

DPU MUN 2019

Welcome to the Security Council

Introducing required amendments and reforms in the United Nations Security Council

Esteemed participants,

We, the Secretariat of DPU Model United Nations Conference 2019 feel more than honored to be welcoming you to the 2nd Edition of this ambitious youth conference. Organized under the framework of Model United Nations, in accordance with its vision to familiarize MUN related activities to young people in the country, the DPU MUN 2019 is eager to reach wide range of attendants from high schools and universities which are deeply interested in diplomacy, international relations, politics and the United Nations itself while constituting a unique experience of debating and socializing at the same time. This year, the conference takes it a step further as it is composed of 4 committees chosen delicately to the very attention of the mentioned variety of participants holding Security, Human Rights, Development Programme committees as well as a Rajyasabha simulation. The academic team embraces an understanding of content which concerns actual and urgent problems that the world faces currently in order to create awareness of the facts touched upon over the youth to which it addresses. The academic content and the structure of the committee have been prepared by the respected Secretary-General (Ms. Ketaki Sawant) and Deputy-Secretary-General (Mr. Bharat Patkar). We advise the participants of this well-prepared committee to read the provided guide thoroughly. For any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact us via mun.dpu@gmail.com .

Best regards Ms. Ketaki Sawant (Secretary-General), Mr. Bharat Patkar (Deputy-Secretary-General), Ms. Shruti Shinde (Director-General), Mr. Aman Kumar (Deputy-Director-General) and Mr. David Nathi (Deputy-Director-General) of DPU MUN Conference 2019.

INTRODUCTION

The Charter of the United Nations – an international treaty obligates member states to settle their disputes by peaceful means, in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered. They are to refrain from the threat or use of force against any state, and may bring the dispute before the Security Council. The UN Charter gives the Security Council primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security. The Council may convene at any time, whenever peace is threatened. In contrast to the decisions made by the General Assembly, all Member States are obligated under the UN Charter to carry out the Security Council's decisions.

When the Council considers a threat to international peace, it first explores ways to settle the dispute peacefully. It may suggest principles to the parties for a peaceful settlement, appoint special representatives, ask the Secretary-General to use his good offices, or undertake investigation and mediation. It has developed and refined the use of non-military measures including arms embargoes, travel bans, and restrictions to guard against the exploitation of natural resources to fuel conflicts, as well as taking a lead role in the coordination of international counter-terrorism efforts. In the event that a dispute has erupted into armed conflict, the Council tries to secure a ceasefire. It may send a peacekeeping mission to help the parties maintain the truce and to keep opposing forces apart.

The Council may, in some cases, authorize the utilization of military force by a coalition of member states or by a regional organization or arrangement. This can only be carried out as a last resort when all possible peaceful means of settling a dispute have been exhausted, or after a threat to the peace, a breach of the peace or an act of aggression have been determined to exist.

In order to hold combatants accountable for their actions, the Council has also created international tribunals to prosecute those accused of grave human rights violations and serious breaches of international humanitarian law, including genocide.

In addition to its responsibility to maintain international peace and security, the Council also makes recommendations to the General Assembly to appoint a new Secretary-General and to admit new Members to the UN.

Here's a look at the United Nations Security Council, a 15-member body within the United Nations.

Overview

The Security Council has primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

There are five permanent members: the United States, the Russian Federation, France, China and the United Kingdom.

Ten temporary members are elected by the General Assembly for two-year terms.

UN Security Council Voting

To be approved, a Council resolution must have nine "YES" votes out of 15 and no "NO" votes from any of the five permanent members.

Each Council member has one vote.

A "NO" vote from one of the five permanent members kills the resolution.

There is no such thing as a "VETO" vote in formal UN rules, though a "NO" vote from a permanent member has the effect of vetoing a resolution.

If a member "ABSTAINS" from voting, it does not count as either a "YES" or "NO" vote.

Members raise their hands to vote, and sit at a horseshoe-shaped table.

Each of the five Permanent Members has gone to war or invaded a country without Security Council approval.

Security Council Vetoes:

A list of resolutions presented to the Security Council, along with the permanent member negative votes, can be found [here](#).

UN Security Council Presidency:

The presidency of the Council rotates monthly, going alphabetically among member states.

