

• • • COSTA RICA INTERNATIONAL
MODEL UNITED NATIONS

SEPTEMBER 2019



SECURITY COUNCIL

"Territorial Conflict in the
Disputed Region of Kashmir
and Jammu"

 +(506) 8720-5102

 supervisor@crimun.org

 Leadership Network

• • •
CONTENTS



Welcome Letter from the Secretary Generals	3
Introduction Letter from the Directors	4
Introduction to the Committee	5
Topic Introduction	6
Key Terms	8
Timeline of Events	9
Historical Background	13
Current Situation	17
Bloc Positions	20
People's Republic of China	21
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	21
Russian Federation	21
United States of America	22
French Republic	22
Republic of India	22
Islamic Republic of Pakistan	22
Previous Resolutions	22
Possible Resolutions	23
Position Paper and Resolutions	24
Questions a Resolution Must Answer	24
Appendix	25
Bibliography	26



WELCOME LETTER FROM SECRETARY GENERALS

Dear delegates, facilitators and guests,

It is with the utmost pleasure that we welcome you to the fifth annual Costa Rica International Model United Nations conference at the Radisson hotel. This year, we have the pleasure of sharing this event with participants from around the world. CRIMUN 2019 has been a process that our staff has been working arduously on for 10 months, and we cannot wait to watch it culminate in a successful and educational conference.

From its inception, CRIMUN has strived to be a conference of high educational value and deep personal development, where young people like us can find ourselves in positions of leadership and power that allow us to incite global action. This all happens in an environment where cultural exchange and diplomacy is key to unlocking one's full potential in furthering one's knowledge. By attending this conference, you are inserting yourself into a platform of global leaders and exchanging ideas with some of the world's greatest young minds. With so many of us coming from different backgrounds and experiences, it is inevitable for this conference to become an opportunity for you to learn about global perspectives through first-hand experiences.

Your choice to participate in Model United Nations is not untelling of your character as a global citizen. Activities like these bring together those of us that, despite current conflicts and injustices, believe that we can forge a peaceful world through dialogue and empathy towards others. The personal passion that each and every one of you shows towards your respective topics is a testament to how much you truly care about making this world better for everyone. At the end of the day, the future of the globe is in our hands. It is up to us to find our voices and stand up for each other.

In the three days that you will be accompanying us at the Radisson, you will engage in productive, and at times difficult, debate with your peers. While this may prove to be challenging, you must remember that the committee's sole objective is to unify and not divide, to come together and reach a solution to the situation at hand. Your speaking, writing, negotiation and listening skills will prove to be the greatest tools in constructing plausible solutions that may, one day, become a reality. Embrace the responsibility that this entails, as we are building our future, one step at a time.

We hope that you enjoy this conference and gain life long lessons from it.

Kind regards,

The Costa Rica International Model United Nations 2019 Secretariat

 Ariana Chacón
Secretary General

 Alba Cerna
Secretary General

 Mauricio Campos
Secretary General

 Fabiola Sanabria
Secretary General

 Daniela Gamboa Aguilar
Secretary General

 Josemaría Hernández
Secretary General

 Sydney Winter
Secretary General

 Diego Vargas
Secretary General

CONTACT

 + (506) 8720-5102

 supervisor@crimun.org

 Leadership Network

San Jose, Costa Rica



INTRODUCTION LETTER FROM DIRECTORS

Welcome to CRIMUN's Security Council Committee! My name is Sofia Milian and I will be your chair for this upcoming conference. I'm a Junior at Country Day School and consider myself to be an avid debater with a passion for diplomacy and politics that began in CRIMUN's Trainee Program. Now that I am part of this year's board of committee directors, I feel honored to moderate but most importantly to witness earnest dialogue stemming from global-minded delegates.

Dialogue and conversation is the most worthwhile opportunity CRIMUN provides. It encourages people with similar diplomatic interests to interact in a manner that has the potential to engage in future real-life political action. For this reason I hope all delegates take advantage of every kind of chance they get to collaborate with each other and learn the true value in the art of compromise and new friendships. If you have any questions, grievances, requests or things you want clarified; do not hesitate to get in touch with us.

Hello delegates, and welcome to the Security Council! I am Andrey Solano Solano, and I will be chairing the UNSC at this year's CRIMUN. I'm currently in tenth grade in La Salle High School, and though I've only had one year of experience with MUN, I can safely say it is a very important activity for me, and carries with it considerable growth in experience, knowledge, speaking, leadership, and critical thinking. I will now get the chance to experience MUN from the eyes of a committee director, and am greatly looking forward to the questions you pose, the ideas you offer, and the ensuing constructive debate. I strongly believe that diplomacy, solutions, and the peacekeeping the UN proposes comes from people like us. CRIMUN is an excellent forum for all of us to share and start building the people we want to be so we can build the world we want to see. It is fundamentally important (plus a great experience for us as chairs!) that all of the delegates in our committee have a chance to step up and speak out. As such, I urge all delegates to get in touch with us should they have any questions on anything conference- or topic-related. The topic we'll touch upon is a delicate one and a test for us as chairs and delegates: let's make the most of it. Thank you, and we look forward to seeing you all in September!

Sincerely,

Sofia Milian and Andrey Solano.

 Sofia Milian
Director

 Andrey Solano
Director

CONTACT

 andrey.josue23@gmail.com

 so.milian2002@gmail.com

San Jose, Costa Rica

INTRODUCTION TO THE COMMITTEE

The Security Council is one of the main organs of the United Nations. It was envisioned, per the UN Charter, as the organ with the "primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security". It is also the only body in the United Nations which can issue directives all member states are forced to comply with. As such, the resolutions therein discussed carry more than just moral weight: the nations are obliged to obey them.

