



Southern China International MUN

Security Council: On measures to promote nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation on the Korean Peninsula.

Agenda overseen by: Theo Ryu

1. Description of the Issue

1.1 History of the Issue

Ever since 1957, following the close of the Korean War without any signed peace agreement, the Korean Peninsula has remained a focal point for ongoing nuclear tensions. Separated by a ceasefire that never led to reconciliation, North and South Korea drifted further apart. Over time, absence of closure deepened suspicion – shaping fractured alliances, cautious standoffs, lingering dread over possible atomic escalation in East Asia.

Out of what most political scientists call fear rather than aggression, North Korea's nuclear journey took root during the tense decades of the Cold War. Safety – real or imagined – from American influence and regional allies shaped early thinking in Pyongyang. Though Moscow pushed hard, leading to a signature on the Non-Proliferation Treaty by 1985, skepticism followed like shadow. Monitoring promises were made; quiet work may have continued anyway.¹ By the early 1990s, uncertainty turned sharp when withdrawal from the accord was announced.² What came after was not sudden conflict, but slow friction with international demands.

In 1994, talks between Washington and Pyongyang led to an agreement: freeze plutonium work in exchange for energy aid plus two light-water reactors. At first tensions softened, yet suspicion returned when each accused the other of falling short on promises – political changes adding more strain later.³ By the early 2000s, cooperation had broken down entirely. Then came 2003, when North Korea walked away from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, becoming the sole country to do so. From that point onward, six nations - the DPRK, ROK, the United States, China, Japan, and Russia - entered negotiations focused on diplomatic solutions to denuclearization. In 2005, a joint declaration marked modest progress by affirming shared goals for a weapon-free Korean Peninsula. Still, disagreements arose over verification methods, sequence of steps, and consequences for noncompliance. As trust weakened, so did movement within the process. Fundamental differences in procedure left little room for agreement, stalling what had begun with cautious hope.

1.2 Recent Developments

The recent years had shown great turbulence in the Korean Peninsula in terms of nuclear dynamics. Missile tests on the Peninsula grow more frequent, altering regional stability. Not only are intercontinental systems advancing, but also smaller-scale nuclear capabilities gain momentum under DPRK initiatives. These efforts widen threats beyond local borders, reaching global dimensions through technological reach.⁴ Legislation within the North adjusts accordingly, codifying what was once ambiguous: possession of atomic arms becomes official policy. Denuclearization talks fade further into background noise as legal frameworks lock in this declared identity.

Responding to recent shifts, South Korea along with the United States has deepened military coordination through more frequent exercises and stronger mutual defense assurances. Japan, facing missile threats, has raised its defense spending noticeably in step with others across Northeast Asia. These moves feed into growing mistrust, where actions meant to increase safety instead heighten regional tensions. The result is a cycle of suspicion that defines much of today's strategic environment in the area.

Right now, talks between nations are barely moving forward because global political splits make it harder to apply penalties consistently. Pressure strategies meant to stop nuclear spread get tangled up when food and medical crises emerge inside North Korea.⁵ With almost no communication paths open, small errors could spiral more easily than expected.

Key Terms

Nuclear Non-Proliferation: Efforts aimed at preventing the spread of nuclear weapons and related technology.

Denuclearization: The process of reducing or eliminating nuclear weapons and associated infrastructure in a region.

Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT): An international treaty designed to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and promote peaceful nuclear cooperation.

Extended Deterrence: A security commitment whereby a nuclear-armed state pledges to protect an ally under its nuclear umbrella.

Sanctions: Restrictive measures imposed to influence state behavior, often in trade, finance, or military capabilities.

2. Emphasis of the Discourse

2.1 Stance of Intergovernmental Organizations

The UN continues to treat North Korea's nuclear activities as a risk to global stability. Despite repeated bans set by the Security Council, Pyongyang carries out missile flights and atomic tests. Punitive measures follow each violation, designed to limit progress on military technology.⁶ Peaceful negotiation remains central to these council decisions, with talks encouraged over confrontation. Dismantling weapons programs without violence stands as the stated goal.

