
Message from the Executive Board

Prospective Delegates,

The Executive Board of the UNGA SPECPOL being simulated at the ODM 2024 welcomes your participation in this conference. We plan to channelize our efforts in making this a big learning experience.

Considering the nature of the conference, we look forward to making this more of a learning engagement while still keeping up the spirit of competition and the essence of debate. To meet such ends, we shall be formulating UN4MUN Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business which shall be explained to you in brief prior to the first session as well as throughout the working of the committee, as and when required. We expect the debate to comprise of substantive points, logical analysis of facts and suggestions and advancement of country opinion.

To clear any contentions, the participants need not let thoughts about our expectations be a hurdle in their research or give way to any fear regarding fulfilment of their objectives. The only thing the Executive Board will put strong emphasis on, would be helping you understand the international analysis, and argumentative debating. Participants shall be tested on their knowledge and arguments, along their specific country lines and the respective ideology, over the various topics discussed in the debate and also the deliberations before choosing a particular topic.

This guide, although very comprehensive and factual, provides a basic idea of the topics likely to be argued upon and topics to be discussed in view of the committee and may vary from those of the respective delegate's ideologies. In no way is this guide to confine a participant's research. The guide consists of subjective and factual data with arguments, but this is just to make the participants understand the ways in which they must make their addresses.

We do not expect this guide to serve as enough research for the topics and you to revert to us for any help with understanding or proceeding with the research, in case you have any doubts or contentions till the end of the conference.

Wishing you the very best,

Avyakt Mishra (Chairperson)

Arindum Roy (Vice Chairperson)

Research Suggestion

1. Read the agenda guide, at least 7 days prior to the conference and make a note of everything that needs to be understood.
2. Google/search everything and find relating documents (UN news articles, scholarly articles) for whatever was not really understood.
3. After wholly understanding (subject to how in depth you wish to go for the research), try understanding your allotted country's perspective on the agenda.
4. Make the stance in accordance with the country's perspective on the agenda which shall also define your foreign policy (history, past actions etc.)
5. Understand the cues and hints that are given minutely in the background guide that may come handy while presentation of contentions in committee.
6. Take a good look at the mandate of council as to what you can discuss and what you can do in this council. This point is placed here, just because your knowledge base shouldn't be limited to the mandate of the council. Know everything; speak whatever the mandate allows.
7. Predict the kind of discussions and on what sub topics can they take place, thereby analysing the sub topic research you have done and prepare yourself accordingly. Make a word document and put your arguments there for better presentation in council and bring a hard copy of it to the committee.
8. Ask the Executive Board your doubts, if you have any, by means of the given email id and make sure to not disclose your allotted country, until you want to understand the policy of your country.
9. Download the United Nations charter and other relevant treaties and documents given.
10. Ask questions regarding procedure to speak something etc., if you have any, on the day of the conference.

Nature of Proof and Evidence

Documents from the following sources will be considered as credible proof for any allegations made in committee or statements that require verification:

- Reuters: Appropriate Documents and articles from the Reuters News agency will be used to corroborate or refute controversial statements made in committee.
- UN Document: Documents by all UN agencies will be considered as sufficient proof. Reports from all UN bodies including treaty-based bodies will also be accepted.
- Government Reports: Government Reports of a given country used to corroborate an allegation on the same aforementioned country will be accepted as proof.

Crisis in the Korean Peninsula

- Introduction
- Historical background
- Whose interests are infringed?
- What are the sources of the problem?
- Recent developments
- Main players and their positions
- Into what groups are countries divided in the solution of the problem?
- Key documents
- What solutions has the UN proposed in the past?
- Problems that should be addressed in a resolution
- Links for further research



SPECPOL

Introduction

The subject of sub-regional security on the Korean peninsula is global. The beginning of 2013 was marked by the harsh response of the DPRK establishment on UN Security Council Resolution 2087 and the third nuclear test held by this state over the last seven years. The reaction of the Security Council was quite consistent: UN resolutions imposed serious sanctions on the DPRK. However, the deterioration of the situation did not stop at this point.

