Hello! My name is Leo Dannenbaum. I am a senior at Eastern Regional High School, and I will be your chair at SJMUN 2017! This year is my fourth year doing MUN, and I have loved every second of it. In fact, my first ever conference was SJMUN 2014! The resources and information at your disposal is limitless. I can confidently say that what you put in to this committee, you will get out of it. With hard work and research, you will be rewarded with a great experience. Not only this, but you will also be able to meet many new people throughout the conference. This is my favorite part of MUN. There are so many different people who participate in the club at various schools. Going to conferences at Rutgers and Johns Hopkins has exposed me to people from different cultures and different states. The relationships I have made are those to remember for a lifetime. I urge you to take advantage of every opportunity you have to participate and succeed in MUN. I am looking forward to a great committee this year at SJMUN 2017!

The following information will serve as an addition to the brief:

As of 2013, the political instability within the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK) has continued to progress. The periodic nuclear tests, missile launches, international threats, and bailing outs on peace treaties have created great dangers for the North Korean’s, citizens of surrounding countries, and others around the world. Since the time of this brief’s writing, there has been some changes to the situation. Due to the world’s inability to truly know what is going on within North Korea, there has been great speculation over the truth. Whether it be through the media, word of mouth, or Hollywood films such as The Interview, people want to know the truth. Since 2013, Kim Jong-un has continued to ensure the nuclear threats that the DPRK has appeared to possess. This has included an announcement of the following: the country’s first hydrogen bomb test, long-range guided missiles capable of carrying nuclear warheads, and the Yongbyon nuclear plant being put back into operation. The failure to form any peace between the DPRK and South Korea has caused great political tension within the two nations. As a committee, it will be your job to relieve these tensions, and allow the unpredictability of the North Korean government to be controlled.
Committee History

Introduction

The United Nations Security Council is the epicenter of collective security, with its primary responsibility being the maintenance of international peace and security. While it has the ability to exercise sweeping powers within the United Nations system, the Council was ineffective for much of the Cold War due to the systemic geopolitical rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union. In contemporary international relations, however, it has been able to address breaches of international peace and security without much burden, and has been active in areas such as the former Yugoslavia, Angola, the Democratic Republic of Congo or Libya, though not without criticism.

Due to the role it plays in the United Nations system and the urgency of its programme of work, the Security Council does not meet in sessions; instead, the President may, at his or her own prerogative or at the behest of a sitting Member State, call a meeting to order. The ongoing nature of Council meetings also allows flexibility in its deliberations, with each meeting having its own provisional agenda consisting of items brought forward by the Secretary-General and items the Council has previously deferred or left incomplete.

Powers of the Security Council

Charter Powers

Chapters VI and VII of the Charter of the United Nations accord the responsibility of maintaining international peace and security to the Security Council. Under Chapter VI, Pacific Settlement of Disputes, Member States are compelled to resolve a dispute through all diplomatic means necessary, such as mediation, judicial arbitration, or the referral of the dispute to a regional collective security organization. The Security Council may further decide to investigate a situation and determine if said situation would undermine international peace and security, and subsequently call upon the parties involved to resolve it through diplomatic means. Subsequently, the Council may “at any stage of a dispute […] recommend appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment.”

Should there be a threat to peace or an act of aggression, the Security Council may decide to act under Chapter VII of the Charter, Action with Respect to Threats to the Peace, Breaches of the Peace, and Acts of Aggression. In this vein, the Security Council may enforce collective security by calling upon Member States to apply any measures that the Council has deemed necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security; these measures may include trade embargos, severance of telecommunications, or the withdrawal of diplomatic representation. Only when these measures have proved to be inadequate may the Council decide to act militarily, with Member States providing the necessary resources to conduct such a military operation. Security Council resolutions passed under Chapter VII are unique in international law, as these decisions are binding on Member States according to Article 25 of the UN Charter.