Even though the IAEA provides key technical support, entry into North Korean sites remains highly restricted. Some regional groups back United Nations stances, yet stress avoiding violence and maintaining calm. Still, deep disagreements between powerful countries have weakened broader organizational impact.

2.2 Stance of Developed Countries

Wealthy nations tied by security promises in East Asia place strong emphasis on stopping nuclear spread while maintaining deterrent capabilities. Instead of relying solely on pressure, countries like the U.S., Japan, and select European powers blend sanctions with dialogue efforts - making sure any move toward peace includes proof of weapons reduction. Without visible progress in dismantling arsenals, many fear such deals might weaken international norms meant to prevent atomic arms expansion.

Facing similar goals, richer countries disagree about when to apply rewards versus consequences. Some support gradual steps that include financial assurances alongside defense commitments; despite this, doubt persists among those recalling earlier deals that fell apart.

2.3 Stance of Developing Countries

A fresh look at global equity shapes how poorer nations view diplomatic challenges today. Viewed through their experience, national independence matters deeply alongside stable assurances among states. Security worries tied to North Korea appear real when history's weight is acknowledged during talks on arms reduction. Human costs from trade restrictions draw concern too - many stress that aid channels must remain open where people suffer most.

In smaller nations, insights into global rules emerge when looking at Korea - how control over weapons interacts with legal sovereignty becomes clear. A test of limits appears where security demands meet national entitlements. What unfolds there reflects tensions others face too. Power shifts reveal themselves through such standoffs. Legal claims sit alongside pressure to conform. Not just about missiles or treaties, it is about who decides what counts as lawful.

2.4 Right-Wing (Conservative) Approach

Security takes center stage when realists assess the situation on the Korean Peninsula. The North Korea missile program alarms them, seen as destabilizing across Asia and beyond. For these analysts, disarming must come before any diplomatic thaw can begin. Trust matters less than verified rollback of warheads in their calculus.

What stands out here is doubt about diplomatic efforts. Examples like the Agreed Framework or results from the Six-Party Talks are brought up frequently - showing how North Korea may have used talks to win benefits while avoiding real nuclear rollback. Because of this pattern, those on the right usually resist easing penalties or offering safety promises before clear, lasting, full dismantling

happens.

2.5 Left-Wing (Liberal) Approach

A different angle sees dialogue, mutual trust, small steps toward safety, along with deeper political conditions as key to denuclearizing Korea. Seen this way, North Korea's weapons effort stems less from hostility and more from long-term exclusion, threat perception, unhealed war wounds.

Still, sanctions can backfire - pressuring leaders yet worsening civilian hardship at the same time.

Because of this tension, many progressive officials lean toward easing certain penalties, allowing aid flows, and opening limited trade channels instead. These steps aim less at punishment, more at creating room for dialogue. Outcomes depend heavily on timing, design, and how much local economies rely on restricted sectors.

3. Possible Solutions

3.1 In Favor of Developed Countries

With tensions lingering, discussions among industrialized states will focus on easing threats tied to weapons spread and safety concerns in Korea. Because unchecked actions could unsettle broader peace efforts, reinforcing reliable deterrents stands out as a priority. Enforcement of current United Nations penalties, applied uniformly, is expected to draw strong attention.⁷ When violations occur, responses must be unmistakable - this clarity helps protect trust in worldwide rules meant to block nuclear expansion. For many advanced nations, consistent follow-through shapes how seriously such frameworks are taken.

Still, progress often stalls when pressure is the only tool used by wealthier countries. Because of this, some might back a step-by-step approach to talks, where small rewards follow clear moves toward giving up nuclear weapons. New ways to track compliance could emerge, especially if global organizations are brought back into the process. Steps meant to ease tensions might go hand in hand with better oversight, so long as military partnerships stay intact. A shift in strategy may depend less on force and more on timing, trust, and transparency.

3.2 In Favor of Developing Countries

Should talks shift toward fairness, poorer countries might question how much weight non-proliferation gets compared to national independence and human costs. Security worries rooted in past conflicts could shape their stance on lasting arms reduction in Korea. Without trust, progress often stalls – so pauses in weapons tests, open channels of communication, maybe even slow diplomatic warming might seem like unavoidable groundwork before real talks begin.