As far as the urgency of the problem is concerned, one can refer to the tensions in the international relations on the Korean peninsula that historically were strong, especially since the beginning of the 21st century. Controversies and gaps divide of Korea and the Republic of Korea in the spheres of ideology, social and economic development as well as their positions on the global arena. All in all, it is an issue of regional importance that threatens to develop into a large-scale conflict. One of the most significant factors for that matter is the involvement of the bigger states, major powers like U.S., Japan, Russia and PRC. It is not only the territorial closeness that predetermines their interest, but also certain a geopolitical subdivision that still exists in the post- bipolar world. For instance, on the one hand, it is the "axis of evil" rhetoric used by George W. Bush "a regime arming with missiles and weapons of mass destruction, while starving its citizens"); while, on the other hand, North Korean leadership keeps claiming that it only needs nuclear program for self- defense against "imperialist invaders". It is up to the delegates to take a common stand and agree on the practical steps to help resolve the problem.



Historical Background

It was in 1948 that two states (DPRK and Republic of Korea respectively) were founded on the Korean peninsula. North Korea is located on the northern part of the peninsula and it extends from China south to the 38th parallel of latitude. South Korea then extends from that area and encompasses the rest of the Korean Peninsula.

To be more specific, at the end of the World War II, Korea was divided into northern and southern portions at the 38th parallel by the Allies at the Potsdam Conference. The United States was to administer the southern part, while the USSR administered the northern area. This division started the conflicts between the two areas of Korea because the northern region followed the USSR and became communist, while the south opposed this form of government and formed a strong anti-communist, capitalist government. As a result, in July of 1948, the anti-communist southern region drafted a constitution and began to hold national elections. On August 15, 1948, the Republic of Korea (South Korea) was officially founded and Syngman Rhee was elected as president. Shortly thereafter Kim Il-Sung established a Communist North Korean Government called the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (North Korea). Once the two Koreas were formally established, Rhee and Il-Sung worked to reunify Korea. This caused conflicts though because each wanted to unify the area under their own political system and rival governments were established.

By 1950, the conflicts on the border of North and South Korea led to the beginning of the Korean War. The U.S. and its allies heavily supported South Korea, whereas the USSR and China assisted DPRK. But by July 27, 1953, peace negotiations ended and the Demilitarized Zone was formed. Shortly thereafter, an Armistice Agreement was signed by the Korean People's Army, the Chinese People's Volunteers and the United Nations Command, which was led by the U.S. South Korea, however, never signed the agreement and to this day an official peace treaty has never been signed between North and South Korea.

The state of affairs has become especially complicated since the DPRK withdrew from the NPT (in 2003) and claimed that it obtained nuclear weapons at the beginning of 21st century (having officially declared it in 2009). Former IAEA Director Mohamed El Baradei considers the DPRK to be a "fully fledged nuclear power", possessing around 6-18 nuclear weapons (estimated). The problem was discussed at UNSC meetings, being the subject of a number of its resolutions (see below).

Whose Interests are infringed? What are the Sources of the Problem?

- DPRK is trying to strengthen its positions in the region, holding nuclear tests and launching missiles, promoting thus the principle of self-reliance (so-called Juche policy).
- Russia shares a 17 km border with North Korea and has a long history of relations with this country (in particular taking into consideration the Soviet period). Russia is also a party to the bilateral treaty on Friendship, Good-Neighborly Relations and Cooperation with DPRK.
- China is, perhaps, one of the most important partners for DPRK (ideology is one of the main grounds for that), participating in the Sino-North Korean treaty; however, their bilateral relations were worsened by a border conflict (that dispute has been solved, as of now).
- South Korea is rather a prosperous country with a developed and diversified market economy, strongly relying on the security guarantees provided by its American partners, but also having its own armed forces, with reported personnel strength of around 3.5 million (including reserves).
- The United States are bound by bilateral agreements with the Republic of Korea and Japan with the aim to promote peace and security in the region as an international mission.



