

Delhi Public School Bangalore South



BACKGROUND GUIDE



UNSC

United Nations Security Council

Table of Contents

Letter from the Executive Board	01
Introduction to Committee	02
Brief on Agenda	03
Timeline of Agenda	04
Case Studies	06
Major Stakeholders	11
UNCLOS	14
QARMA	15

LETTER FROM THE EXECUTIVE BOARD

"The United Nations is not a utopia, but a workshop where the real work of humanity is forged." ~ Ralph Bunche

Dear Delegates,

Greetings from the Executive Board of the UN Security Council. We are delighted to extend a warm welcome to all of you at the United Nations Security Council session of DiPSMUN 2024. My name is Krishnan Unni Dileep, and I will be serving as your committee chair for the duration of the conference, along with my Vice Chairperson, Shireen Sumir, and our Moderator, Samantha Thomas.

The United Nations Security Council (UNSC) stands as one of the most pivotal committees within the UN framework, charged with the vital task of maintaining international peace and security. Under the United Nations Charter, the functions and powers of the Security Council are profound and far-reaching. UNSC resolutions stand alone as the only enforceable mandates within the international community, carrying the full weight of global authority.

As delegates, you are entrusted with the significant responsibility of representing your country effectively and developing solutions that transcend mere resolutions. Your efforts should be aimed at fostering sustainable peace and security. I hope to witness exemplary oratory skills, teamwork, leadership, and above all, diplomacy. My approach as a chair is relatively hands-off. I will try to help and guide the conversation and discourse when needed. However, I encourage the committee to be completely delegate-run. While I do expect you all to be well-versed in basic procedure, I will allow a certain level of flexibility.

Speak, even if you believe your words to be less impactful than most. Speak, even if you believe you won't be heard. Speak, because if you have no voice, how can you represent the voiceless?

The Executive Board of the UN Security Council eagerly look forward to seeing you all in committee.

Best Regards,
Krishnan Unni Dileep
Chairperson

INTRODUCTION TO COMMITTEE

The United Nations Charter established six main organs of the United Nations, including the Security Council. It gives primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security to the Security Council, which may meet whenever peace is threatened. The General Assembly meets for two-year terms.

The UNSC has 15 members, five of which are permanent members: China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States. The other 10 members are elected by the UN General Assembly for two-year terms.

The UNSC is a powerful body, but it is also subject to the veto power of the five permanent members. This means that any resolution that is opposed by one of the permanent members cannot be adopted. Leading to criticism over its workings.

According to the United Nations Charter, the organization has four primary purposes: maintaining international peace and security, developing friendly relations among nations, cooperating to solve international problems and promote human rights, and harmonizing the actions of nations.

When dealing with threats to peace, the Security Council first recommends peaceful resolutions but can also investigate, mediate, send missions, appoint envoys, or involve the Secretary-General. The Security Council has been operational since January 17, 1946, and is based at the UN Headquarters in New York City. Each member must have a representative present at all times to ensure the Council can convene as needed.

Over the years, the Committee's work has led to significant changes in laws, policies, and practices at both national and individual levels, directly improving lives worldwide. The Committee remains committed to making its work relevant and applicable to all States parties, striving for the full and non-discriminatory enjoyment of all civil and political rights guaranteed by the Covenant.

BRIEF ON AGENDA

For decades, the Aegean Sea dispute has been one of the most contentious matters between Greece and Turkey, two territorial NATO allies who have had different disputes for quite a long time. The dispute over the Aegean Sea is a very ancient and complex geopolitical issue, firmly based on historical grievances, legal interpretations, and strategic interests. At core, the dispute revolves around Greece's intention to extend its territorial waters from 6 to 12 nautical miles. This really is in furtherance of international maritime law, particularly UNCLOS. The latter allows such extensions under certain conditions. Greece says that with such an extension, it would be better placed to protect its maritime resources by asserting its sovereign rights in conformity with the prevailing international norms.

On the opposite side, Turkey stands opposed to Greece's territorial expansion plans and believes that this will mean an unfair constraint on the maritime access of Turkey, thus compromising strategic interests in the Aegean. Turkey insists that an extended extension of the Greek territorial waters will unduly limit its ability to navigate and get access to international waters—issues very vital to its maritime trade and security considerations. Added to this territorial water controversy are disputes regarding the delimitation of air space, where Greece claims 10 nautical miles, while Turkey recognizes only 6, hence frequent violations in that country's airspace.