A power that is not prescribed explicitly by the Charter but regularly exercised by the Council is the deployment of peacekeeping operations. Peacekeeping operations provide the necessary security and ceasefire arrangements in order for the parties to participate in the peace process. During a peacekeeping mission, United Nations personnel shall remain impartial and refrain from the use of force except in situations of self-defense.
operations retain characteristics of Chapters VI and VII mandates, meaning that a military force is deployed but only
to establish the necessary conditions for the parties involved to resolve the conflict diplomatically; this has led
former Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld to famously call such missions to be under “Chapter Six and a
Half.”16

Responsibility to Protect
In recent years, the concept of a Responsibility to Protect (R2P) which was first formulated in 2001, has received
increased attention in the realm of international peace and security.17 While foreign interventions for the
maintenance of peace and security were allowed under the UN Charter, interventions under a humanitarian mandate
were controversial and the Security Council seldom took action under the latter cause, which led to much criticism,
notably in the situations of the Former Yugoslavia or in Somalia.18 R2P challenged the norms of state sovereignty
and shifted sovereignty towards the state bearing responsibility for the protection of its population.19 In this vein,
should a state fail to protect its population from “internal war, insurgency, repression or state failure, [or] the state in
question is unwilling or unable to halt or avert it,” the international community has an obligation under international
humanitarian law to protect the population in danger.20 R2P further stipulates that the Security Council, despite not
having an explicit mandate to deploy military resources for humanitarian interventions, possesses the legal capacity
to do so and to debate humanitarian interventions based on a broader interpretation of the Charter as well as
changing international norms.21 The concept was formally introduced within the United Nations at the 2005 World
Summit, when the General Assembly acknowledged the principle in an abridged form in the World Summit
Outcome document.22 The Security Council has subsequently adopted this principle in resolution S/RES/1674.23

Membership
The Security Council is composed of 15 Member States of the United Nations.24 Of the 15 Member States, five –
China, France, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom, and the United States – hold permanent seats on the
Council, with the remaining ten elected by the General Assembly for two-year terms.25 Equality between Member
States is similarly observed on the Council, with each Member State possessing one vote.26 Procedural matters
require the consent of at least nine Member States, whereas all other matters of the Council require the consent of
at least nine Member States including the five permanent members.27 This Charter provision has been interpreted
consistently in such a way that an abstention by a permanent member does not count as a veto.28 Any Member State
of the United Nations or a non-member state may be invited to participate as an observer, should a dispute affect the
state in question.29

The Security Council in 2013
The Council has met regularly throughout the first half of 2013 to discuss a wide array of topics.30 At its 6903th
meeting, the 15 Member States, along with representatives from numerous other countries as well as the European
Union, met to discuss United Nations peacekeeping operations.31 At this meeting, Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon
emphasized that priorities for any peacekeeping operation shall continue to be identified by national governments;
the successes in Timor-Leste were in large part owed to the political commitments made by the East Timorese
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government. The representative of the Republic of Korea further identified the need for peacekeeping operations to address needs on development and peacebuilding in addition to the traditional security concerns. The Council subsequently adopted resolution S/RES/2086, recognizing the need for broader peacekeeping mandates to allow peace consolidation and reconciliation to take place accordingly. Peacekeeping was also a major aspect in various country-specific resolutions. For example, resolution S/RES/2103 further reaffirmed the responsibilities tasked upon the Integrated Peacebuilding Office in Guinea-Bissau, such as promoting political dialogue and national reconciliation, assisting to strengthen democratic institutions and constitutional rule of law, and providing strategic advice to combat drug trafficking; the resolution also reaffirmed the need for the military to fall under civilian control. Other country-specific matters that were discussed in 2013 are, amongst others, the situation in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea and the ongoing armed conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.
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The Responsibility to Protect (R2P) doctrine was formulated in 2001 in response to the changing nature of conflicts around the world. In the post-Cold War era, international crises and other crimes against humanity became less inter-state and much more intra-state; with this in mind, the United Nations was ill-equipped to respond to intra-state conflicts as it would violate the sovereignty of the Member State in question. The R2P doctrine, as such, transforms the notion of sovereignty from a right to a responsibility of the state. States much bear the responsibility of protecting their populations from violence or persecution, and should a state refuse to act in this manner the international community has a further responsibility of intervening in the name of human security. The R2P doctrine was officially adopted by the Council via resolution 1674 in 2006.


This Web site contains all documents pertinent to Security Council meetings for the year of 2013. These documents may include meetings records, press statements, and any resolutions or reports that have been tabled with the Council. Delegates are strongly encouraged to consult this Web site on a regular basis in order to familiarize themselves with the Council’s programme of work for this year as well as for past years. This is crucial as meetings records and resolutions further demonstrate the substantive mandate of the Security Council as well as how Member States’ foreign policies are conducted.