The Security Council, initially comprised of 11 nations—five permanent members (the Republic of China [now Taiwan], France, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States, which hold veto power over every substantive resolution) and six non permanent members chosen by the UN General Assembly for two-year terms. A correction to the UN Charter in 1965 expanded committee participation to 15, including the first five lasting spots and 10 non-permanent individuals. Among the permanent members, the People's Republic of China replaced the Republic of China in 1971, and the Russian Federation succeeded the Soviet Union in 1991. The non-permanent spots are commonly picked to accomplish even-handed portrayal among geographic locales, with

five members originating from Africa or Asia, one from eastern Europe, two from Latin America, and two from Western Europe regions. Five of the 10 non-permanent individuals are chosen every year by the General Assembly for two-year terms, and five resign every year. The Presidency of the Council is held by every member on a rotating one month term.

Image 1: United Nations Security Council.



Source: Reuters (2014).

Within the Security Council, every nation has one vote. On each "procedural" matter—the meaning of which is often debated debate—choices by the board are made by a certifiable vote of nine member states. Substantive issues, for example, the examination of a debate or the use of assents, likewise require nine votes, including the concurrence of the five permanent members holding veto control. However in practice, a permanent member has the ability to abstain without intruding upon the validity of the decision at hand. A vote on whether an issue is procedural or substantive is itself a substantive inquiry.

Since the Security Council is required to work constantly, sessions are held consistently at the United Nations headquarters in New York City.

TOPIC INTRODUCTION

"In our search for a lasting solution to the Kashmir crisis, both in its internal and external dimensions, we shall not traverse solely on the beaten track of the past. Mindsets will have to be altered and historical baggage jettisoned." -Atal Behari Vajpayee, former Prime Minister of India

To the north of the Indian subcontinent, almost perfectly nestled between India and Pakistan, lies the region of Kashmir and Jammu, a 222,236 square kilometer region. This former princely state, a sovereign entity from British control in India during its colonial period, has been the center of what is most commonly referred to as the "Kashmir Conflict". This conflict is a territorial-turned-nuclear power struggle between India, Pakistan, and China which has, despite the many claims that a lasting peace would be built, only worsened in the past few years.

The region has a distribution of territory between the three Asian nations, and this same distribution is the leading

cause of more than 70 years worth of tense military, civil, and political tension. About 45% of the region is controlled by the Indian government, with 35% under Pakistani control, and 20% having Chinese administration as it is shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Kashmir Map, BBC.



Important geographic and social divisions define Kashmir. Much of this region is underdeveloped and dominated by mountain ranges such as the Himalayan and Karakoram ranges. The Valley of Kashmir is located between mountain ranges along with large rivers. Socially, the most densely populated regions are Jammu and Azad Kashmir. Mirpur, Dadayal, and Kolti are amongst the main cities of Kashmir. Kashmir and Jammu has a Muslim majority population. According to the 2011 census, Islam is practiced by approximately 70% of the population, while 28% are Hindu, 2% are Sikh, and 1% are Buddhist. Of the Muslim population, 14% are Shia and the rest are Sunni. A prominent Muslim

community exacerbates Pakistan's claim to the region, whereas a strong political and historic argument forms the basis of India's case for claims over Kashmir and Jammu.

The most recent major event in the seemingly never-ending saga occurred in February of 2019, when a suicide bomber, later attributed to a young Islamic militant (associated with the Pakistani terrorist organization Jaish-e-Mohammed (or JeM), rammed into a bus filled with Indian nationals, who in turn were members of paramilitary forces. In this accident 44 people died, and several more were injured. Pakistan has denied any involvement with the attack, and in fact has banned JeM from operating within its borders. However, such a ban remains merely theoretical, with the organization still receiving tacit support from the Pakistani government.

Despite the fact that, since 1947, India and Pakistan have gone to war three times over this issue, the events this February were the bloodiest and most worrying to happen in decades in the region. This event triggered an immediate, strong response from the Indian and Pakistani governments, led by Prime Ministers Narendra Modi of India and Imran Khan of Pakistan respectively, urging the other side to abstain from using any sort of force and warning of the considerable dangers any escalation would pose.

Prime Minister Modi additionally stated his intentions to unequivocally punish Pakistan for the attack, despite the latter's government denying any responsibility or ties to criminal groups whatsoever. Indeed, a mere two weeks later, an attack was carried out by Indian forces over Pakistani military bases, and the tensions between the two nations remain at a high not reached since the end of their last major armed conflict, with such cryptic statements as a Pakistani general telling Indian leaders to prepare for a "surprise".

Some of the permanent members of the Council retain a vested interest in the region. China claims a small part of this border and maintains a covert support for Pakistani government. This furtive support increases the intriguing and tension from the international standpoint.

The threat posed by two nuclear states claiming a similar and competing territorial interest cannot be disregarded. Equally noteworthy for the Council are the conditions in which the people of Kashmir live. Economic opportunity and stimulus in the region is often disregarded, painfully ignoring the fact that, at the end of the day, Kashmir is still home to a significant amount of people.

Internal political considerations also play a

significant part in the region's calculations. Notably each country's aggressive political statements heighten tension given the bilateral development of nuclear warheads. Additionally, a huge part of the loaded rhetoric surrounding Kashmir from the Indian government stems from the fact that Prime Minister Modi is locked in a tough reelection battle; In many campaign rallies, he is keenly motivated to respond to voters clamoring for a government that appears tough on Kashmir and has claimed "terrorists will pay the price". In these and other ways, Mr. Modi has carefully crafted his political image to mirror and feed upon that popular concern.

The tensions between two nuclear powers, coupled with significant public unrest, make this a hugely important and pressing issue for the Council to deal with.

KEY TERMS

Partition of India 1947: Refers to the division of the former British India between the two nations of India and Pakistan after the territory achieved independence.

Indo-Pakistani War of 1947-1948: Also referred to as the first Kashmir War, it was the first conflict fought between India and Pakistan over the region of Kashmir. It had an inconclusive result, and similar conflicts

would later arise over the issue.