The more complicated issues are those of delimitation of the continental shelves and EEZs, which are indispensable in claiming rights over natural resources such as mineral resources, mainly oil and gas, and fisheries. These unsettled issues have periodically given way to military posturing, naval exercises, and even diplomatic standoffs.

In the case of the Aegean Sea dispute, there have been solution attempts through international organization-mediated negotiations, but no comprehensive and mutually acceptable solution has been reached so far. The complex weaving of historical narratives, national interests, and regional dynamics persists and hence calls for continuous diplomatic engagement and respect for international law while seeking fair compromise, basementization that will stunningly foster stability and cooperation in the Eastern Mediterranean.

TIMELINE

1923

- **Treaty of Lausanne:** The treaty defined the borders of Turkey and Greece, but did not resolve the issue of territorial waters and airspace in the Aegean Sea.

1970s

- **Continental Shelf Dispute:** Tensions rose over the delimitation of the continental shelf in the Aegean Sea, particularly after Greece discovered the Prinos oilfield in 1973.
- **Airspace Violations:** Incidents of airspace violations by both sides increased, with both countries accusing each other of violating their airspace.

1980s

- **Tensions escalated again over the delimitation of the continental shelf, with Turkey conducting exploratory oceanographic research missions in parts of the disputed area.**
- **Incidents of airspace violations continued, with both countries accusing each other of violating their airspace.**

1996

- **Imia/Kardak Crisis:** A dispute over the tiny barren islets of Imia (known as Kardak in Turkey) led to a military buildup and the brink of war between the two countries.

1998-2010

- **Diplomatic Efforts:** The two countries engaged in diplomatic measures to ease tensions, particularly with a view to Turkey's accession to the European Union.

2014

- **Natural Gas Discoveries:** Seismic surveys suggested that Greece could be sitting on significant natural gas reserves, leading to increased tensions over the delimitation of the continental shelf.

2016

- **Offshore Concessions:** Greece leased offshore concessions to international oil and gas companies, while Turkey continued to invest in its own hydrocarbon exploration efforts.

2022

- Incidents of airspace violations continued, with both countries accusing each other of violating their airspace.
- A dispute over tourism marketing led to increased tensions between the two countries.



CASE STUDIES

The Imia/Kardak Crisis of 1996:

The question of the sovereignty of Aegean islands and islets emerged on 25 December 1995 when a Turkish freighter, ran aground on Imia/Kardak, a rocky islet, which is located approximately 5.5 miles from the Greek island of Kalymnos and 3.8 miles off the Anatolian coast of Turkey. The captain of the ship radioed for help but refused to be towed by a Greek tug, which arrived first, claiming that he was aground on Turkish territory and was expecting help from a Turkish tug. The Greek captain insisted on helping because of the salvage fees, and finally the Turkish captain accepted to be towed to the nearest Turkish port. However, the freighter captain protested the Greek's salvage claim, arguing that the freighter had been in Turkish territory and was waiting for a Turkish tug.

The dispute over the salvage fees between the Turkish freighter captain and the Greek tug captain led to a routine request to the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, asking to whom did Imia/Kardak belong. On 29 December 1995, the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs contacted the Embassy of Greece, questioning the status of the islets asserting that the islets of Imia/Kardak constitute part of Turkish territory.

On 10 January 1996, the Greek Embassy answered to the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs rejecting the Turkish claims on the grounds that Turkey had clearly recognized the Imia/Kardak islets as belonging to Italy by virtue of a bilateral agreement concluded in 1932; the islets were subsequently ceded by Italy to Greece with the rest of the Dodecanese island chain by the Paris Peace Treaty of 1947.

Few days later, during a radio news conference, the Greek Minister of Foreign Affairs Theodoros Pangalos mentioned that Ankara was raising the level of confrontation in the Aegean by claiming that Imia/Kardak was in Turkish territorial waters.

Although it was a small comment in a large interview, Turkish journalists picked up the comments. On 28 January 1996, a team of journalists rented a helicopter, flew to Imia/Kardak, removed the Greek flag and replaced it with a Turkish one in front of the cameras of a private Turkish television channel.

