Afghanistan also remains subject to occasionally violent political jockeying. The country has continued to grapple with the Taliban insurgency and the threat of attacks from a few remaining elements of Al-Qaeda. While in 2009 the Taliban had reported that they have completely severed all ties with Al-Qaeda, the U.S. has yet to engage in formal negotiations with the faction. In December, U.S. President Barack Obama announced that he would escalate U.S. military involvement by 30,000 troops over the next six months.

The UN Security Council has continually extended the use of the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan, but has yet to make a definite stance on the current situation, preferring instead to leave the situation between the U.S. and Afghan governments.

Question #1 – Is this a topic that the UN Security Council should discuss, i.e. is it reflective of their goals and principles?

Question #2 – What recommendations and/or legitimate actions can the SC take to alleviate the situations in Afghanistan?

Question #3 - What is your country's position on Afghanistan? What other positions exist?

Question #4 – Are there still unaddressed situations in Afghanistan that threaten global security? If so, what are they and what position should your nation and the SC take?

Question #5 – Has the U.S. overstepped its authorities in dealing with the problems in Afghanistan?

Question #6 - Are there short-term and long-term solutions? Are they the same? Are they counter-intuitive?

Darfur

The Darfur area of Sudan has been at conflict since the beginning of the century. After surviving as an independent sultanate for several hundreds of years, it was incorporated into Sudan by the British. Amongst its struggles over the years, Darfur has had Islam introduced, lived under Egyptian rule, defeated British forces invading Egypt, and finally were defeated by British forces in WWII, which was when it was incorporated into the Sudan.

The three states of Darfur have been seeking autonomy in some form since becoming an part of Sudan. The region has undergone skewed development, thanks in part to the proxy wars between the Sudan, Libya, and Chad in which the ideology of Arab supremacy began to influence Darfurians.

An extreme famine led to the first social distortions and the first of the violent fighting between the different factions in Darfur. Since then, the resistance has become more organized and the civil war has killed more than 300,000 and displaced more than 2.5 million people. Continued fighting and instability has kept the displaced out of the region, where many have said they feel safer inside the camps than they did in their own homeland.

Question #1 – Is this a topic that the Security Council should discuss, i.e. is it reflective of their goals and principles?

Question #2 - What recommendations and/or legitimate actions can the SC take to bring about an solution to the conflict in Darfur?

Question #3 - What is your country's position on Darfur? What other positions exist?

Question #4 - Can a consensus be reached that reflects each of these different positions? Is that consensus consistent with the SC's goals and principles?

Question #5 – With all of the displaced citizens, what, if anything, can the SC do to help countries who have taken in the Darfur refugees?

Question #6 - Are there short-term and long-term solutions? Are they the same? Are they counter-intuitive?

www.mideastweb.org

www.darfurisdying.com

www.savedarfur.org

www.unhcr.org

www.adl.org/iran

www.fas.org

www.armscontrol.org

www.afghan-web.com

www.afghanistannews.net

Narcoterrorism

Narcoterrorism involves the violent attempts made by those in the narcotics trade to influence the policy of governments. The term itself has come under debate, yet it is clear that narcoterrorism has a growing presence in our world, especially in Latin America. Narcoterrorism

now refers to terrorist groups that rely on narcotics to finance their operations, such as the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), National Liberation Army (ELN), and the United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia (AUC) in Colombia and Shining Path (PCP-SL) in Peru. This topic is an especially interesting and complex way of looking at both terrorism and illicit narcotics trafficking. Narcotics trafficking often takes place across borders and thus falls in the SC's purview.

Each nation has a stake in this issue. The United States is involved in Mexico and Afghanistan. Countries such as Turkey and Austria have concerns over drug trade in the EU and surrounding countries. Drug trafficking is also deeply tied to other violations of international law such as human trafficking and organized crime. Drugs affect the domestic and foreign policy of every nation and thus narcotics trafficking would make an interesting and complex topic for the UNSC to address. In many countries, drug cartels are more powerful even than the national government. There are claims that many governments use laundered drug money to finance their political control. This interconnectedness makes the issue of narcopolitics, and therefore narcoterrorism a difficult one.

Security Council members will have to discuss and determine how to define narcoterrorism, what powers the SC has to deal with the situation, and how the SC can work with individual governments to combat the problem.

Questions to Consider:

What is the nature of the drug culture/economy in your nation?

Are drugs by their nature an obstacle to democracy or is it a freedom of choice issue?

Can narcoterrorism be considered in the same vein as traditional terrorism, and therefore can the standard counter-terrorism tactics be applied?

What agreements on combating terrorism that are already in place are applicable here?

How is national sovereignty an issue?

Recommended Research Links:

<http://www.southcom.mil/appssc/pages/counterNarco.php>

<http://www.iar-gwu.org/node/39>

http://www.reportingproject.net/new/pdf/Emma_Narcoterror.pdf

<http://www.un.org/sc/ctc/>

http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/english/static/in_depth/world/2000/drugs_trade/default.stm