2019 schedule for presidency

January: Dominican Republic

February: Equatorial Guinea

March: France

April: Germany

May: Indonesia

June: Kuwait

July: Peru

August: Poland

September: Russian Federation

October: South Africa

November: United Kingdom

December: United States

UNSC Functions & Power:

All Members of the United Nations agree to accept and execute the decisions of the Security Council:

"to maintain international peace and security in accordance with the principles and purposes of the United Nations;"

"to investigate any dispute or situation which might lead to international friction;"

"to recommend methods of adjusting such disputes or the terms of settlement;"

"to formulate plans for the establishment of a system to regulate armaments;"

"to determine the existence of a threat to the peace or act of aggression and to recommend what action should be taken;"

"to call on Members to apply economic sanctions and other measures not involving the

use of force to prevent or stop aggression;"

"to take military action against an aggressor;"

"to recommend the admission of new Members;"

"to exercise the trusteeship functions of the United Nations in 'strategic areas';"

"to recommend to the General Assembly the appointment of the Secretary-General and, together with the Assembly, to elect the Judges of the International Court of Justice."

Power in international politics is not a constant. The rise and fall of empires throughout history is testament to this fact. The once powerful are no longer powerful and the once weak are now strong. A reformed Council will not

represent the end of history. In twenty, thirty and forty years time, new emerging countries such as Indonesia, Mexico, South Korea and Turkey will ask the question: why aren't we on the Council? And so the reform debate will begin again.

So what are the alternatives?

Model B proposed by the Secretary-General in 2005, although unattractive to the membership, is more inclined to provide for a more effective membership formula. Four-year renewable members are more accountable; as the wider membership of the UN has the opportunity to assess each elected Council member's performance — favourably or unfavourably.

Another alternative route to reform is by way of reform of the Council's processes and meeting formats, known as working methods. Although, frequently overlooked, working methods reform does have its supporters within the ranks of the UN membership and they are currently organized under the banner — Accountability, Transparency and Coherence (ACT). In the next article in the series, an alternative vision of the Council will be articulated based on a new set of working methods.

Brazil has been elected ten times to the Security Council. It has contributed troops to UN peacekeeping efforts in the Middle East, the former Belgian Congo, Cyprus, Mozambique, Angola, and more recently East Timor and Haiti. Brazil is one of the main contributors to the UN regular budget.

Prior to the UN's founding in 1945, Franklin D. Roosevelt lobbied for Brazil to be included on the Security Council, but the UK and the Soviet Union refused. The United States has sent strong indications to Brazil that it was willing to support its membership; albeit, without a veto. In June 2011, the Council on Foreign Relations recommended that the U.S. government fully endorse the inclusion of Brazil as a permanent member of the Security Council.¹

The German campaign for a permanent seat was intensified in 2004. Schröder made himself perfectly clear in August 2004: "Germany has the right to a seat." Its bid is supported by Japan, India, Brazil, France, the United Kingdom and Russia, among other countries. Current German Chancellor Angela Merkel, who had initially been quiet on the issue, re-stated Germany's bid in her address to the UN General Assembly in September 2007.

India's bid for permanent member of UNSC is now backed by four of the five permanent members, namely France, Russia, United Kingdom and United States. On 15 April 2011, China officially expressed its support for an increased Indian role at the United Nations, without explicitly endorsing India's Security Council ambitions.

Japan has been one of the largest Official development assistance donor countries. Thus, Japan, along with India, are considered the most likely candidates for two of the new permanent seats. China has stated that it was ready to support India's move for a permanent seat on the UNSC if India did not associate its bid with Japan. This may be contrary to the Indian stand since Japan and India are both members of the G4 and support each other's candidature. Japan has been elected to the Security Council for eleven terms as a non-permanent member.

According to a formal statement by Antanas Valionis, former Lithuanian Minister of Foreign Affairs, at the General Debate of the 58th session of the United Nations:

The Security Council must be able to take leadership in maintaining international peace and security. Thus Lithuania supports substantial reform for the better, equitable representation in both categories, permanent or non-permanent, through the inclusion of Germany and Japan, as well as certain other leading countries from other regions.

Prime Minister of Malaysia Mahathir Mohamad at the General Debate of the 73rd session of the United Nations General Assembly stated that:

Five countries on the basis of their victories 70 over years ago cannot claim to have a right to hold the world to ransom forever. They cannot take the moral high ground, preaching democracy and regime change in the countries of the world when they deny democracy in this organisation. I had suggested that the veto should not be by just one permanent member but by at least two powers backed by three non-permanent members of the Security Council. The General Assembly should then back the decision with a simple majority.

President of Russia Dmitry Medvedev at the General Debate of the 64th Session of the United Nations General Assembly stated that:

The UN must rationally adapt itself to new world realities. It should also strengthen its influence and preserve its multinational nature and integrity of the UN Charter provisions. The reform of the UN Security Council is an essential component of its revitalization. The time has come to speed up the search for a compromise formula of its expansion and increased efficiency of its work.

