

"NON DUCOR, DUCO"

Manipal Model United Nations India-MMUN

January 17 - 20, 2020

MMXX

**Background Guide
to the Continuous
Crisis Committee**

Table of Contents

Letter from the Secretary-General	1
Letter from the Director-General	2
Letter from the Director	3
Introduction	4
The Middle Eastern Theatre of conflict.....	4
The Latin American Theatre of conflict.....	11
The Theatre of conflict in South China Sea.....	14
The Kashmiri Theatre of conflict	17
Bibliography.....	22

Manipal Model United Nations

A LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

Shivank Chandra
Secretary-General

Tanya Nijhawan
Director-General

Director

Assistant Director

Sincerely,

Shivank Chandra
Secretary-General
Manipal Model United Nations India 2020

Manipal Model United Nations

A LETTER FROM THE DIRECTOR GENERAL

Dear Delegates,

Shivank Chandra
Secretary-General

Tanya Nijhawan
Director-General

Director

Assistant Director

Sincerely,
Tanya Nijhawan
Director General
Manipal Model United Nations India 2020

Manipal Model United Nations

A LETTER FROM THE DIRECTOR

Dear Delegates,

Shivank Chandra
Secretary-General

Tanya Nijhawan
Director-General

Director

Assistant Director

Director's name
Director, Continuous Crisis Committee
Manipal Model United Nations India 2020

Introduction of the Committee

“The innermost circle of hell is reserved for those who maintain their neutrality in times of great moral crisis.” – Dante’s *Inferno*

The Continuous Crisis Committee (CCC) is the most elusive committee of Manipal MUN 2020. Every year, the CCC is at the pinnacle of debate and decision making at Manipal Model United Nations. The CCC offers delegates an opportunity to step beyond the boundaries of a regular Model United Nations and step into the shoes of the leaders of the world. A CCC replaces resolutions with directives and creates an environment of conflict instead of the peaceful atmosphere of any regular committee. In this committee, all actions taken and decisions made will be in the hands of, you, the delegates and we hope that you use this opportunity responsibly.

By far the most exciting aspect of crisis simulations are the crises themselves. Unlike other types of committees, Crisis actually moves forward in time and can be affected by events that occur in the outside world. In sessions debate may be interrupted with important news or information. Wars may break out, natural disasters can occur, and scandals or corruption can be revealed. Delegates must be able to think quickly, for a single crisis may alter the course of the debate and create new problems that must be responded to immediately

This year’s CCC, will be a fast-paced hybrid crisis committee that will include several crises spread across multiple fronts. This will require the fellow members of this committee to have an extensive knowledge of Geopolitics, International Relations, and current Affairs. While the delegates will be responsible for channeling the direction of the committee, it will include multiple crises happening in opposite ends of the world simultaneously, linked by a common underlying theme. It is left to the ability of the delegates to understand the working of this committee and identify the bigger picture.

In this year’s Manipal MUN, the world will witness the up rise and downfall of various great states through the working of this committee as all hell breaks loose. From the re-partition of Tibet from China to a worker’s revolution all around the globe, the conclusions of this committee are endless and will largely depend of the strategic teamwork displayed by its members.

That being said, the date is January 17th, 2020. Welcome to this year’s CCC! This committee is now in order.

1. THE MIDDLE EASTERN THEATRE OF CONFLICT

Introduction to the Agenda

1. *Saudi Arabia-Iran proxy conflict:*

The Iran–Saudi Arabia proxy conflict, is the ongoing struggle for influence in the Middle East and surrounding regions between the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. The two countries have provided varying degrees of support to opposing sides in nearby conflicts, including the civil wars in Syria, Yemen, and Iraq. The rivalry also extends to disputes in Bahrain, Lebanon, Qatar, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Nigeria, and Morocco, as well as broader competition in North and East Africa, parts of South Asia, Central Asia, and the Caucasus.