The powers of the Security Council originate from the Charter of the United Nations, with the sections that are specific to the Security Council being Chapters V, VI, and VII. Chapter V sets out the composition of the Council and rules regarding membership. Collective security is enforced through Chapters VI and VII. In the former, the Council may investigate international disputes or situations that would give rise to violence, and recommend necessary actions. In the latter chapter, the Council may elect to take concrete action and physically intervene in a breach of international security, usually by a UN peacekeeping force or an approved multilateral mission.

II. The Situation in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea

Introduction

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) has long been a country of interest within the Security Council. With periodic nuclear tests and missile launches, international threats and bailing outs on peace treaties, the DPRK situation has called for coalesced international concern about peace and security. As a remnant of the cold war, the DPRK remains isolated in regards to nuclear developments despite prohibitions and condemnations from the United Nations. As the principal organ within the United Nations charged with the maintenance of international peace and security, the Security Council is pivotal to efforts for peaceful international reconciliation; as such, it must give the utmost attention to the situation in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Historical Context

The Korean War (1950-1953)

The division of the Korean peninsula between the Allied victors took place as a result of the defeat of Japan, as Korea was a former Japanese colony. However, Korean independence was ostensible; by the time of the Yalta Conference, the Soviet Union retreated from Manchuria and occupied Korea north of the 38th parallel and the United States occupied the south. The occupations by these ideological foes resulted in General Assembly Resolution 195 (III) which legitimized the Republic of Korea (ROK) in the eyes of the United Nations at the time and called for the withdrawals of both occupying powers. Both Koreas aspired to reunify the peninsula under their own political systems; against this backdrop, numerous border conflicts occurred until tensions escalated and the Korea People's Army (KPA) of the DPRK invaded the ROK in 1950. The Security Council met, amidst a boycott by the Soviet Union, and, through resolutions 82, 83 and 84 (1950), condemned the invasion, and called for the deployment of troops under the United Nations Joint Command to stop the invasion by the DPRK. With reinforcement from several United Nations Member States, the ROK forces managed to recapture Seoul and pushed the KPA to north of the 38th parallel. But as the United Nations forces reached the Yalu River, the People’s Republic of China (PRC), upon Soviet Union consent, entered the Korean War as an ally of the DPRK. PRC’s involvement resulted in an impasse for the Council, with the lack of unanimity of the permanent members. This led to the adoption of General Assembly resolution 377 (V), aptly named *Uniting for Peace*, which permitted the General Assembly to assume the Council’s role in maintaining international peace and security upon the Council’s failure. Under the resolution, a multilateral force was deployed to the Korea peninsula, which stabilized the conflict at around the 38th parallel and led to the signing of the Korean Armistice Agreement. While the ceasefire agreement resulted in the Korean Demilitarized Zone and Joint Security Area as mechanisms to stabilize the conflict, it lacked the role of a peace treaty that would have formally ended the conflict. The United Nations has signaled its desire to see a formal peace treaty via General Assembly Resolution 3990 (XXX) and Security Council presidential statement S/PRST/1996/42. However, with no significant alterations, tensions at the demarcation line remain to this day.

North Korea's Nuclear Ambitions

DPRK’s nuclear interests were initiated in the 1950s when the Soviet Union began training North Koreans on the development of nuclear programs; by the late 1960s, the DPRK showed movements of nuclear weapons.
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development in Yongbyun. Despite such progress, DPRK nuclear concerns cooled off in the 1970s and 1980s, during which the country joined the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and acceded to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). By 1991, the two Korea governments reached an agreement with the Declaration on Denuclearization for a nuclear-free peninsula. However, an international dispute in 1993 between DPRK and IAEA, derived from the country’s refusal to disclose its nuclear history, resulted in DPRK’s suspension from the IAEA and the refusal to all IAEA inspections. Tensions seemed to have eased in 1994 upon a DPRK-U.S. agreement, in which the DPRK pledged to dismantle the nuclear weapons program in exchange of two power-producing nuclear reactors, only to be disrupted by a 1998 multistage Taepodong-1 missile. Though promising to freeze long-range missile tests in 1999, by July 2000, the DPRK resumed its prior threats to restart its nuclear program, further threatening in 2001 that it will reconsider missile test moratorium if the United States did not resume the normalization of relations between the two countries. By 2003, DPRK expelled IAEA nuclear inspectors from its territory and withdrew from the NPT.