Currently, no country in Africa has a permanent seat on the Security Council. Although no one nation from Africa has formally been put forward as a candidate for membership on the Security Council, Algeria, Egypt, Ethiopia, Kenya, Nigeria, and South Africa are seen as the strongest choices. Algeria has gained a great deal of respect for its neutrality over the years and its great commitment to African development; Egypt has the second-largest economy in Africa and the biggest military on the continent, was one of the founding members of the United

Nations, enjoys great influence in Africa and in the Arab world, and hosts the headquarters of the Arab League.

Uniting for Consensus (UfC) is a movement, nicknamed the **Coffee Club**, that developed in the 1990s in opposition to the possible expansion of permanent seats in the United Nations Security Council. Under the leadership of Italy, it aims to counter the bids for permanent seats proposed by G4 nations (Brazil, Germany, India, and Japan) and is calling for a consensus before any decision is reached on the form and size of the Security Council.

Discussions on improving the UN's effectiveness and responsiveness to international security threats often include reform of the UNSC veto. Proposals include: limiting the use of the veto to vital national security issues; requiring agreement from multiple states before exercising the veto; abolishing the veto entirely; and embarking on the transition stipulated in Article 106 of the Charter, which requires the consensus principle to stay in place. Any reform of the veto will be very difficult. Articles 108 and 109 of the United Nations Charter grant the P5 veto over any amendments to the Charter, requiring them to approve of any modifications to the UNSC veto power that they themselves hold.

The Inter-Governmental Negotiations (IGN) on Security Council reform during the 72nd UNGA confirmed the existence of areas of convergence, as well as the persistence of diverging views on key aspects of the reform, especially on the items attaining to the “categories of membership” and the question of the “veto”.

Eager to achieve results in the process, UfC Countries reaffirm that the IGN remains the sole legitimate setting for discussion on Security Council reform, in full transparency and with the participation of all UN Member States.

UfC Ministers reiterate the need and the urgency for the membership to agree on a reform model capable of making the future, expanded Security Council more democratic, accountable, representative, transparent and effective, reaffirming that the creation of new permanent seats would hamper the achievement of these goals.

The UfC Ministers therefore call upon all Member States to continue to engage constructively in seeking a fair and equitable compromise solution that meets the collective interest of all 193 Member States of the UN, garnering the widest possible political support from the membership.

UfC Countries invite other Member States and negotiating Groups to explore the idea of creating longer-term non-permanent seats, assigned to UN regional groups and with the possibility of an immediate re-election, coupled with an increase in other non-permanent seats. UfC Ministers believe that this proposal can be the basis for a possible solution able to satisfy the aspirations of the

entire UN membership to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security.

The UfC Countries reaffirm their full commitment to continued constructive engagement with the President of the General Assembly, the Chair/s of the Inter-Governmental Negotiations, all Member States and negotiating Groups.

Reforming the Working Methods of the UN Security Council - The ACT Initiative (August 2013)

The Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung has issued a publication about the newly formed ACT initiative created by 22 UN countries to accelerate and promote developments in accountability, coherence and transparency within the UN Security Council. ACT also aims to encourage non-council members to take part and reform the prior working methods of the council to allow non-members to benefit more from the body.

Increasing membership

On 21 March 2005, the then UN Secretary General Kofi Annan called on the UN to reach a consensus on expanding the council to 24 members, in a plan referred to as "In Larger Freedom". He gave two alternatives for implementation, but did not specify which proposal he preferred.

The two options mentioned by Annan are referred to as Plan A and Plan B:

- *Plan A* calls for creating six new permanent members, plus three new nonpermanent members for a total of 24 seats in the council.
- *Plan B* calls for creating eight new seats in a new class of members, who would serve for four years, subject to renewal, plus one nonpermanent seat, also for a total of 24.

In any case, Annan favored making the decision quickly, stating, "This important issue has been discussed for too long. I believe member states should agree to take a decision on it—preferably by consensus, but in any case before the summit—making use of one or other of the options presented in the report of the High-Level Panel".

The summit mentioned by Annan is the September 2005 Millennium+5 Summit, a high-level plenary meeting that reviewed Annan's report, the implementation of the 2000 Millennium Declaration, and other UN reform-related issues.

Does the UN Security Council need reform?

Beyond a threefold increase in the global population, the rapidly changing world of the 21st century is characterised by a diffusion of power (away from states); an accompanying shift in relative material power and influence from the West to the East; and an ongoing transition from a brief period of unipolarity to multipolarity.

Transnational threats such as terrorism and cybercrime are straining national capacities, while globally armed conflict has been rising for several years; reversing the sharp downturns seen after the collapse of the Berlin Wall

There is near unanimous consensus on the need for the UNSC to be reformed, but progress is rendered impossible by power politics.