In what has been described as a cold war, the conflict is waged on multiple levels over geopolitical, economic, and sectarian influence in pursuit of regional hegemony. American support for Saudi Arabia and its allies as well as Russian and Chinese support for Iran and its allies have drawn comparisons to the dynamics of the Cold War era, and the proxy conflict has been characterized as a front in what Russian Prime Minister Dmitry Medvedev has referred to as the "New Cold War". The rivalry today is primarily a political and economic struggle exacerbated by religious differences, and sectarianism in the region is exploited by both countries for geopolitical purposes as part of a larger conflict. Iran is largely Shia Muslim, while Saudi Arabia sees itself as the leading Sunni Muslim power

BRIEF TIMELINE

The proxy conflict can be traced back to the Iranian Revolution in 1979, when the US-backed monarchic Imperial State of Iran became an Islamic republic. The revolutionaries called for the overthrow of monarchies and secular governments to be replaced with Islamic republics, much to the alarm of Iran's smaller Sunni-run Arab Neighbors Saudi Arabia, Ba'athist Iraq, Kuwait, and the other Persian Gulf states, most of whom were monarchies and all of whom had sizable Shia populations. Islamist insurgents rose in Saudi Arabia in 1979, Egypt and Bahrain in 1981, Syria in 1982, and Lebanon in 1983.


Prior to the Iranian Revolution, the two countries constituted the Nixon Doctrine's "twin pillar" policy in the Middle East. The monarchies, particularly Iran since the US-led 1953 regime change, were allied with the US to ensure stability in the Gulf region and act as a bulwark against Soviet influence during the Arab Cold War between Saudi Arabia and Egypt under Gamal Abdel Nasser. The alliance acted as a moderating influence on Saudi-Iranian relations.

During this period Saudi Arabia styled itself as the leader of the Muslim world, basing its legitimacy in part on its control of the holy cities of Mecca and Medina. In 1962, it sponsored the inaugural General Islamic Conference in Mecca, at which a resolution was passed to create the Muslim World League. The organization is dedicated to spreading Islam and fostering Islamic solidarity under the Saudi purview, and has been successful in promoting Islam, particularly the conservative Wahhabi doctrine advocated by the Saudi government. Saudi Arabia also spearheaded the creation of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation in 1969.

Saudi Arabia's image as the leader of the Muslim world was undermined in 1979 with the rise of Iran's new theocratic government under Ayatollah Khomeini, who challenged the legitimacy of the Al Saud dynasty and its authority as Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques. King Khalid initially congratulated Iran and stated that "Islamic solidarity" could be the basis of closer relations between the two countries, but relations worsened substantially over the next decade. In response to the 1987 Mecca incident in which Shia pilgrims clashed with Saudi security forces during the Hajj, Khomeini stated: "These vile and ungodly Wahhabis, are like daggers which have always pierced the heart of the Muslims from

the back...Mecca is in the hands of a band of heretics." Iran also called for the ouster of the Saudi government.

Kingdom of Saudi Arabia vs Islamic Republic of Iran : a proxywar in the Middle East



IRAN-IRAQ WAR


In 1980, Saddam Hussein attempted to take advantage of revolutionary unrest in Iran and quell the revolution in its infancy. Fearing a possible revolutionary wave that could threaten Iraq's stability and embolden its Shia population, Saddam launched an invasion on 20 September, triggering the Iran–Iraq War which lasted for eight years and killed hundreds of thousands. Saddam had reportedly secured Saudi support for Iraq's war effort during an August 1980 visit he made to Saudi Arabia. This was in addition to financial and military support Iraq received from neighboring leaders in Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Kuwait, Jordan, Qatar, and the United Arab Emirates, in part to hedge Iranian power and prevent the spread of its revolution.

American support for Iraq during the war had profound effects on Iran. The United States' defense of Saddam and its role in blocking investigations into Iraq's use of chemical weapons on Iranian soldiers and civilians convinced Iran to further pursue its own unconventional weapons program. The government has also used American hostility to justify foreign and domestic policies, including its nuclear program and crackdowns on internal dissent.

Apart from the Iran–Iraq War, Iran and Saudi Arabia engaged in tense competition elsewhere, supporting opposing armed groups in the Lebanese Civil War, the Soviet–Afghan War, and other conflicts. After the Cold War, Iran and Saudi Arabia continued to support different groups and organizations along sectarian lines such as in Afghanistan, Yemen, and Iraq.

The current phase of the conflict began in 2011 when the Arab

Spring sparked a revolutionary wave across the Middle East and North Africa, leading to revolutions in Tunisia, Egypt, and Yemen, and the outbreak of civil war in Libya and Syria. The Arab Spring in 2011 destabilized three major regional actors, Iraq, Syria and Egypt, creating a power void. These uprisings across the Arab world caused political instability throughout the region. In response, Saudi Arabia called for the formation of a Gulf Union to deepen ties among the member states of the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC), a political and economic bloc founded in 1981. The proposal reflected the Saudi government's preoccupation with preventing potential uprisings by disenfranchised minorities in the Gulf monarchies as well as its regional rivalry with Iran. The union would have centralized Saudi influence in the region by giving it greater control over military, economic, and political matters affecting member states. With the exception of Bahrain, members rejected the proposed federation, as Oman, Qatar, Kuwait, and the United Arab Emirates were wary that it would lead to Saudi dominance.