The next day the Greek flag was raised again, and this time twelve Greek commandos were placed on the largest of the two Imia/Kardak islets in order to protect the national symbol.. Turkey re-contacted the Greek Embassy, arguing the Protocol of 1932 was never validated. Meanwhile, Turkish naval forces were assembling in the waters near the islets, soon to be met by Greek naval units. The dangerous military situation was eventually diffused via intense pressure from high U.S. diplomats to both sides. A compromise was reached where both countries withdrew their forces and flags and returned to the “status quo ante”.

Libya-Turkey Maritime Deal and the Aegean Dispute

The 2019 Turkey-Libya Maritime Boundary Delimitation Agreement has significantly impacted the strategic and legal landscape of the Eastern Mediterranean region. This deal, which establishes maritime boundaries between Turkey and Libya, starts from Turkey's southwestern coast and extends to Libya's Derna-Tobruk-Bordia coastline. It challenges existing regional agreements, particularly those involving Greece, Cyprus, and other coastal states, and allows Turkey to conduct drilling activities under its naval protection.

Legally, the deal is based on the principles of the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), aiming to determine exclusive economic zones (EEZs) and continental shelf boundaries in accordance with international law. However, it has faced opposition from regional actors, especially Greece and Egypt. In response to the Turkey-Libya deal, Greece and Egypt signed their own agreement in 2020, designating an EEZ that overlaps with areas claimed by the Turkey-Libya agreement. This response highlights the contentious nature of maritime boundaries in the region.

The recent suspension of the maritime deal by a Libyan court, amid Libya's political turmoil, adds further complexity. The Government of National Unity (GNU) retains the option to appeal the decision, underscoring the fragile political and legal landscape in the region. This situation is further complicated by the longstanding Aegean Dispute between Turkey and Greece, which centers on the delimitation of the continental shelf and territorial waters. Turkey insists that boundaries should be determined between mainland states, while Greece argues for full EEZ rights for its islands.

These disputes have led to military confrontations and diplomatic tensions between NATO allies Turkey and Greece. Greece has accused Turkey of illegal drilling in the Aegean, while Turkey claims Greece is militarizing its islands. The broader implications of these tensions include a regional arms race and escalating military conflicts, drawing in global powers such as the EU, the US, and Russia.

The competition for energy resources and maritime boundaries in the Eastern Mediterranean has hindered economic cooperation and the development of energy resources, impacting both regional economies and the global energy market. The lack of a comprehensive and binding agreement on maritime boundaries further exacerbates these issues, highlighting the need for diplomatic solutions and legal clarity.

In conclusion, the Turkey-Libya Maritime Deal and the Aegean Dispute present complex challenges with significant strategic, legal, and geopolitical implications. The competing claims and absence of a comprehensive agreement contribute to a volatile situation. Resolving these disputes requires diplomacy, legal considerations, and compromise among stakeholders, which will ultimately affect energy geopolitics, regional stability, and global economic interests in the Eastern Mediterranean and Aegean Sea.

NATO's Role in the Aegean Sea Dispute

The Aegean Sea dispute between Greece and Turkey involves complex issues such as territorial waters, national airspace, exclusive economic zones (EEZs), and the status of demilitarized islands. This dispute has strained relations since the 1970s and almost led to armed conflict in 1987 and 1996.

NATO has been crucial in mediating this dispute and preventing military confrontation. In February 2016, NATO deployed ships to the Aegean Sea to support Greece, Turkey, and the EU's border agency Frontex during the refugee and migrant crisis. NATO's Standing Maritime Group 2 (SNMG2) arrived quickly, with ships from Germany, the UK, Turkey, the US, and Greece. They conducted reconnaissance, monitoring, and surveillance to provide real-time information to coastguards and authorities, aiming to disrupt human trafficking and reduce migrant crossings.

NATO also worked closely with the EU. Liaison arrangements between NATO's Allied Maritime Command (MARCOM) and Frontex facilitated information exchange and improved actions against human trafficking. In April 2016, a Frontex liaison officer was embedded with NATO's deployment to strengthen cooperation.

Despite NATO's efforts, tensions persist. In August 2022, Turkey accused Greece of "radar locking" NATO aircraft and Turkish F-16 jets during a military exercise. Greece denied the claim. Disagreements over maritime boundaries, airspace, and territorial claims remain unresolved, making the dispute a potential flashpoint.