Kargil Conflict: Medium-scale conflict fought in 1999 over the Kashmir territory, after Pakistani forces entered Indian-administered land.

Siachen Conflict: Refers to the decades-long conflict between 1983 and 2003 over the Himalayan Siachen Glacier.

Aksai Chin: Territory of Kashmir under Chinese administration, disputed mostly between China and India.

Ceasefire: Temporary suspension of fighting, typically one wherein peace talks and diplomatic dialogue takes place.

Line of Control: De-facto border between the states in conflict regarding Kashmir, located between India and Pakistan. Referred to as LoC, trespassing has historically resulted in armed conflict.

Hari Singh: Last sovereign prince of the one-time Kashmir princely state. Maintained the independence of Kashmir until a violent revolution arose along the western borders of the state.

Narendra Modi: Prime Minister of India serving since 2014. Wishes "complete isolation of Pakistan from the global

community".

Imran Khan: Prime Minister of Pakistan since 2018, who has maintained friendly relations with China and a threatening disposition towards India.

Nuclear Weapons: Explosive device used for mass destruction, caused by the fission of atoms' nuclei. Possessed by the so-called "nuclear states", and a threat to world peace when utilized.

TIMELINE OF EVENTS

In order to have a clear understanding of the conflict, it is critical to know the events that contributed the years-long tension that has been building up in the past century. From the end of the British colonial period to present day, specific incidents make up a chain reaction that produced today's Kashmir Conflict.

August 15, 1947 - End of British rule partition, creating Hindu-majority India and Muslim Pakistan.

October 6, 1947 - Maharaja of Kashmir signs a treaty of accession with India after a Pakistani tribal army attacks. War breaks out between India and Pakistan over Kashmir.

1948 - India brings up the Kashmir conflict to the UN Security Council. The result of this meeting is Resolution 47, which calls for a referendum to determine the status of the territory. It also orders Pakistan decrease its military presence in Kashmir and India. Although a ceasefire is established, Pakistan refuses to comply with evacuate its troops, and Kashmir is partitioned for practical purposes.

1951 - Elections in Kashmir and Jammu are commissioned under the administration of India back accession to India. India says that this makes a referendum unnecessary, while the UN and Pakistan disagree and argue that a referendum needs to consider the votes of voters throughout the former princely state.

1953 - Pro-Indian authorities dismiss and arrest Prime Minister Sheikh Abdullah, who was the leader of the governing National Conference, after he takes a pro-referendum stance and delays former accession of Kashmir and Jammu to India. A new government of both regions ratifies accession to India.

1957 - The constitution of Indian-administered Jammu and Kashmir defines it as part of India.

1950s - China gradually occupies eastern

Kashmir (Aksai Chin). Indian war with China commences.

1962 - China defeats India in small power-struggle war over control of Aksai Chin.

1965 - India and Pakistan have a brief war over Kashmir which ends in a ceasefire and a return to previous positions.

1971-72 - Another Indo-Pakistani war results in a defeat for Pakistan, leading to the 1972 Simla Agreement. This agreement turns the Kashmir ceasefire line into the Line of Control. This line pledges India and Pakistan to settle their differences through negotiations and diplomatic dialogue, calling for a final settlement of the Kashmir dispute. The agreement determined the future basis of Pakistani-Indian relations.

1984 - The Indian Army seizes control of the Siachen Glacier, an area not covered by the Line of Control. For this reason, Pakistan makes continuous attempts to capture the area in the following decades.

1987 - This year marks the start of escalation of the modern Kashmir conflict. Disputed state elections in Indian-administered Jammu and Kashmir gave traction to a pro-independence revolt around the Jammu and Kashmir Liberation Front (JKLF). It was during this time when

India accuses Pakistan of stirring up the insurgency by despatching fighters across the Line of Control. Pakistan denies this allegation, escalating tensions between the two countries.

1990s - The revolt escalates after the Indian Army kills about 100 demonstrators. Attacks lead to the exodus of almost all Hindus from the Kashmir Valley area of India. India imposes Armed Forces Special Powers Act (AFSPA) in Jammu and Kashmir. Protests continue, with Kashmiri militants getting involved. Violence against civilians by both sides is described as a "human rights disaster" by the United Nations.

1999 - India and Pakistan go to war again after militants cross from a Pakistan-administered part of Kashmir into another Indian-administered district of the region. India returns the attack, accusing Pakistan of being responsible for the militants, and breaking off relations.

2000 - Any attempt to improve relations between the two countries are disrupted by violence. Major protests erupt in the Indian-controlled Kashmir Valley after a protestor is killed by the Indian army. 2,000 unidentified bodies are found along the Line of Control and Activists accuse security forces of arresting many of the disappeared protestors.

2013 - India's and Pakistan's prime ministers agree to reduce the number of violent incidents at the Kashmir border.

2014 - India cancels political dialogue with Pakistan after accusing it of interfering in India's internal affairs. This decision is a result of Pakistan's High Commissioner in Delhi consulting Kashmiri separatist leaders in advance of the talks. Pakistan and India exchange very seriously-worded warnings after a flare-up of violence across their common border leaves at least 18 people dead.

2015 - Violent protests continue leaving a couple protestors dead after a visit to Indian-administered Kashmir by Prime Minister Narendra Modi.

2016 September - India and Pakistan exchange war threats after 18 Indian soldiers are killed in a riot by gunmen on an army base in Indian-administered Kashmir. During the rest of the year, India and Pakistan will exchange war threats and accuse crimes of one another. The Indian army will try to forcefully make its way into Kashmir where they shoot suspected militants. Chaos ensues between the two armies and Kashmir is caught in the midst of the fighting.

2017 to 2018 - Violence and chaos is a

constant in Kashmir and Jammu, casualty estimates over 100 civilian and 324 military and security forces. Experts begin to believe the situation will not improve in the short term. As security forces, particularly Indian, carry out operations, they are confronted by crowds of people trying to block their way.