Due to the decreasing importance of the Israeli–Palestinian conflict as a wedge issue and mutual tensions with Iran, GCC states have sought strengthened economic and security cooperation with Israel, who is involved in its own proxy conflict with Iran. Saudi Arabia has also become increasingly concerned about the United States' commitment as an ally and security guarantor. The American foreign policy pivot to Asia, its lessening reliance on Saudi oil, and the potential of rapprochement with Iran have all contributed to a more assertive Saudi foreign policy. In 2015 Saudi Arabia formed the intergovernmental Islamic Military Alliance to Fight Terrorism (IMAFT) in December 2015 with the stated goal of combating terrorism. The coalition currently comprises 41 member states, all of which are led by Sunni-

dominated governments. Shia-led Iran, Iraq, and Syria are notably excluded, something which has drawn concerns that the initiative is part of the Saudi effort to isolate Iran.

The onset of the Arab Winter exacerbated Saudi concerns about Iran as well as its own internal stability. This prompted Riyadh to take greater action to maintain the status quo, particularly within Bahrain and other bordering states, with a new foreign policy described as a "21st century version of the Brezhnev Doctrine". Iran took the opposite approach in the hope of taking advantage of regional instability by expanding its presence in the Shia crescent and creating a land corridor of influence stretching from Iraq to Lebanon, done in part by supporting Shia militias in the war against ISIL.

While they all share concern over Iran, the Sunni Arab governments both within and outside of the GCC have long disagreed on political Islam. Saudi Arabia's Wahhabi religious establishment and its top-down bureaucracy differ from some of its allies such as Qatar, which promotes populist Sunni Islamist platforms similar to that of President Recep Tayyip Erdogan in Turkey. Since King Salman came to power in 2015, Saudi Arabia has increasingly moved from its traditional Wahhabi ideological approach to a nationalist one and has adopted a more aggressive foreign policy.

2016

The 2015 Mina stampede in Mecca during the annual Hajj pilgrimage further inflamed tensions. Tehran blamed the Saudi government for the tragedy and accused them of incompetence, which Riyadh rejected. In May 2016 Iran suspended participation in the upcoming Hajj. In September, Saudi Arabia launched a 24-hour Persian language satellite channel to broadcast the Hajj proceedings from 10 to 15 September. Ayatollah Khamenei accused Riyadh of politicizing the Hajj tragedy and argued that Saudi Arabia should not be running the pilgrimage.

On 2 January 2016, 47 people were put to death in several Saudi cities, including prominent Shiite cleric Nimr al-Nimr. Protesters of the executions responded by demonstrating in Iran's capital, Tehran. That same day a few protesters would eventually ransack the Saudi Embassy in Tehran and later set it ablaze. Police donned riot gear and arrested 40 people during the incident. In response, Saudi Arabia, along with its allies, Bahrain, Sudan, Djibouti, Somalia, and the Comoros cut diplomatic ties with Iran. Iran's foreign ministry responded by saying the Saudis were using the incident as a pretext for fueling tensions.

In recent years, King Salman made significant changes in domestic policy to address growing unemployment and economic uncertainty. Such economic pressures further

affected the regional dynamic in 2016. Russia, who has long maintained ties with Iran, has also sought closer ties to Saudi Arabia. In September 2016, the two nations conducted informal talks about cooperating on oil production. Both have been heavily affected by the collapse of oil prices and considered the possibility of an OPEC freeze on oil output. As part of the talks, Russian President Vladimir Putin recommended an exemption for Iran, whose oil output has steadily increased following the lifting of international sanctions in January 2016. He stated that Iran deserves the opportunity to reach its pre-sanction levels of output. In what was seen as a significant compromise, Saudi Arabia offered to reduce its oil production if Iran capped its own output by the end of 2016.