The discovery of potential hydrocarbon reserves in the Aegean and Eastern Mediterranean adds complexity, as both Greece and Turkey vie for control over these resources. Resolving this conflict will require diplomatic effort, adherence to international law, and concessions from both countries. NATO's ongoing involvement, alongside the EU, will be crucial in maintaining stability in the Aegean Sea.

MAJOR STAKEHOLDERS

The Aegean Sea dispute draws in a wide range of principal stakeholders characterized by divergent interests and influences: directly involved nations, regional actors, international global organizations, and private sector individuals. The following is an in-depth review of the major stakeholders in the Aegean Sea dispute:

GREECE

Greece will be a direct stakeholder in the Aegean Sea dispute, which touches on matters of great interest nationally, economically, and strategically to it. The present Greek government can seek territorial claims based on international law, mostly by the United Nations Convention of the Law of the Sea. For Greece, maritime boundaries, air space, and access to potential underwater resources are matters of national sovereignty and economic future. The Greek military is friend to the very best of these claims, while at the same time, public opinion in Greece is overwhelmingly in support of the government's stance on this matter.

TURKEY

Another primary stakeholder in the dispute is Turkey, which has its national, economic, and strategic interests. Turkey contests all Greek claims and does not ratify UNCLOS, hence showing a different approach on legal grounds due to the peculiar geography of the Aegean Sea. Its prime concerns are to ensure access to international waters, the security of the sea border, and potential energy resources. The claims of Turkey are strongly upheld by the T

EUROPEAN UNION

The European Union is a significant stakeholder due to Greece's membership in the bloc. The EU supports Greece's claims in the dispute and has called for adherence to international law. The EU's involvement adds a layer of diplomatic and economic pressure on Turkey and influences the broader geopolitical dynamics of the dispute. The EU's interest lies in maintaining regional stability, upholding international legal standards, and ensuring the security of its member states.

NATO

Both Greece and Turkey are members of NATO, making the alliance a key stakeholder. NATO's primary interest is preventing conflict between its member states and maintaining regional stability. The Aegean Sea dispute poses a challenge to NATO's cohesion and effectiveness, as tensions between Greece and Turkey can complicate joint military operations and strategic planning. NATO often acts as a mediator, encouraging dialogue and cooperation between the two countries to resolve their differences peacefully.

United Nations (UN)

The United Nations, through its various bodies and conventions, plays a role in providing a legal framework for resolving maritime disputes. The United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) is particularly relevant, as it outlines the rights and responsibilities of nations concerning the use of the world's oceans. While Greece relies on UNCLOS to support its claims, Turkey's non-ratification and differing interpretations of the convention make the UN a crucial but challenging stakeholder in the dispute.

United States

The United States has strategic interests in the Aegean Sea region, given its geopolitical importance and the NATO membership of both Greece and Turkey. The U.S. often acts as a mediator in the dispute, seeking to balance its relationships with both countries while promoting regional stability.

The United States has strategic interests in the Aegean Sea region, given its geopolitical importance and the NATO membership of both Greece and Turkey. The U.S. often acts as a mediator in the dispute, seeking to balance its relationships with both countries while promoting regional stability.

Energy Companies

International energy companies are stakeholders due to the potential oil and gas reserves in the disputed areas of the Aegean Sea. These companies are interested in securing exploration and extraction rights, which are contingent on the resolution of the maritime boundaries. The involvement of energy companies adds an economic dimension to the dispute, as the potential for resource exploitation raises the stakes for both Greece and Turkey.

Regional Companies

Neighboring countries in the Eastern Mediterranean, such as Cyprus, Egypt, and Israel, have stakes in the broader regional stability and their own maritime boundaries and resources. The outcomes of the Aegean Sea dispute could set precedents or impact their own maritime claims and energy exploration activities. These countries may support diplomatic efforts to resolve the dispute and ensure that regional tensions do not escalate.

In summary, the Aegean Sea dispute involves a complex web of stakeholders, each with its own interests and influences. The primary parties, Greece and Turkey, are supported and influenced by regional and international actors, making the resolution of the dispute a challenging and multifaceted endeavor.