2019 February 14 - This month marks the highest rate of increase in violence, beginning with a suicide bomber ramming into a car with Indian paramilitary police in Kashmir. This is the deadliest attack of security forces in decades. The Prime Minister keeps a close eye on Pakistani militia forces.

2019 February 15 - Pakistan-based terror group Jaish-e-Mohammed claims responsibility for the attack. Pakistan's foreign ministry "condemns heightened acts of violence" in Kashmir and rejects any links to the attack and speculations from the Indian government and media circles. India accuses Pakistan of not acting against this terrorist group despite international demands.

2019 February 16 - The Indian Finance Minister withdraws Pakistan's "most favored nation" status, given to countries receiving trade advantages with Indian such as low tariffs. Consequently, basic customs duty

on Pakistani exports to India rise 200 percent.

2019 February 19 - Pakistani Prime Minister Imran Khan offers assistance to India to investigate the suicide bombing, but he warned that Pakistan will retaliate against any acts of aggression from New Delhi. India dismisses this offer and brings up previous terror attacks in Mumbai.

2019 February 20 - India halts a bus service between Srinagar (Capital of India-administered Kashmir) and Muzaffarabad (Capital of Pakistan-controlled Kashmir) without explanation. It then increases a crackdown in Kashmir and detains 160 separatists. Civilians are killed as Indian security forces clash with a Pakistani militant group in Kashmir in the next days.

2019 February 26 - India said its air force conducted strikes against a Jaish-e-Mohammed training base. The attack killed many terrorists and senior commanders of such terror group. Pakistan denies there were any casualties from that attack and said the strikes missed any targets. Pakistan's foreign ministry said the Indian aggression was a threat to regional peace and stability and would get a response by Pakistan at any time they choose.

2019 February 27 - Media reported that

Imrani Khan chaired a meeting of the National Command Authority, a body that oversees Pakistan's nuclear warheads. Pakistan said its air force carried out strikes across the de-facto "so-called Line of Control" in order to demonstrate its "right to self-defense". A representative for the Pakistani armed forces said Indian planes entered Pakistan's air space and two jets were shot down. One aircraft fell on India's side of Kashmir and the second on Pakistani territory. This Indian pilot was captured. India's foreign ministry acknowledged the pilot was missing and a combat jet was lost, but then a video emerged of a man identifying as the Indian pilot emerged. India said it handed over a dossier to its counterpart with specific details of Jaish-e-Mohammed role in the February 14 terror attack and their presence in Pakistan. Pakistan's Prime Minister consequently called for talks with India hoping a "better sense" would de-escalate the situation.

2019 February 28 - Pakistan's Prime Ministers told his parliament that Pakistan will release the captured Indian pilot the next day as a peace gesture towards India. This move was appreciated by India's three armed forces but they would not say if New Delhi considered the return as a de-escalation of the conflict. Nuclear weapons remain intact in both countries, increasing

fear in civilian's daily life and worry amongst the international community.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Indian Peninsula B.C: Early Civilizations

The Indian Peninsula has been populated for over 3000 years, since approximately the third millennium BC, when the Indus Valley Civilization, or Aryan Civilization, (the first known group to inhabit the peninsula, who spanned the whole region of today's India) rose. Like civilizations in Mesopotamia and Egypt, the Indus River Valley civilizations developed near water and became the core and foundation of later civilizations in the region. Between 2500 and 2000 B.C.E., indigenous peoples of the Indian subcontinent, known as Dravidians, established two sophisticated urban centers in the Indus River Valley: Harappa and Mohenjo-Daro.

The descendents from the Aryan Civilization later moved west and settled their society in the northwestern part of the Indian Subcontinent, around the current-day Pakistan, India, and disputed regions. In what pertains to religion, a major undercurrent on the issue at hand, the Vedic civilization (precursor to modern Hinduism) arose centuries later. The late Vedic Age (800-400 B.C.E.) was marked by the Aryans' growing awareness of Dravidian

beliefs, or the worship of deities, nature worship, ancestor worship and the belief in an afterlife. The interaction of both traditions is exemplified in the Upanishads, a collection of religious thought that illuminated several new religious concepts: brahma, dharma, karma, and moksha. The Upanishads is a foundational text for the set of religious beliefs that later became known as Hinduism. It is historically significant because it reflects the blending of Aryan and Dravidian religious values, and also because it reflects the social structures of Ancient India.

Image 4: Vedic Civilization Illustration.



Source: Iskcon (2019).

It is during this time that Hinduism first emerges as an established religion, rather than a collection of loosely-related folk mythology. The collection of popular beliefs related to the deities and philosophical thought that form modern Hinduism intertwine for the first time due to the continued contact between each micro civilization: the figures of Brahma, Vishnu,

and Shiva, deities of creation, conservation, and destruction, for example, form one united mythology for the first time, creating the earliest iteration of Hindu religion. Ever since then, Hinduism has remained the largest religion in what is modern-day India, despite considerable demographic influence from other religions, such as Buddhism.

Centuries of a period of relative stability followed in the subcontinent due to urban development, lots of trade, and technological innovations, as well as influence from an Alexandrian invasion in the last centuries BC, where the Greek language, architecture, mythology, and philosophy became widespread and produced new forms of art, most notably that of Greco-Buddhist temples in South Asia.

Islamic Era

During the 7th Century AD, Islam first appeared in the Arabian peninsula, brought about by its founder Muhammad, who then focused on fostering its geographic and demographic expansion. After Muhammad's religion had taken hold in the Arabian peninsula, he focused on expansion through a mix of military conflicts and conquests (mostly towards the Northeast and West of the Arabian Peninsula).