Extremist movements throughout the Middle East have also become a major division between Iran and Saudi Arabia. During the Cold War, Saudi Arabia funded extremist militants in part to bolster resistance to the Soviet Union at the behest of the United States, and later to combat Shia movements supported by Iran. The support had the unintended effect of metastasizing extremism throughout the region. The Saudi government now considers extremist groups like ISIL and the Al-Nusra Front to be one of the two major threats to the kingdom and its monarchy, the other being Iran. In a New York Times op-ed, Iranian Foreign Minister Mohammad Javad Zarif agreed that terrorism was an international threat and called on the United Nations to block funding of extremist ideologies using Iran's WAVE initiative as a framework. However, he placed the blame on Saudi Arabia and its sponsorship of Wahhabism for instability in the Middle East. He argued that Wahhabism was the fundamental ideology shared among terrorist groups in the Middle East, and that it has been "devastating in its impact". He went so far as to proclaim "Let us rid the world of Wahhabism" and asserted that, despite arguments otherwise, Wahhabism was the true cause of the Iran–Saudi Arabia rivalry.

The election of Donald Trump in the United States in 2016 prompted uncertainty from both countries about future US policy in the Middle East, as both were targets of criticism during his campaign. The Saudi government anticipated that the Trump administration would adopt a more hawkish stance than the Obama administration on Iran, which would potentially benefit Riyadh. Iran feared the return of economic isolation, and President Hassan Rouhani made efforts to establish further international economic participation for the country by signing oil deals

with Western companies before Trump took office.

2017

In May 2017, Trump declared a shift in US foreign policy toward favoring Saudi Arabia at Iran's expense, marking a departure from President Obama's more reconciliatory approach. This move came days after the re-election of Rouhani in Iran, who defeated conservative candidate Ebrahim Raisi. Rouhani's victory was seen as a popular mandate for liberal reforms in the country.

In May 2017, Saudi forces laid siege on Al-Awamiyah, the home of Nimr al-Nimr, in a clash with Shia militants. In June, the Iranian state-owned news agency Press TV reported that the president of a Quran council and two cousins of the executed Shia cleric Nimr al-Nimr were killed by Saudi security forces in Qatif. During the subsequent crackdown the Saudi government demolished several historical sites and many other buildings and houses in Qatif.

In the wake of the June 2017 Tehran attacks committed by ISIL militants, the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps issued a statement blaming Saudi Arabia, while Saudi Foreign Minister Adel al-Jubeir said there was no evidence that Saudis were involved. Later Iranian official Hossein Amir-Abdollahian stated that Saudi Arabia is the prime suspect behind the Tehran attacks. The commander of IRGC, Major General Mohammad Ali Jafari, claimed that Iran has intelligence proving Saudi Arabia's, Israel's, and the United States' involvement in the Tehran attack. Iran's Supreme Leader Ayatollah Khamenei later accused the United States of creating ISIL and of joining Saudi Arabia in funding and directing ISIL in addition to other terrorist organizations.

In October 2017, the government of Switzerland announced an agreement in which it would represent Saudi interests in Iran and Iranian interests in Saudi Arabia. The two countries had severed relations in January 2016.

Several major developments occurring in November 2017 drew concerns that that proxy conflict might escalate into a direct military confrontation between Iran and Saudi Arabia. On 4 November the Royal Saudi Air Defense intercepted a ballistic missile over Riyadh International Airport. Foreign Minister Adel al-Jubeir asserted that the missile was supplied by Iran and launched by Hezbollah militants from territory held by Houthi rebels in Yemen.

Crown Prince Mohammad bin Salman called it "direct military aggression by the Iranian regime" and said that it "may be considered an act of war against the kingdom".

2018

Saudi Arabia under King Salman has adopted a more assertive

foreign policy, particularly reflected in the country's intervention in Yemen in 2015 and its involvement in Lebanon in 2017. This has continued with the June 2017 appointment of Mohammad bin Salman as Crown Prince, who has been considered the power behind the throne for years. The Crown Prince has referred to Iran, Turkey, and Islamic extremist groups as a "triangle of evil," and compared Supreme Leader Khamenei to Adolf Hitler.

As part of the Saudi Vision 2030 plan, Mohammad bin Salman is pursuing American investment to aid efforts to diversify Saudi Arabia's economy away from oil. The reforms also include moving the country away from Wahhabi conservatism.

Both Israel and Saudi Arabia supported the US withdrawal from the Iran nuclear deal. In anticipation of the withdrawal, Iran indicated it would continue to pursue closer ties to Russia and China, with Ayatollah Khamenei stating in February 2018: "In foreign policy, the top priorities for us today include preferring East to West." The unilateral decision by the United States drew concerns of increased tensions with Russia and China, both of which are parties to the nuclear agreement. It also heightened tensions in the Middle East, raising the risk of a larger military conflict breaking out involving Israel, Saudi Arabia, and Iran.