A new campaign by the Institute for Security Studies (ISS) called Elect the Council advocates that civil society bring its weight to bear on the task of major structural and procedural reform that would make the UNSC representative, allow it to retrieve its legitimacy and relevance, and enhance its effectiveness.

CURRENT SITUATIONS IN UNSC:

UN Security Council discusses Kashmir, China urges India and Pakistan to ease tensions:

The Security Council considered the volatile situation surrounding Kashmir, addressing the issue in a meeting focused solely on the dispute, within the UN body dedicated to resolving matters of international peace and security, for the first time since 1965.

The Chinese Ambassador, Zhang Jun, spoke to reporters outside the chamber following deliberations, urging both India and Pakistan to “refrain from taking any unilateral action which might further aggravate” what was an already “tense and very dangerous” situation.

The Indian-administered part of the majority-Muslim region, known as Jammu and Kashmir had its special status within the constitution revoked by the Indian Government on 5 August, placing it under tighter central control. Pakistan has argued that the move violates international law.

The UN has long maintained an institutional presence in the contested area, which both countries claim in its entirety, with the areas under separate administration, divided by a so-called Line of Control. The UN Military Observer Group in Indian and Pakistan (UNMOGIP) observes and reports on any ceasefire violations.

UN Secretary-General António Guterres said he had been following the situation in Jammu and Kashmir “with concern”, making an appeal for “maximum restraint”.

“The position of the United Nations on this region is governed by the Charter...and applicable Security Council resolutions”, said the statement. “The Secretary-General also recalls the 1972 Agreement on bilateral relations between India and Pakistan also known as the Simla Agreement, which states that the final status of Jammu and Kashmir is to be settled by peaceful means”, in accordance with the UN Charter.

Pakistan’s Ambassador, Maleeha Lodhi said “the voice of the people of the occupied Kashmir” to be heard “in the highest diplomatic forum of the world.” She argued that “the fact that this meeting took place, is testimony to the fact that this is an international dispute.”

She said that “as far as my country is concerned, we stand ready for a peaceful settlement of the state of Jammu and Kashmir. I think today’s meeting nullifies India’s claim that Jammu and Kashmir is an internal matter for India.

India’s Ambassador, Syed Akbaruddin, said that “our national position was, and remains, that matters related to Article 370 of the Indian Constitution, are entirely an internal matter of India...The recent decisions taken by the Government of India and our legislative bodies are intended to ensure that good governance is promoted, socio-economic development is enhanced for our people in Jammu and Kashmir and Ladakh.”

He said that the Chief Secretary of Jammu and Kashmir had announced measures which would return the region towards a state of “normalcy”.

The Amazon rainforest is still on fire

Brazil’s Amazon rainforest fires have caused global concern. And yet it could get even worse as the country’s fire season is just getting started.

Since January more than 70,000 fires have been detected in Brazil’s Amazon rainforest, up 84% from the number tracked in 2018, according to the country’s National Institute for Space Research. This not only threatens the region’s future, but could also speed up climate change, since the rainforest significantly helps reduce the world’s carbon dioxide levels.

According to the World Resources Institute, since 62% of Brazil’s forest fires traditionally occur in September through the end of the year.

The U.N. Security Council Should Order International Firefighters and Economic Boycott:

As empowered by the United Nations Charter, the Security Council should find that the fires in the Amazon pose a “threat to the peace” and order measures to restore and maintain international peace and security. Those measures “may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations.”

The Council should require that member states refrain from entering into trade agreements with Brazil unless and until it agrees to allow international economic and physical firefighting assistance. As Moira Birss, Amazon Watch’s finance campaign director said in a release issued by the Institute for Public Accuracy (IPA), “Now that the world is finally paying attention, it’s important to also understand that governments and companies around the world are emboldening Bolsonaro’s toxic policies when they enter trade agreements with his government or invest in agribusiness companies operating in the Amazon.”

In addition, the Council should order member states to contribute money and personnel to fight the fires raging in the Amazon.

There is precedent for this type of resolution. In 1985, the Council passed Resolution 569, which condemned the South African government’s policy of apartheid. It urged UN members to adopt measures including suspension of all new investment in South Africa, prohibition of the sale of South African currency and coins, restrictions on cultural relations and sports, suspension of guaranteed export loans, prohibition of new nuclear contracts, and prohibition of sales of computer equipment that could be used by the South African police and army. The international boycott of South Africa led to the end of the apartheid regime.

All UN member countries are bound by the resolutions of the Security Council. Article 25 of the Charter says, “The members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council.” And Article 49 states that the UN members “shall join in affording mutual assistance in carrying out the measures” upon which the Council decides.