Still, some nations highlight how long-term sanctions deepen human hardship. Because talks often stall, aid networks struggle to reach those in need. Even when controls aim to limit weapons spread, their effect on ordinary lives draws concern. With oversight shifting slowly, pressure builds for

change. Though firm measures have a place, fairness matters just as much. Under UN coordination, dialogue could become more balanced. When all voices enter the room, outcomes tend to shift beyond narrow agendas. Broad agreement often emerges only when dominance gives way to cooperation.

4. Keep in Mind the Following

Delegates are to aim for holistic reviews of their countries' positions in the settings of international dynamics. This background might shape your thinking later on. As you go deeper, examine possible fixes – both close to the region and across global frameworks – keeping earlier findings in mind. Ask yourself these questions as you gather information:

1. What shaped your nation's experience with nuclear spread or nearby tensions? Some see weapons as shields; others recall close calls too vividly.
2. What stance does your nation take on North Korea's possession of nuclear arms along with its exit from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty – how that view steers policy toward penalties, prevention efforts, or talks?
3. What steps might your nation take to support the United Nations' efforts, especially via the Security Council or global oversight systems, in advancing nuclear disarmament and preventing weapons spread on the Korean Peninsula?
4. What role do economic penalties play alongside defense strategies when weighing civilian consequences and tensions across neighboring areas?
5. How might your nation engage with wealthier countries while also working alongside emerging economies to encourage conversation, mutual trust efforts, and lasting peace across Northeast Asia?
6. How might your nation suggest lowering chances of misjudgment or conflict growth, yet still support confirmed, lasting arms reduction?

5. Evaluation

With the situation on the Korean Peninsula still unsettled, patterns of standoff and broken talks have deepened mistrust over time. The UN Security Council holds a duty to uphold peace worldwide, relying on collaboration instead of force whenever possible. Nuclear spread remains a serious challenge, clashing with efforts to preserve stable regions and lasting safety for all nations. Progress in weapons technology continues despite repeated calls for restraint, revealing how fragile communication channels truly are. Without steady diplomatic contact, tensions grow harder to manage through peaceful methods alone.

For progress at this conference, agreement must emerge - not perfect, yet practical - on lowering nuclear dangers while halting conflict drift across Northeast Asia. Lasting calm there cannot rise from isolated moves, heavy pressure tactics, or goals shaped by single nations alone. Instead, shared effort matters most: steady talks guided by UN Security Council authority make forward movement more likely than force or isolation ever could.

6. Bibliography

1. International Atomic Energy Agency. “Fact Sheet on DPRK Nuclear Safeguards.” International Atomic Energy Agency, www.iaea.org/newscenter/focus/dprk.
2. United Nations, 1993, “Security Council Condemns Democratic People’s Republic of Korea’s Ballistic Missile Launches.”
3. Council on Foreign Relations. “The Six-Party Talks on North Korea’s Nuclear Program.”, 2022 Council on Foreign Relations, www.cfr.org/backgrounder/six-party-talks-north-koreas-nuclear-program.
4. Reuters. “North Korea Fires Ballistic Missiles as Rival South’s Leader Visits China.” Reuters, 4 Jan. 2026, www.reuters.com/world/asia-pacific/north-korea-fires-ballistic-missiles-rival-souths-leader-visits-china-2026-01-04/.
5. OCHA, www.unocha.org/democratic-peoples-republic-korea. United Nations Security Council. Resolution 1718 (2006). 14 Oct. 2006, [www.un.org/securitycouncil/s/res/1718-\(2006\)](http://www.un.org/securitycouncil/s/res/1718-(2006)).
6. United Nations Security Council. Resolution 2375 (2017). 11 Sept. 2017, [www.un.org/securitycouncil/s/res/2375-\(2017\)](http://www.un.org/securitycouncil/s/res/2375-(2017)).
7. United Nations Security Council Sanctions Committees, www.un.org/securitycouncil/sanctions/1718/panel_experts/reports.