Current Situation

Six-Party Talks

Six-party talks, involving the United States, Russia, China, Japan, and the two Korean governments, were established in 2003 to end the DPRK’s nuclear program through diplomacy. Despite numerous hurdles, the parties were able to reach an arrangement in which the DPRK agreed to abandon its pursuit of nuclear weapons in 2005. In addition to abandoning its nuclear weapons, the DPRK rejoined the NPT, and readmitted IAEA monitors in exchange of humanitarian aid. However, the six-party talks stalled in the following years; in 2008, the DPRK refused to verify protocol for its nuclear program and multiple missile and nuclear tests throughout 2009. Tougher sanctions were imposed by the Security Council and tensions peaked in 2010, when the DPRK sank an ROK Navy ship, disclosed a new uranium enrichment facility and light-water reactor, and shelled the South Korean island of Yeongpyeong. In 2011, the DPRK and the United States held bilateral discussions, with the North Korean government stating its return to the talks if they occurred without preconditions; however, the ROK and the United States demanded that the North abandon its nuclear weapons and all related programs before negotiations could resume.

In 2012, under the leadership of Kim Jong-un, the DPRK announced its willingness to suspend nuclear tests and allow the IAEA back in to monitor activities at the Yongbyun plant, allowing the possibility of reentering multilateral talks. However, a long-range missile launch later that year and a nuclear test in early 2013 caused the Security Council to place broader sanctions on the regime; and the international community, including former allies China and Russia, condemned the actions of DPRK. Subsequently, the DPRK government tried to resume diplomatic negotiations, accepting a proposal to open up dialogue with China in May 2013. The DPRK was met with Chinese leader Xi Jinping’s strong appeal that it should resume multilateral negotiations aimed at dismantling its nuclear weapons program. Skeptical statements from the ROK foreign minister and DPRK’s official silence on negotiations cast doubt on prospects for reconvening the long stalled talks, namely the May 29, 2013 rejection by ROK to a DPRK invitation to a discussion on the reopening of the Kaesong Industrial Zone and the cancelling of the bilateral talks on June 12, 2013, despite much anticipation from the international society.
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Military Exercises along the Coast

Though the 38th parallel continues to symbolize the conflict, it was the 2010 Cheonan Incident during which South Korean navy vessel, the Cheonan, sunk and 46 sailors were killed, that heightened military tension along the border. As a response to the incident, joint forces of the United States and the ROK conducted large-scale military exercises, which caused the DPRK to threaten to turn Seoul into a “sea of fire.” With a change in leadership in 2011, the DPRK attempted numerous satellite launches throughout 2012, actions viewed by the United States as “highly provocative” and “threatening the peace and security of the region.” DPRK further aggravated neighboring countries with nuclear tests in early 2013, characterizing them as a defensive act against the United States. Such developments led to more joint military drills between the ROK and the United States; the DPRK responded by cutting the DPRK-ROK hotline, voiding the armistice treaty, and urging front-line troops to be on “maximum alert” in preparation of an immediate war. On March 27, 2013, DPRK cut the last remaining DPRK-ROK military hotlines, which were mainly used by both Koreas for controlling activity in the Kaesong Industrial Complex. The United States responded by assigning two nuclear-capable B-2 bombers to participate in the military drills with ROK and dropping dummy munitions on an island range. Kim Jong-un immediately signed a rocket preparation plan and ordered forces on standby to strike to “settle accounts with the U.S. imperialists,” warned that “inter-Korean relations have naturally entered the state of war,” that DPRK would “retaliate against any US/ROK provocations without notice,” and that hostilities “will not be limited to a local war, but develop into an all-out war, a nuclear war.” The United States retaliated with F-22 stealth fighter jets to participate in the U.S.-South Korean war games; the DPRK again stated intentions to increase production of nuclear weapons material and closing the border to South Koreans.