Recent Developments

The uncertainty surrounding the actions of Pyongyang deepened with the announcement by state media on December 19, 2011, that its ailing ruler, Kim Jong-il, had died of a heart attack on a train on December 17. Kim Jong-un, the youngest and previously least-known son of Kim Jong-il, introduced a policy, which has raised tensions with Washington and Seoul. In his first six months as leader, Kim quickly alienated the Western community and put North Korea on track to develop a nuclear warhead that could hit the United States within a few years. By October 2012, North Korea claimed to have missiles that could reach the American mainland. Most surprising, though, is how Kim has thumbed his nose at China, whose economic largess keeps the government afloat.

In December 2012, North Korea launched a satellite aboard a long-range rocket. The satellite appeared to be tumbling in orbit and was most likely dead. In January 2013, after the Pyongyang missile test held in December 2012, UNSC adopted a rather strict resolution, expanding sanctions against DPRK. In February 2013, the government announced that it had conducted its third, long-threatened nuclear test, posing a new challenge for the regional security ("NY Times"). There was an effort by the Donald Trump administration to discuss peace with North Korea and veer it towards de-nuclearisation. During 2018-19, the two leaders met on three occasions to pursue peace talks. However, the talks failed to take off, and Kim returned to developing and testing delivery systems.

Mr. Kim, recently, in his address to the Supreme People's Assembly, proclaimed that he is scrapping the decades old North Korean goal of reunifying the South, and has rebranded the South as an enemy state. He ordered the rewriting of the North Korean constitution to reflect this new shift in the regime's thinking. The offices related to reunification were closed, and a landmark monument in Pyongyang portraying the reunification ideal was brought down. In addition to these moves, North Korea has also flexed its military muscle by testing multiple types of missile systems during the first month of 2024 itself.

The tensions in the Korean Peninsula are rising at a time when the world is witnessing the activation of historically rooted conflicts such as Russia-Ukraine and Israel-Palestine, while others like China-Taiwan and India-China are smoldering. This is indeed a significant concern as the key external stakeholders of the Korean peninsula are the very same nuclear powers who are locked in a global strategic competition — the U.S., China and Russia.

Russia has boosted its engagement with North Korea, especially in the wake of the Russia-Ukraine war. Mr. Kim visited Russia in September 2023 and met with Russian President Vladimir Putin. During the visit, Mr. Kim was invited to the Vostochny spaceport of Russia, where he was promised assistance in enhancing North Korea's space capabilities in return for arms supplies. This was preceded by Russia's Defence Minister Sergei Shoigu's visit to Pyongyang in July 2023, and was followed by the visit of Russia's Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov's visit in October 2023. It is abundantly clear that North Korea is helping Russia with arms, including short range ballistic missiles for the latter's conflict with Ukraine.

Main Players: Countries Divided in The Solution of the Problem?

The relevance of the Korean issue for the agenda can also be proven by the keen interest that the global actors take in finding ways of the conflict resolution. Basically, major players can roughly be divided into three groups in this situation (nevertheless, this is rather vague, as nearly all of the previous UNSC resolutions were adopted unanimously).

It is believed that North Korea is traditionally supported by the PRC and to some extent Russian Federation. These states would not tolerate the strengthening positions of the U.S. in the region, let alone military intervention. However, taking into account that neither Russia nor China exercised their right of veto when voting on the previous resolutions (moreover, both Russia and the PRC condemned the nuclear test held by DPRK in February 2013), it is still not clear how long they are going to advocate for North Korea.

The U.S., Japan and European states – members of NATO (Western world, in the wide sense) are, as usual. There is no doubt that the international community should react to the events in order to prevent possible aggression on the part of North Korea. But the controversial thing is that the state of affairs can be exploited by some powers as a means of expansion of their influence in this part of the world.