The United States reinstated sanctions against Iran in August 2018 despite opposition from European allies. The Trump administration also pushed for a military alliance with Sunni Arab states to act as a bulwark against Iran. The plan in consideration would establish a "Middle East Strategic Alliance" with six GCC states in addition to Jordan and Egypt.

The assassination of Jamal Khashoggi prompted international backlash against Saudi Arabia and Mohammad bin Salman. The Trump administration issued a statement reiterating its support for Saudi Arabia and blaming Iran for the war in Yemen. The United States Senate responded to the president by passing bipartisan resolutions condemning the assassination and voting to end United States aid to Saudi Arabia for the war in Yemen, though the measures were considered largely symbolic.

2019

Military tensions between Iran and the United States escalated in 2019 amid a series of confrontations involving the US, Iran, and Saudi Arabia. Attacks on oil tankers in

the Gulf of Oman took place in May and June. In the wake of growing tensions, Foreign Minister Javad Zarif stated that Iran sought good relations with Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, and their allies, and called on them to end their dispute with Qatar.

In September 2019 a drone attack was launched on the Saudi Aramco oil processing facilities. The attack knocked out half of the country's oil supply. Although the Houthi rebels in Yemen claimed responsibility, the US Secretary of State Mike Pompeo alleged that Iran was behind the attack, a charge which Iran denied. Saudi Arabia said its investigation was ongoing, but officials alleged that Iranian weapons were used in the strikes and that the attacks were not launched from Yemen. Iran's Hassan Rouhani, after the attack on Aramco, claimed that the Saudi Arabia should take it as a warning to stop its intervention in Yemen. The Saudi-led intervention has led to the deaths of more than thousands till date.



Turkey-Saudi Arabia relations:

In October 2014, Saudi Arabia successfully campaigned against a Turkish bid for non-permanent membership of the United Nations Security Council, due to Saudi opposition to the Turkish stance on the Muslim Brotherhood. Due to the 2017 Qatar diplomatic crisis, the relationship between Turkey and Saudi Arabia faces problems, with Turkey supporting Qatar against Saudi Arabia in the ongoing diplomatic dispute. Saudi Arabia, in response, has threatened to impose sanctions against Turkey, and has conducted discussions with the UAE on the topic of curbing "Turkish expansionist policy". In turn, Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdogan accused Saudi Arabia of being non-Islamic and heretics. Furthermore, Turkey has deployed troops to defend the government of

Qatar from an attempted coup by Saudi Arabia and the UAE.

In March 2018, Saudi Crown Prince Mohammad bin Salman referred to Turkey as part of a "triangle of evil" alongside Iran and Muslim Brotherhood.


On 2 October 2018, Saudi journalist and The Washington Post writer Jamal Khashoggi was killed in the Saudi Arabian consulate in Istanbul. It has been widely alleged that he was killed by the Saudi government, including by Erdogan, although he has refrained from criticizing Saudi Arabia directly and has instead suggested the blame lies with Crown Prince Mohammad bin Salman. After the incident, Prince Mohammad rejected the concept of a rift with Turkey, stating, "Many are trying to drive a wedge between Saudi Arabia and Turkey. They will not be able to do it as long as there is a King Salman, a Mohammad bin Salman and a President Erdogan." Almost a month after Khashoggi's death, Erdogan directly accused the Saudi government of murdering the journalist. Erdogan said, "We know that the order to kill Khashoggi came from the highest levels of the Saudi government." He also said that "the puppet masters behind Khashoggi's killing" would be exposed.

Iran-Israel proxy conflict:

The Iran–Israel proxy conflict is a proxy war between Iran and Israel. The conflict gradually emerged from Iran's hostile stance toward Israel following the Iranian Revolution 1979, into covert Iranian support of Hezbollah during the South Lebanon conflict (1985–2000) and developed into a proxy regional conflict in 2005. Key issues in the conflict include Iran's support of groups opposing Israel in the Arab–Israeli conflict, Israel's support of Iranian rebel groups, Iran's nuclear program, and Israel's ties with other rivals of Iran such as Saudi Arabia and the United States. The involvement of both countries in the Syrian Civil War has created additional possibilities for direct conflict between the two states.

Iran's has provided significant support to Hezbollah and Hamas, whereas Israel has supported the People's Mujahedin of Iran and has conducted assassinations and attacks against Iranian targets directly. The Israeli government has also publicly advocated for international military action against Iran. Iran views Israel as an illegitimate "Zionist regime" and its leadership has accused Israel of being an American client state hostile to Muslims.