Organic as well as forced demographic movement (first by trading between Arabic travelers and Indian salesmen, and then by conquests from Arabia, firstly led by Muhammad bin Qasim, who organised the first Muslim military action in India) brought about the religion to the Subcontinent. Indian opposition was not all that successful (partly due to the fragmented nature of the Hindu population, partly due to the areas the Muslim newcomers settled in), and those who came to the region started settling after a remarkably rapid and successful population of the region. The Muslim population, due in part to coming from the West of the Peninsula, settled mostly in the Northwestern part, in modern-day Pakistan. The Hindus were left with their former territories in the eastern and southern parts of the region. Small princely states started appearing across the region, creating an Indian subcontinent with no centralized government. Even though they remained mostly in the Peninsula's Northwest, the Muslim population still reached some parts of India, and the religion is currently the second-largest in India, after Hinduism.

The cultural influence of the Muslim newcomers was quite notable: Islamic art (and its predisposition towards avoiding human representation for religious reasons) is quite noticeable in the area in the early Second Millennium, and the scientific

development that the Arab World had during the epoch was just as noticeable in the Indian Subcontinent. Tensions have always existed in the Subcontinent due to the religious divide: in fact, one of the main driving forces of the Kashmir conflict is religion: Pakistan claims authority over the region due to a big portion of the population being Muslim.

The British Era

After a millennium of the same small states system, British traders with the East India Company arrived to India as part of the colonization frenzy that had overtaken Europe. The Company was drawn by India due to the large amount of resources and labor it provided. Europeans increasingly became involved in direct governance of India, centralizing the government over the reluctance of some regional leaders and even collecting taxes themselves. After over a century of Company administration and a major uprising in 1857: the Indian people demanded their freedom from the company.

Following a spirited but ultimately unsuccessful short revolution, the Company relinquished its rule of India to the British Government, instituting direct British public administration of the whole subcontinent. The British Raj, the name given to direct British rule after the Hindi word "raj", meaning rule, conquered the

Subcontinent and ruled with an iron fist until 1947. The Raj spanned every single territory under jurisdiction of the modern India and Pakistan, as well as the Kashmir region. Political administration of India (of course including Kashmir) was handled by the British with a small amount of administrative and cultural devolution (the regions were allowed to keep their Princes and cultural traditions).

Image 5: British-Controlled Calcutta.



Source: Wikimedia Commons.

Independence, UN Mediation, and Partition
Public unrest was ubiquitous in the last years of British rule. Despite the British trying to keep their grasp on power in the Subcontinent, civil disobedience arose, and movements like Mahatma Gandhi's "peaceful disobedience" took hold of public opinion. Protests broke out from Calcutta to the outer areas of the Colony, supported by the Indian National Congress (a political movement that lobbied for independence and would later become one of India's political parties) and the Muslim League (a lobbying organized group composed of

Muslims). At the end, Britain's government, under Prime Minister Clement Attlee, could not maintain control, saw its Indian Empire crumble and granted India independence. However, the Muslims and Hindus could not agree on forming a single country, and had to agree on a partition plan: the Muslim-majority areas to the Northwest would become Pakistan, and the rest, Hindu-dominated, would become India. However, Kashmir found itself in a peculiar situation: the majority of its population was Muslim, but their Prince, Hari Singh, was Hindu. It was well-known that Singh wanted Kashmir to join India (despite potential opposition from the people), and as such no satisfactory conclusion could be agreed. After insistence and aggression from Pakistan, Singh could not maintain his stated position of neutrality, and signed an agreement with the young Indian nation. After such an agreement, the first war over the territory started, between 1947 and 1948. The young United Nations ordered a referendum in the area to determine who was the legitimate government, but due to resistance from both parties, it has never been legitimately held. A ceasefire was agreed in 1949 which established the current borders as the Line of Control.

Late 20th Century Conflict

Both India and Pakistan kept a close eye over the region and acquired control over a

fraction of it. Conflict broke out again in the 1960s and early '70s, after Pakistani soldiers entered Indian-controlled Kashmir, but a ceasefire was agreed rapidly. Aggression and tension continued over the decade with continuous military exercises in the area from both governments. Indian and Pakistani Prime Ministers Indira Gandhi and Zulfikar Ali Bhutto were fundamental in writing a provisional non-violence agreement in the late 1970s. However, domestic influence in the region from both nations continued, and the threat of war was as real as it had ever been.

In the 1990s, both nations began testing nuclear weapons and tensions escalated. There was shooting from Pakistani forces into Indian-controlled territory, and reluctance from India to let the UN intervene. In 1999, the last major conflict broke out, which ended in the death of a considerable number of Indian and Pakistani troops and destruction of equipment and artillery.

An ominous peace was agreed, brokered by U.S President Bill Clinton in a series of negotiations with both nations' leaders. Clinton claimed to be preventing terrorism in the region, including in the agreement points that severely restricted Pakistani relationships with Islamist groups like Al-Qaeda and assuring that, in theory, no further military exercises were conducted in

the region by either country. However, tensions have remained, resurfacing this year as an unpropitious reminder of a dark past.

Image 5: Areas in Conflict.



Source: NDTV.

Current Situation

February Events

In February 14th, 40 Indian paramilitary officials were performing military exercises in Indian-administered Kashmir when a suicide bomber performed a terrorist attack, killing all of them and some civilians. The Islamist Pakistani group Jaish-e-Mohammed swiftly claimed sole responsibility for the attack, despite the Pakistani government rebuking any sort of involvement with it. After that, on February 17, the Indian government placed a high 200% tariff on all goods imported from Pakistan. Prime Minister Khan stated he was open to working with his Indian counterpart, but Mr. Modi promised a "strong response". Following, Indian officials launched their response, jailing several separatist leaders

in the Indian-administered territory. India claimed to have hit many Pakistani soldiers, a claim the government of Pakistan swiftly contradicted. Similarly, Pakistan says they shot down two Indian warplanes on February 27, which India denied. Ever since February 14, as can be seen, the tension in the region escalated to a breaking point and ushered in violence from both sides. The violence did continue into March, and even at the time of this writing, threatening military exercises are held by both nations.