Nuclear threats in 2013

The February 12, 2013 nuclear test stirred international concern that DPRK might succeed in fitting a nuclear warhead atop a ballistic missile. The Security Council passed its strongest sanctions against DPRK, but its government asserted its “right to preemptive nuclear attack” against the United States and nullified the 1953 Armistice Treaty. Stating the possibility of attacks on American military bases in Japan and Guam if provoked, DPRK cut the last lines of communication across the DMZ, because “under the situation where a war may break out any moment, there is no need to keep North-South military communications,” and declared a “state of war” with the ROK on March 30, 2013. With plans to restart the Yongbyun nuclear complex area announced in early April, despite United Nations condemnation, the DPRK moved its missiles to its eastern coast and warned all foreigners to evacuate from the ROK, stating that the two countries were on the verge of nuclear war. Shortly after, the DPRK fueled its ballistic missiles; vowed to annihilate Japan, and rejected an offer to talk with the South. On April 15, 2013, the DPRK stated its willingness to develop peaceful international relations, on the conditions that its status as a nuclear power is not challenged, the United Nations sanctions are lifted, and the joint U.S.-ROK military exercises are halted. With the United States rejecting these preconditions, on April 21, 2013, DPRK moved two mobile missile launchers for short-range scud missiles to its coast, demanding recognition as a nuclear state.

Security Council Involvement

The Security Council’s primary responsibility being the maintenance of international peace and security, the Council has acted swiftly in reaction to aggression by the DPRK. Following the DPRK’s announcement about its intention to...
withdraw from the NPT in 1993, the situation was addressed through United Nations Security Council resolution 825. The DPRK expulsion of IAEA nuclear inspectors and its withdrawal from the NPT in 2003 was later addressed in Security Council resolution 1540, which addresses the threat of nuclear weapons in a general fashion and reaffirmed that the “proliferation of nuclear weapons, as well as the means of delivery” constituted “a threat to international peace and security.” In 2006, when the DPRK launched seven missiles, the Council adopted resolution 1695, condemning DPRK’s intentions and unanimously warning against nuclear testing. In reaction to underground nuclear tests later in 2006, the Council adopted resolution 1718 to impose sanctions on DPRK and established a Sanctions Committee to formalize lists of prohibited trade items. In April 2009, the Council condemned what DPRK called a “peaceful” satellite launch as the Member States found that such an act violated resolution 1718; in response, DPRK ordered United Nations inspectors out of the country and vowed against participating in six-party talks. The 1718 Sanctions Committee retaliated by designating three North Korean entities to be subject to assets freezes.

DPRK’s rejection of the 1953 Armistice Treaty and its threat to strike in 2009 led to the unanimous adoption of resolution 1874, which expanded the existing arms embargo and authorized inspection of DPRK cargoes and vessels. Subsequently, on July 4, 2009, the DPRK launched seven ballistic missiles, violating resolutions 1718 and 1874, which was met with additional sanctions in line with resolution 1874. DPRK rejected the validity of the sanctions and displayed noncompliance with the 1718 Sanctions Committee’s information requests, and further stating motives to weaponize plutonium. Such action, along with the Sanctions Committee investigation on an alleged shipment of arms from the DPRK to Iran in September 2009, resulted in a unanimous adoption of resolution 1887.

In March 2010, in recognition of the sinking of the ROK navy ship Cheonan, the Council condemned the attack and encouraged “the settlement of outstanding issues on the Korean peninsula by peaceful means” and “resume of direct dialogue and negotiation as early as possible.” DPRK’s failed rocket launch in April 2012 led to further condemnations by the Council, which determined the launch as a serious violation of resolutions 1718 and 1874, and directed the Sanctions Committee to take steps to strengthen its actions. With a final 2012 missile launch in December, the President of the Security Council recalled prior statements made in S/PRST/2012/13, which demanded the DPRK to halt with further launches, and expressed “determination to take action accordingly in the event of a further DPRK launch.” Subsequently, the Council adopted resolution 2087, condemning the launch, noting its ballistic missile technology and violation of existing resolutions. Furthermore, it prohibited DPRK from further launches and its ballistic missile program, vowing to take “significant action in the event of a further DPRK launch or nuclear test.” Consequently, Security Council resolution 2094, adopted in March 2013 in response to DPRK’s February nuclear test, imposed new sanctions against DPRK and tightened previous measures. DPRK denounced the resolution and said it would only result in “increasing the capability of ‘Songun’ Korea a thousand times,” and later declared its withdrawal from the Korean Armistice Agreement, claiming that “contrary to the position of ROK, the agreement could be unilaterally dissolved.”
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Conclusion: Challenges in addressing the situation in the DPRK