Ruhollah Khomeini was critical of Israel before he became Iran's Supreme Leader, and criticized Pahlavi dynasty Iran's ties with Israel, viewing Israel as a supporter of the Pahlavi regime. Following the 1979 Iranian Revolution, the Khomeini's new government adopted a policy of hostility towards Israel. Iran withdrew recognition of Israel as a state, and severed all diplomatic, commercial and other ties with Israel, referring to its government as the "Zionist regime" and Israel as "occupied Palestine".



In January 2014 Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu warned that Iran's nuclear program would only be set back six weeks as a result of its interim agreement with the international community. In one of the region's oddest pairings, Israel and the Gulf Arab states led by Saudi Arabia increasingly are finding common ground — and a common political language — on their mutual dismay over the prospect of a nuclear deal in Geneva that could curb Tehran's atomic program but leave the main elements intact, such as uranium enrichment. In June 2017, former Israeli Defence Minister Moshe Ya'alon stated that "We and the Arabs, the same Arabs who organized in a coalition in the Six-Day War to try to destroy the Jewish state, today find themselves in the same boat with us. The Sunni Arab countries, apart from Qatar, are largely in the same boat with us since we all see a nuclear Iran as the number one threat against all of us,".

Iran supplied the militant organization Hezbollah with substantial amounts of financial, training, weapons, explosives, political, diplomatic, and organizational aid while persuading Hezbollah to take an action against Israel. Hezbollah's 1985 manifesto listed its four main goals as "Israel's final departure from Lebanon as a prelude to its final obliteration" According to reports released in February 2010, Hezbollah received \$400 million from Iran. By the early 1990s, Hezbollah, with support from Syria and Iran, emerged as the leading group and military power, monopolizing the

Directorship of the guerrilla activity in South Lebanon.



Between 2005 and 2011, Iran was one of the main funders and suppliers of Hamas. Israel estimates the Hamas' Brigades have a core of several hundred members, who received military style training, including training in Iran and in Syria (before the Syrian Civil War). In 2011, after the outbreak of the Syrian Civil War, Hamas distanced itself from the Syrian government and its members began leaving Syria. Since 2012, Hamas ceased receiving any support from Iran due to Hamas' support of the Muslim Brotherhood in Syria. In a speech for the spokesman of the Qassam brigades in 2014 on Hamas's 27 anniversary, he thanked Iran for aid in finance and weapons.

Since the 1960s the United States has been very strong supporter of Israel, and promoted good relations between Israel and Jordan, Lebanon and Egypt, while holding off the hostility from other Middle Eastern nations, especially Syria and Iran. The relations are a very important factor in the United States government's overall policy in the Middle East, and Congress has placed considerable importance on the maintenance of a close and supportive relationship.

Since 1985, the United States has provided nearly US\$3 billion in grants annually to Israel, with Israel being the largest annual recipient of American aid from 1976 to 2004 and the largest cumulative recipient of aid (\$121 billion, not inflation-adjusted) since World War II. Seventy-four percent of these funds must be spent purchasing US goods and services. More recently, in fiscal year 2014, the US provided \$3.1 billion in foreign military aid to Israel.

Israel also benefits from about \$8 billion of loan guarantees. Almost all US aid to Israel is now in the form of military assistance, while in the past it also received significant economic assistance. Strong congressional support for Israel has resulted in Israel receiving benefits

not available to other countries.

In addition to financial and military aid, the United States also provides political support to Israel, having used its United Nations Security Council veto power 42 times with respect to resolutions relating to Israel, out of a total 83 times in which its veto has ever been used. Between 1991 and 2011, 15 vetos were used to protect Israel out of 24 in total.

Israel-Turkey relations:

On 14 May 2018, after the United States recognized Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and rioting broke out, Erdogan accused Israel of carrying out a "genocide" and behaving like a "terrorist state". The Turkish government also declared a three-day national mourning. The next day Turkey expelled the Israeli ambassador and withdrew its ambassador in Tel Aviv for consultations. In response, Israel expelled Turkey's consul in Jerusalem.

On Twitter, Prime Minister of Israel Benjamin Netanyahu described Erdogan as one of Hamas's biggest supporters and suggested that he not preach morality to Israel. Erdogan called Israel an apartheid state which has occupied a defenceless people's lands for 60+ years in violation of UN resolutions. He said that Netanyahu had the blood of Palestinians on his hands and should not cover up his crimes by attacking Turkey. In a joint news conference with British Prime Minister Theresa May in London, Erdogan said Turkey would never accept Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and called on the international community and the U.N. "to act without wasting time and stop this oppression" in Palestine.