An accurate description of the current situation in the region can accurately be given with two nouns: "tension" and "hostility". After the events that transpired in early February with the suicide bomber and the civilian and military deaths, both nations stated a theoretical desire for peace. The climate in a region has remained a source of conflict for over seven decades and it shows no sign of abating: violence, cultural animosity, and the nuclear weapons developed by both countries (as well as others with a vested interest in the region) create a very real threat of a major-scale conflict which could very well-and, of course, should-be avoided.

Image 7: Suicide Bombing Aftermath.



Source: New York Times.

Nuclear and Military Considerations

The question of nuclear weapons is continually argued in international security circles. The primary argument remains that nuclear warheads deters countries from actually using them in warfare. This has proven true in the post-World War II era. No state has used them, however, there are still an astounding 15,000 nuclear weapons in the world. Nuclear proliferation has caused many civilians to live in constant fear, and the more countries that have them, the more likely they are to be used at some stage. While the presence of nuclear weapons in both India and Pakistan may instead prevent a nuclear exchange, they don't discourage nuclear states from using conventional military power against one another. And, as conventional conflicts can quickly escalate, the possibility of a nuclear exchange remains a real possibility.

In the most recent escalation, a suicide bomber from a Jaish-e-Mohammed, an Islamist terrorist group situated in Pakistan, killed 40 Indian military personnel. Through

this event, Jaish-e-Mohammed succeeded in escalating tensions between India and Pakistan. As a response, India retaliated against Pakistan by launching a series of coordinated attacks on Pakistani territory and forces, claiming it is as payback for terrorism. It was not long before both sides were exchanging artillery fire across the line of control and the conflict quickly escalated.

Meanwhile, in a national televised speech, Pakistan's prime minister, Imran Khan, expressed concern that the escalation would soon be too much for both nations, warning: "With the weapons you have and the weapons we have, can we afford miscalculation? Shouldn't we think that if this escalates, what will it lead to?" Prime Minister Modi has the choice of escalating the conflict by deploying more jets into Pakistani territory, which could lead to more back-and-forth retaliations.

Since 1974, when India shocked the world with its unforeseen nuclear preliminary of the "Smiling Buddha" weapon, South Asia has been seen as a worldwide nuclear threat. Until this point, India, similar to China, has kept up a "No First Use" doctrine, which states that India will just utilize its atomic weapons only in response to a nuclear attack. The arrangement was declared in 1999, a year after Pakistan adequately detonated five of its own atomic weapons. But Pakistan has so far

refused to issue any clear doctrine governing its own use of nuclear weapons. The nuclear arsenals of Pakistan and India combined are miniscule compared with those of the US, Russia or China. However, they are more powerful than those dropped on Japan in 1945 and could release massive destruction if sent to civilians. The exchange of warheads between the two countries would be the most catastrophic ever, considering the danger of the radioactive fallout and its long-term impact on the environment.

India's atomic fueled ballistic rocket submarine, INS Arihant, became operational in 2018, it gave the nation a "nuclear triad" – the capacity to deplore atomic strikes via land, air and sea. Its other ground-based ballistic rocket, the Agni III, has a range of around 3,000km.

The two nations have somewhere in between of 130 and 150 atomic weapons.

While Pakistan has a somewhat bigger atomic arms stockpile – estimated to be 140-150 warheads in 2017 – it is less capable of delivering to targets. In spite of the fact that Pakistan is growing new ballistic rockets, its current ballistic missile range is 2,000km and the nation has no nuclear-armed submarines. In any case, it would take under four minutes for an

atomic rocket to be propelled from Pakistan and into India, and vice versa.

The worst case scenario is that, what started with a terrorist attack grows in a nuclear war aimed at Indian, Pakistani and Kashmiri civilians, who are especially in danger because of their geographical position. Technological advances may likewise compound the already dangerous situation. India's arsenal now includes the BrahMos, a cruise missile developed jointly with Russia, which can be fired from land, sea or air and used as a counterforce weapon.

A Counterforce doctrine, in terms of nuclear strategy, means that warheads target the opponent's military infrastructure with the use of a nuclear strike.

Discontent in the Kashmir valley could likewise escalate and prompt further crises. No Indian government has up to this point showed the political will to unravel the Kashmir emergency, either to disarm it, or to indulge in diplomatic negotiations with Pakistan. Nor has Modi have been able to prevent radical Hindus from forming vigilante squads in the region and threatening those who think they are defiling their religious convictions. Thus, on an everyday basis, ordinary individuals continue to suffer.

Previously, during periods of global tension, the US took initiatives in deescalating international crisis. Now, it seems unlikely that either country would turn to the Trump administration to facilitate solutions. Finally, leaders from both countries must also consider the reaction of Asia's third nuclear power, China, which has always been the primary focus of India's nuclear program.

Political Considerations

An important aspect of the conflict are the political considerations both the Khan and the Modi governments have. Mr. Modi is locked in a tough re-election battle, and as such, he tries to appear as tough as possible on the Kashmir issue in order to get so-called "nationalism votes" and a "rally around the flag" effect, persuading his voters to support him based on his aggressive stance on Kashmir.

The challenge of this committee will be building a resourceful solution, which can pass the Council, as pursuant to its voting rules, that engages twenty-first century diplomacy and circumvents the errors that were made during the last century. We need to stop violence in the Kashmir region, and do so in a way that prevents future violence, addresses current situations, and mend past mistakes.

Tension and hostility have been the driving

forces. This has been manifested in the fall of both nations' fighter planes (over the other's airspace) and in the terrorist attacks. The Council's duty is to remove-or at the very least alleviate-these two regrettable driving forces.

Image 8: Prime Ministers Khan (L) and Modi.