As for other countries in understanding the situation and the ability to orientate themselves in the short term (they can enhance their international standing in this situation, maybe even earn definite economic benefits).



Key Documents

- NPT (The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons; signed July 1, 1968, entered into force March 5, 1970; main goal: to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and weapons technology, to promote cooperation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and to further the goal of achieving nuclear disarmament and general and complete disarmament)
- CTBT (The Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty; adopted by UN GA September 10, 1996, not entered into force yet; main goal: to ban all nuclear explosions in all environments, for military or civilian purposes)
- Mutual Defense Treaty (between U.S. and Republic of Korea; signed October 1, 1953; The U.S. created an alliance with South Korea, and established the basis of South Korean adherence with U.S. Government consultations on North Korean policy)
- The Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security between the United States and Japan (between U.S. and Japan; signed January 19, 1960)

- The Sino-North Korean Mutual Aid and Cooperation Friendship Treaty (between North Korea and the People's Republic of China; signed July 11, 1961, prolonged in 1981 and 2001)
- Treaty on Friendship, Good-Neighborly Relations and Cooperation (between Russia and North Korea, signed February 9, 2000)

What Solutions Has the UN proposed in the Past?

Resolution 825 (May 11, 1993)

The Security Council adopted a resolution calling upon North Korea to reconsider withdrawing from the Treaty on Non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The resolution urges North Korea to honor its non-proliferation obligations under the Treaty

Resolution 1540 (April 28, 2004)

Resolution 1540 affirms that proliferation of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons, as well as their means of delivery, constitutes a threat to international peace and security. The Security Council urges all States to take additional effective measures to prevent proliferation, including nuclear, chemical or biological weapons and their means of delivery

Resolution 1695 (July 15, 2006)

In this resolution, the Security Council explicitly condemns the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) nuclear weapons program. While calling for a diplomatic solution to the situation, the Council demands that the DPRK cuts back its missile launches, which jeopardize peace and security in the region. In addition, Resolution 1695 bans all member states from transactions with North Korean involving material, technology or financial resources transfer connected to DPRK's missiles or weapons of mass destruction programs.

Resolution 1718 (October 14, 2006)

The Security Council, acting under Chapter VII of the UN Charter, unanimously imposed sanctions on North Korea, in reaction of Pyongyang's nuclear test. After arduous negotiations, this softer version establishes an embargo on military and technological materials, as well as luxury goods, but does not include reference to military intervention as the US proposed initially. Furthermore, the resolution demands the freezing of North Korea's financial assets with the exception of funds necessary to meet basic needs.

Resolution 1874 (June 12, 2009)

The resolution, passed under Chapter VII, Article 41, of the UN Charter, imposed further economic and commercial sanctions on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (the DPRK, or North Korea) and encourages UN member states to search North Korean cargo, in the aftermath of an underground nuclear test conducted on 25 May 2009.

Resolution 1928 (June 7, 2010)

After recalling previous resolutions on the topics of North Korea and nuclear weapons, the Council extended the mandate of a panel of experts monitoring sanctions against the country until June 12, 2011. The Security Council determined that the proliferation and delivery of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons constituted a threat to international peace and security. Acting under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, the Council extended the mandate of the expert panel established in Resolution 1874 to monitor the newly-strengthened sanctions regime against North Korea, imposed after an underground nuclear test conducted in May 2009. The panel was requested to provide a report by November 12, 2010 and a second report 30 days prior to the termination of its current mandate with its findings and recommendations.

Resolution 1985 (June 10, 2011)

After recalling previous resolutions on the topics of North Korea and nuclear weapons, the Council extended the mandate of an expert panel monitoring sanctions against the country until June 12, 2012. China had blocked the release of the previous report of the expert panel after it accused North Korea of violating the sanctions.