Erdoğan tweeted that Hamas was not a terrorist organization but a resistance movement that defends the Palestinian homeland against an occupying power. Netanyahu responded that "A man who sends thousands of Turkish soldiers to hold the occupation of northern Cyprus and invades Syria will not preach to us when we defend ourselves from an attempted infiltration by Hamas."

On 17 May, Turkish Foreign Minister Mevlüt Çavuşoğlu said that Israel should be taken to the International Criminal Court for crimes against humanity and Turkey was providing the Palestinians with legal assistance towards this end.

Netanyahu condemned the 2019 Turkish offensive into north-eastern Syria and warned against ethnic cleansing of Kurds by Turkey and its proxies. He stated that Israel would extend humanitarian assistance to the Kurds.

Suggestions for further research

- The Syrian Civil War, involved parties, changing and unusual alliances

- Aspirations for regional domination using religious rhetoric in the Middle East
- Emergence of Turkey as a Sunni Muslim leader and a moderate alternative to Saudi Arabia
- Iranian Nuclear Program
- Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action
- Deepening Saudi-Israel relations against a common regional rival
- Covert Iran support to Hamas, Hezbollah and Houthi rebels

2. Latin American Theatre Of Conflict

INTRODUCTION: History of anti-Americanism in Latin America

Anti-Americanism in Latin America has deep roots and is a key element of the concept of Latin American identity, "specifically anti-U.S. expansionism and Catholic Anti-Protestantism."

Vice-President Richard Nixon's tour of South America in 1958 prompted a spectacular eruption of anti-Americanism. The tour became the focus of violent protests which climaxed in Caracas, Venezuela where Nixon was almost killed by a raging mob as his motorcade drove from the airport to the city. In response, President Dwight D. Eisenhower assembled troops at Guantanamo Bay and a fleet of battleships in the Caribbean to intervene to rescue Nixon if necessary.



Fidel Castro, the late revolutionary leader of Cuba, tried throughout his career to co-ordinate long-standing Latin American resentments against the USA through military and propagandist means. He was aided in this goal by the failed Bay of Pigs Invasion of Cuba in 1961, planned and implemented by the American government against his regime. This disaster damaged American credibility in the Americas and gave a boost to its critics worldwide. The United States embargo against Cuba maintained resentment and Castro's colleague, the famed revolutionary Che Guevara, expressed his hopes during the Vietnam War of "creating a Second or a Third Vietnam" in the Latin American region against the designs of what he believed to be U.S. imperialism.

Many subsequent U.S. interventions against countries in the region, including democracies, and support for military dictatorships solidified Latin American anti-Americanism. These include 1964 Brazilian coup d'état, the invasion of the Dominican Republic in 1965, U.S. involvement in Operation Condor, the 1973 Chilean and 1976 Argentine coups d'état, and the Salvadoran Civil War, the support of the Contras, the training of future military men, subsequently seen as war criminals, in the School of the Americas and the refusal to extradite a convicted terrorist, U.S. support for dictators such as Chilean Augusto Pinochet, Nicaraguan Anastasio Somoza, Haitian Duvalier, Brazilian Emílio Garrastazu Médici, Paraguayan Alfredo Stroessner and pre-1989 Panamanian Manuel Noriega.

Venezuela

Since the start of the George W. Bush administration in 2001, relations between Venezuela and the United States deteriorated markedly, as Venezuelan President Hugo Chávez became highly critical of the U.S. foreign policy. Chávez has been known for his anti-American rhetoric. In a speech at the UN General Assembly, Chávez said that Bush

promoted "a false democracy of the elite" and a "democracy of bombs". Chávez opposed the U.S.-led invasion of Iraq in 2003. Chávez also condemned the NATO-led military intervention in Libya, calling it an attempt by the West and the U.S. to control the oil in Libya.

Chávez's public friendship and significant trade relationship with Cuba and Fidel Castro undermined the U.S. policy of isolating Cuba; moreover, on Chavez's initiative, long-running ties between the U.S. and Venezuelan militaries were severed. During Venezuela's presidency of OPEC in 2000, Chávez made a ten-day tour of OPEC countries. In the process, he became the first head of state to meet Saddam Hussein since the Gulf War. The visit was controversial in the

U.S., although, Chávez did respect the ban on international flights to and from Iraq as he drove from his previous stop in Iran.