Source: On

BLOC POSITIONS

An important dimension to take into account is that no P5 country has expressed a forceful endorsement of either India or Pakistan's territorial claims. This is because of a variety of geopolitical reasons such as: China is protecting territorial interests, the UK seeks to maintain political support from both nations, or at least diminish geopolitical reasoning from other factors like Russia or the United States. The nuance and subtleties of each country's positions will make it all the more interesting for each delegate to balance calling for peace with protecting their nation's tacit, subtle interests.

People's Republic of China

The PRC is among the main players in the Kashmir conflict. It is, along with India and Pakistan, the administrator of a small part of Kashmiri territory, despite not intervening much on the main conflict. As such, it stands to reason that it would want to protect, or even advance, its influence and importance in the region. Historically, the Chinese government has been friendlier to Pakistan than to India, but that is mainly the product of geopolitical reasoning, not of any deep, long-standing friendship. They have supported, however, an Indian-led call for peace in recent times, which could be seen as a subtle pivot from earlier positions while still stopping short of supporting India's claims. However, the consensus seems to be that they are still aligned more with Pakistan on the issue. They will have to strike a balance between calling for peace, like other members of the global community, and still protecting its territorial interests.

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The UK is probably the main historical force behind the Kashmir troubles: their division of the subcontinent at the end of Colonial rule was the main catalyzing root of the conflict. In modern times, the United Kingdom finds itself at a crossroads between its two former colonies: there

have, over the years, been many pro-Pakistan and pro-India manifestations both by Members of Parliament and citizens. Despite good relations with both governments, both countries are growing concerned about the influence each other has on British politicians and policies. The current British government has loudly called for peace, but refrains from an endorsement (voiced or tacit) of either nation's claims. They have solely claimed to, as stated by Prime Minister May's first Foreign Secretary, Boris Johnson, look for "a lasting solution to the situation in Kashmir taking into account the wishes of the Kashmiri people."

Russian Federation

While the Federation has had friendly relations with both countries, it has been a consistent position for them to support Indian claims, with varying degrees of forcefulness. The Ministry of External Affairs has stated that this position has been stable since the Soviet era, and claims it is "an issue of Indian sovereignty". However, Russian forces have been engaged in joint military exercises with Pakistani forces, toward which Russia Foreign Ministry maintains that "friendly relations of Russia with other countries do not dilute Moscow's ties to India". All in all, the position expressed by the government is one that is overall friendly to Indian interests, but some

of the strongest pro-Indian voices express concerns about the legitimacy of that friendship.

United States of America

The United States have been, in many of the conflicts between India and Pakistan, theoretically impartial mediators and have brokered peace in a few conflicts. They have had friendly relations with both nations for a long time, and have cast themselves in the role of peacemakers with no allegiance to either country's position.

French Republic

Despite France's reluctance to take a strong position on the issue (do to their lack of as strong a historical or geopolitical reasoning as the other P5 members), France has shown itself to be in favor of the Indian government, arguing, after the February events, that it was India's right to defend herself from alleged terrorist attacks.

Republic of India

India is, along with Pakistan, the protagonist of the troubles faced in the region. They claim the Kashmir region to be rightfully theirs, based on historical and geographic ties, as well as their administration of a significant portion of the region. They have been very loud in their reluctance to compromise with Pakistan, despite

theoretically supporting a peaceful resolution. They have been perpetrators of attacks, but have mostly framed them as a necessary response to terrorism.

Islamic Republic of Pakistan

Pakistan's territorial claim is as uncompromising as India, framing the issue as one of popular sovereignty and religious freedom seeing as the majority of the Kashmiri population identifies as Muslim. They have been (and are) involved in armed conflict against India over the region, as herein described.

PREVIOUS RESOLUTIONS

The Kashmir issue is one that has been in the Council's docket for decades, literally since the UN was first founded. As such, a number of resolutions have been issued. In 1948, UNSC Resolution 11196 was adopted, which called for a plebiscite to be held on the region and for a fair partition plan. Neither of these goals was ever achieved.

Additionally, across the 1950s, the Council issued several directives pertaining to the region and calling for peace and for a diplomatic solution, to foster cooperation and non-aggression, which was not upheld given the high amount of conflict that has occurred across the decades. The UNSC did establish a commission, however, which

has evaluated potential solutions, the UN Military Observer Group for India and Pakistan. Neither party was content with the Commission's actions and determinations, which furthered animosity and conflict, as well as disregard of the UN's directives. The UN has of course not had any official statement regarding rightful control of the region, and such a determination could be part of the Council's future action. The Line of Control between both countries was also established a part of UN mediation, and remains a point of dispute.

Overall, the resolutions have been numerous, but the actual solutions have been very scarce. These have established a lot of theory and goals, but no concrete way to achieve them, and achieving a solution (either by building upon established ones or drafting an entirely new one with broader socioeconomic, legal, political, and ethnic considerations) should be this committee's priority. The failures of past resolutions, and how to avert that in the committee, will be one of our challenges.

POSSIBLE RESOLUTIONS

There is no immediate solution to this complex conflict. The situation is made worse by public debate and the different political military players. The highly

charged political rhetoric and stance of parties to the conflict has made the search for fighting a mutually accepted solutions more difficult. Hence, a practical solution would be a steady peace process between India and Pakistan.

It is important to involve Kashmiris and accept them as stakeholders. They must receive priority after not being the focal point for the majority of the problem. Yet, it is them who for generations have continued to suffer from India and Pakistan's decisions about them without consultation.

The international community in general should play its role to resolve this protracted conflict. With the help of the international community and especially that of the Security Council, who has been long involved in the conflict, a joint administration including India, Pakistan and Kashmiris should be worked out. Yet, it is critical for the Security Council to negotiate a nuclear deal, whether it be economic or sanctions-based, to prevent the use of weapons of mass destruction that keeps millions living in fear. Such should be especially discussed with China and the other permanent members of the council. Borders could be considered irrelevant and trade and movement could be allowed without restrictions, if a workable framework can be built. Regarding militancy, it could be tackled if both

countries show real political will to resolve this issue. Amongst several proposals made in diplomatic dialogue, political independence for Kashmir is on the table. However, it is the least likely to be agreed upon.