UNCLOS

The United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea or UNCLOS is an incredibly seminal international treaty that, having been adopted in 1982 and enforced in 1994, joining together comprehensive guidelines governing issues of using and managing the world's oceans and seas to establish rightful claims and responsibilities of nations toward one another over matters pertaining to the seas. The core aims incorporate the definition of maritime zones, promotion of scientific research at sea at the international level, protection of the marine environment, and establishment of a framework for the peaceful settlement of disputes. UNCLOS is, therefore, considered vital in striking a balance between the interests of coastal states, ensuring the sustainable development of ocean resources, and fostering stability and cooperation in global maritime governance.

The sections that follow provide step-by-step research into how UNCLOS dovetails with key issues in this contentious maritime conflict-

Territorial Waters and EEZs

The dispute over the Aegean Sea centers on rival claims about territorial waters and EEZs:

GREEK CLAIM: Greece wants to extend its territorial waters from the current 6 to 12 nautical miles, as provided for in UNCLOS, to exercise full sovereignty over this belt. Such an extension would affect maritime traffic and could shut off international waters to traffic from Turkey through narrow straits and channels.

TURKISH STAND: Turkey opposes the extension of Greece based on security concerns and historical claims. In such a case of extension, Turkey feels it will be deprived of the freedom of navigation in the Aegean Sea, mainly within those areas near the Greek islands with overlapping maritime claims.

Delimitation Of Maritime Boundaries

Guidelines for the equitable delimitation of maritime boundaries between neighbouring states are provided by UNCLOS:

Principals of Delimitation: UNCLOS strongly puts forward principles guiding equity and fairness in the process of delimitation, taking into account factors such as the length of coastlines, geographical proximity, and relevant circumstances of the parties.

Status of Islands:

UNCLOS makes a distinction between islands, which are entitled to an EEZ and continental shelves based on their capacity for habitation and economic life, and rocks, which have limited maritime entitlements. This would be the case regarding the classification of the islands and rocks in the Aegean Sea, relevant for determining the extension of maritime zones for both Greece and Turkey.

Dispute Resolution Mechanisms

UNCLOS offers multiple avenues for resolving maritime disputes peacefully:

- **Negotiation and Mediation:** States are encouraged to resolve disputes through bilateral negotiations or third-party mediation, aiming to achieve mutually acceptable solutions.
- **Compulsory Procedures:** If negotiations fail, UNCLOS provides for compulsory dispute settlement mechanisms, including arbitration or adjudication by international courts such as the International Court of Justice (ICJ) or the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea (ITLOS). These mechanisms ensure impartial resolution based on international law.

International Community and UNCLOS

The international community supports adherence to UNCLOS principles in resolving maritime disputes:

- **United Nations Role:** The UN promotes the peaceful settlement of disputes and upholding of UNCLOS provisions through its various agencies and bodies, including the Security Council and General Assembly.
- **Regional Organizations:** Organizations like the European Union (EU) and NATO facilitate dialogue and cooperation between Greece and Turkey, encouraging confidence-building measures and crisis management strategies in the Aegean Sea.

UNCLOS proves to be an important framework toward tackling the complexities of the Aegean Sea dispute by providing guidelines and mechanisms aimed at peaceful delimitation of maritime boundaries and settling disagreements. In relation, adherence to the principles of UNCLOS shall be a landmark toward enhancing maritime stability, ensuring long-term resource management, and fostering regional cooperation in the Aegean Sea by Greece and Turkey respectively.

QARMA

1. To what extent should the delimitation of the Aegean Sea's maritime boundaries take into account the reconciliation between historic claims, geographical features, and international law?
2. Which multilateral frameworks should be established in disputed waters for exploring and exploiting natural resources with a view to an equitable sharing system?
3. What kind of complete airspace management system might be developed to resolve the conflicting claims about this portion of the Aegean Sea and ensure civil aviation safety?
4. What types of confidence-building measures and rules will have to be devised to constrain military activities and avoid potential confrontations in the Aegean?
5. What role can international organizations, including the UN and NATO, play in mediating sustained dialogue between Greece and Turkey?
6. In case of adjudication of the Aegean Sea dispute before the International Court of Justice, under what specific legal frameworks and conditions is this to be?
7. What kind of strong mechanism i.e. related to monitoring compliance, shall be necessary to secure adherence to the resolution, promoting long-term peace in the Aegean Sea?