Despite numerous international efforts to ease tensions, the conciliation attempts between the two Korean governments still face many challenges. Despite signing a 1992 safeguard agreement and several multilateral treaties with the IAEA, the DPRK has continuously shown disregard to most nonproliferation attempts, lately displaying its capability of making nuclear devices small enough to be delivered by ballistic missiles. Through these actions, DPRK has lost nearly all potential allies; its missile technology ever growing, much international concern has been evoked. Ever since the 2006 missile launch, various countries have begun imposing sanctions against it. The sanctions combined have substantive impact, but with China still supplying the country’s basic needs, sanctions have only “severely damaged but not crippled North Korea's economy.” However, since DPRK’s nuclear test in February 2013, China has shown support for the installation of new sanctions targeted to impact the North Korean economy. Also, despite the ROK’s “conciliatory stance” in the 1990s and early 2000s, the 2013-elected President Park Geun-hye of the ROK stated that any DPRK nuclear provocation against the South would result in its government being “erased from the earth.” Though President Park also stated the need to build trust with the North and has continued to offer aid, any empathic North Korean ties with the ROK are forthrightly damaged. And ROK’s aggressive stance has been highly approved by the United States; the United States sent a guided-missile destroyer and B-2 stealth bombers to the peninsula, sending a message that it will defend its allies in the region.

The Security Council, as the main forum for addressing questions of international peace and security, is called upon to respond to these challenges. When searching for innovative solutions to the ongoing conflict on the Korean peninsula, delegates will have to carefully evaluate past action by the Security Council, assess its effectiveness and devise new strategies for addressing an international conflict that is almost as old as the World Organization itself.
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BCC country profiles provide a concise overview of most countries of the world, including North Korea. Even though delegates are encouraged to conduct research on North Korea through other avenues, this Web site is an excellent starting point for delegates to acquaint themselves with the geopolitical, cultural, and historical context of the situation in North Korea. The timeline is especially convenient in terms of understanding conciliation efforts and the breakdown thereof.

This is the latest resolution adopted by the Security Council regarding the recent North Korean aggression, specifically the nuclear test on February 12, 2013. The Council continues to denounce all nuclear activities by the North Korean government and the wilful transgression from international law and obligations. The economic sanctions against North Korea are extended and further deepened; with the adoption of this resolution, financial institutions are also barred from operating on North Korean soil. Adopted under Chapter VII, this resolution is binding upon all UN Member States.
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Resolution 82 (1950) authorized the United Nations to act in the defense of South Korea when North Korea crossed the 38th parallel. The Security Council demanded North Korea to halt its invasion of South Korea immediately and to move its troops north of the 38th parallel to maintain the status quo. It also called upon Member States to prepare to provide assistance to South Korea and to refrain from assisting North Korean authorities. While the Soviet Union was an ally of North Korea and held a permanent seat on the Security Council, this resolution passed as the Soviet delegation had boycotted Security Council meetings and did not participate in the voting.


Security Council Report is an independent non-governmental organization whose mission is to provide timely and accurate information on the activities in the Security Council and its subsidiary bodies. It publishes a Monthly Forecast on its geographic and thematic topics and this is the latest issue pertaining to North Korea. During April 2013, the North Korean government acted against the international community on several occasions; these actions include the nullification of the 1953 armistice agreement, the recommencement of its nuclear program, and its ongoing negligence of Security Council resolutions. Delegates are encouraged to read the latest Month Forecast prior to the conference.


General Assembly Resolution 377, Uniting for Peace is pivotal upon understanding the role and flaws of the United Nations Security Council. Issued in 1950, Resolution 377 states that in any cases where the Security Council, due to lack of unanimity amongst the five permanent members, shall fail to act in maintaining international peace and security, the General Assembly may issue recommendations necessary to restore international peace and security. The Security Council’s flaw was evidently deemed upon the situation of the Korean War due to USSR and PRC vetoes. The resolution not only provides insight upon the workings of the Security Council, but also the various roles of the Korean War within world history.