A formal partition in Kashmir is also another possibility, the general idea behind this partition is an official international boundary between India and Pakistan. Likewise, an issue to be considered is the possibility of a binding plebiscite like the one proposed decades ago on what nation the Kashmiri people would like to be governed under. The people of Kashmir must be permitted to choose their own leaders in free and fair elections, as do Indians in every other state in that union, and New Delhi should commit to supporting Kashmir's provincial autonomy and the human rights of its people.

POSITION PAPER AND RESOLUTIONS

Questions a resolution must answer:

1. What is the legal status of the Kashmiri people and territory? Should they be free to choose what country to be a part of, will there be a partition plan or will the Council pursue another solution?
2. How can the socio economic situation of the Kashmiri people be adequate while still in the middle of the conflict? How will the

Council ensure their rights?

3. What measures will be taken pertaining to deterring nuclear proliferation in the region? How will the Council ensure non-aggression from both parts, including both nuclear control and conventional warfare?
4. What entity shall serve as direct mediator for the conflict, or will the Council take control with its directives? How will potential geopolitical divisions between the main players be circumvented?

Guidelines for the Position Paper

The Position Paper must include a brief summary of the topic, followed by the delegation's position and relationship with the Kashmir conflict. This section, due to the many subtleties each delegation has in their interaction with Kashmir, must be quite detailed and provide an accurate description of the nation's position and actions regarding Kashmir. The third part the Paper must include pertains to potential solutions to the conflict: it must provide an idea of the kind of compromise the delegation will be looking to reach, as well as what options should be looked at or are unacceptable for the delegation. The position paper must be sent to both chairs for consideration of an award.

Chair: so.milian2002@gmail.com

Co-Chair: andreyjosue23@gmail.com

• • •
APPENDIX



1. More on the history of the Kashmir Conflict, starting in 1947 to present for more understanding on its origins:
<https://www.nationalgeographic.com/culture/2019/03/kashmir-conflict-how-did-it-start/>
2. A summary video on the Kashmir Conflict for to reinforce understanding on the conflict in a concise manner:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GbtyfvnGafk>
3. An explanation why Kashmir is one of the most militarized nations of the world:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cyayif_nla8
4. A recent understanding of the events unfolding in the 21st century: <https://gulfnews.com/opinion/op-eds/india-and-pakistan-need-to-resolve-kashmir-1.62096214>
5. Information on alterior concequences if a nuclear war unfolds between India and Pakistan:
<https://www.businessinsider.com/india-pakistan-kashmir-nuclear-weapons-climate-cooling-2019-2>
6. An interview with Avinash Paliwal, a lecturer and deputy director of the South Asia Institute at the School of Oriental and African Studies in London, discussing the history of the dispute over Kashmir and what it will take to prevent future crises from escalating:
<https://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/trend-lines/27761/without-dialogue-between-india-and-pakistan-another-kashmir-crisis-is-inevitable>



BIBLIOGRAPHY



United Nations. (1945). Charter of the United Nations. Retrieved from <https://treaties.un.org/doc/publication/ctc/uncharter.pdf>

Bose, S. (2003). Kashmir: Roots of Conflict, Paths to Peace. Retrieved from https://books.google.co.cr/books?hl=en&lr=&id=3ACMegWBdNAC&oi=fnd&pg=PA1&dq=kashmir+conflict&ots=DCq0Nl819f&sig=5FmhYDSvovV4xby2wG4qplokt8Q&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false

The Guardian. (2019). India-Pakistan Crisis: A visual guide. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/feb/27/india-pakistan-visual-guide-to-kashmir-tensions>

Mir, A. (2019). The Kashmir Attack Could Prompt a Crisis. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2019/02/15/the-kashmir-attack-could-prompt-a-crisis-in-south-asia-heres-why/?utm_term=.d0a7da169ea4

Goel, V. (2019). India-Pakistan Crisis. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2019/world/asia/india-pakistan-crisis.html?module=ArrowsNav&contentCollection=World&action=keypress®ion=FixedLeft&pgtype=Multimedia>

Burki, S. (2007). Kashmir: A Problem in Search of a Solution. Retrieved from <https://www.usip.org/publications/2007/03/kashmir-problem-search-solution>

BBC. (2019). Kashmir: Why India and Pakistan Fight Over It. Retrieved from <https://www.bbc.com/news/10537286>

UNSC. (2001). Resolution 1373 (2001). Retrieved from <https://web.archive.org/web/20090311120540/http://www.state.gov/s/ct/index.cfm?docid=5108>



BIBLIOGRAPHY



CNN. (2019). Kashmir Fast Facts. Retrieved from <https://edition.cnn.com/2013/11/08/world/kashmir-fast-facts/index.html>

"Kashmir: Conflict Timeline." Kashmir:Conflict Timeline, Peace Insight, www.peaceinsight.org/conflicts/kashmir/conflict-profile/conflict-timeline

Choudhury, Saheli Roy. "Timeline: India and Pakistan's Latest Confrontation over Kashmir." Timeline: India and Pakistan's Latest Confrontation over Kashmir, CNBC, 1 Mar. 2019, www.cnbc.com/2019/03/01/india-pakistan-conflict-timeline.html.

Wolpert, Stanely. "How India and Pakistan Became Nuclear States." South China Morning Post, California Scholarship Online, 7 Mar. 2019, www.scmp.com/week-asia/explained/article/2188958/explained-how-india-and-pakistan-became-nuclear-states

"Population by religion community – 2011. Census of India, 2011. The Registrar General & Census Commissioner, India. Archived from the original on 25 August 2015.