Resolution 2050 (June 12, 2012)

This document extends the UN's mandate to monitor nuclear, chemical and biological weapons possessed by North Korea.

Resolution 2087 (January 22, 2013)

After recalling all previous relevant resolutions on the situation concerning North Korea, the Council condemned the December 12, 2012 rocket launch by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The new resolution saw the rocket launch as a violation of earlier sanctions imposed by the UN in 2006 (Resolution 1718) and strengthened in 2009 (Resolution 1874).

Problems that should be Addressed in a Resolution

The key goal of any resolution in itself should be the peaceful settlement of the conflict, prevention of the military development of the events (serving thus the first of the principles, reflected in the Charter of the United Nations). The resolution should reflect proper reaction of the global community to the acts of the North Korean government. It is advisable to confirm the adherence to the former decisions of the Security Council on North Korea. However, one should keep in mind that the leadership of the DPRK claimed that it would open hostilities against the Republic of Korea if the sanctions are broadened by the UN. The most important thing is lessening of the combat operation probability (perhaps, this would require an unusual, unordinary step), keeping in mind that both sides possess nuclear weapons. It is also debatable whether it is necessary to touch upon sensitive problems like possible reunification of Korea, but this could also be a card in the game. As such, it is all about balancing and compromising of countries having a stake in the ongoing situation.



Links for further research

http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Nuclear_Non-Proliferation_Treaty
<http://www.fas.org/nuke/control/npt/text/npt3.htm>
http://www.ctbto.org/fileadmin/content/treaty/treaty_text.pdf
<http://www.iaea.org/newscenter/focus/iaeadprk/index.shtml>
http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Treaty_of_Mutual_Cooperation_and_Security_between_Japan_and_the_United_States_of_America
<http://www.usfk.mil/usfk/sofa.1953.mutual.defense.treaty.76> http://www1.korea-np.co.jp/pk/156th_issue/2001022105.htm
<http://www.globalpolicy.org/images/pdfs/0511res825.pdf>
<http://www.globalpolicy.org/images/pdfs/0428res1540.pdf>
<http://www.globalpolicy.org/images/pdfs/0715res1695.pdf>
<http://www.globalpolicy.org/images/pdfs/1014reso1718.pdf>
http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/United_Nations_Security_Council_Resolution_1874
http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/United_Nations_Security_Council_Resolution_1928
[http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1985\(2011\)](http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1985(2011))
<http://www.securitycouncilreport.org/atf/cf/%7B65BFCF9B-6D27-4E9C-8CD3-CF6E4FF96FF9%7D/NKorea%20S%20RES%202050.pdf>
[http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/2087\(2013\)](http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/2087(2013))
<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-pacific-11813699> <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-21438129> <http://edition.cnn.com/2010/WORLD/asiapcf/11/23/koreas.clash.explainer/index.html>
<http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/25/world/asia/north-korea-vows-nuclear-test-as-threats-intensify.html>
http://www.nytimes.com/2013/02/26/world/asia/south-koreas-park-geun-hye-warns-north-against-nuclear-pursuits.html?_r=0
<http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/01/25/us-korea-north-idUSBRE900AJ20130125>
<http://thediplomat.com/2013/02/14/beijings-north-korea-problem/>
<http://www.smh.com.au/technology/sci-tech/north-korea-launches-rocket-20121212-2b90n.html>
<http://www.smh.com.au/world/defiant-north-korea-ups-nuclear-rhetoric-20130123-2d7as.html>
<http://www.eurasiareview.com/29012013-north-korea-an-all-out-confrontation-after-fresh-unsc-sanctions-analysis/>
<http://www.abc15.com/dpp/news/national/north-korea-conflict-north-korea-issues-caustic-message-to-us-military>
<http://mg.co.za/article/2013-02-23-north-korea-warns-us-forces-of-destruction-ahead-of-war-drill>



SPECPOL



SPECPOL