On 11 August 2017, President Trump said that he is "not going to rule out a military option" to confront the autocratic government of Nicolás Maduro and the deepening crisis in Venezuela. Venezuela's Defense Minister, Vladimir Padrino López, immediately criticized Trump for his statement, calling it "an act of supreme extremism" and "an act of madness". The Venezuelan Communications Minister, Ernesto Villegas, said Trump's words amounted to "an unprecedented threat to national sovereignty". President Maduro's son, Nicolás Maduro Guerra, stated during the 5th Constituent Assembly of Venezuela session that if the United States were to attack Venezuela, "the rifles would arrive in New York, Mr. Trump, we would arrive and take the White House".

On 23 January 2019, Maduro announced that Venezuela was breaking ties with the United States following President Trump's announcement of recognizing Juan

Guaidó, the leader of Venezuela's National Assembly, as the interim President of Venezuela. Maduro said all US diplomats must leave within 72 hours, but Guaidó said that they should stay. Maduro later confirmed the closure of the Venezuelan Embassy and all consulates in the United States. In response Maduro ordered the expulsion of US diplomats, giving them 72 hours to leave Venezuela. The US said it would not close its embassy, stating their diplomatic relationship was with Guaidó's government, and holding Maduro responsible for the safety of its staff. On 26 January 2019, only hours before the deadline, the Maduro government backtracked on its expulsion order, giving US diplomats another 30 days.

Bolivia

The election of the Evo Morales as president later in 2006 caused fresh tensions. The Morales platform includes programs to return land and power to the Aymara people of Bolivia, to nationalize key industries and to legalize use of coca, a traditional Aymara medicine. In September 2008, US president George W. Bush placed Bolivia on a counter-narcotics blacklist along with Venezuela. He said that Bolivia had "failed demonstrably" to meet commitments to combat the production and trafficking of illicit drugs, mainly cocaine. Speaking a week later, Evo Morales said the United States has tried to thwart his policies and had failed to condemn a pro-autonomy movement that uses terrorist tactics. He said that as a member of parliament in 2002, he was accused by the U.S. ambassador of being a narcotics trafficker and an assassin, and that later the ambassador had called him an Andean bin Laden and threatened to cut off aid if Bolivians voted for him. Morales accused the CIA of assisting the previous regime in Bolivia, and said that the U.S. military had supported illegal arms shipments to rebels.

In November 2010, Morales accused the U.S. of aiding coup attempts in Venezuela, Bolivia and Ecuador, as well as successful coup in Honduras, while also denouncing the U.S. attempts to define whom Bolivia should have foreign relations with, alluding to disagreements over possible talks between Iran and Bolivia.

In September 2018 at a United Nations Security Council meeting, Morales accused the U.S. of promoting torture. Morales also criticized US president Donald Trump face-to-face for threatening Venezuela and for its opposition to the International Criminal Court.

Relations between the United States and Bolivia deteriorated further in July 2013, when Bolivian President Evo Morales' plane, while returning to Bolivia from Russia, landed in



Vienna, Austria after France, Spain, Portugal and Italy informed with 24 hours advance that their airspace was closed to his plane due to unsubstantiated rumours that U.S. whistleblower Edward Snowden was on-board his aircraft. Morales

claimed the United States pressured the European countries into preventing his passage home. After arriving back in La Paz, Morales threatened to close the US Embassy in La Paz, stating "We do not need the embassy of the United States."

The Historical Basis for Anti-Americanism

Anti-Americanism has its roots not necessarily in populism, but rather the United States' intervention in the Latin American region. Since the Monroe Doctrine, particularly before 9/11, the United States considered the Western Hemisphere to be its domain reserve, meaning that no other country should mess in the United States' "backyard." The U.S. had routinely intervened in Mexico during the late 1800 and early 1900s, and the U.S. led invasion of Cuba in 1898 (the Spanish-American War) set up a proxy state sympathetic to U.S. interests.

The United States also supported military leaders, discussed above, who were vehemently anti-communist. The Cold War dimension pitted many on the left against the United States and conservative military elements of society.

U.S. overt and covert support for these regimes was a leading cause of anti-Americanism for those on the left. Concerned about Soviet advances in the region after the Cuban Revolution, U.S. interventions in Guatemala, Cuba and the Dominican Republic were viewed with hostility among many in the region. Plans like Operation Condor, where the U.S. and allied Latin American governments sought to kill Marxists and leftists in the region, and U.S. covert support for the military coup of Augusto Pinochet against the only democratically elected Marxist head of state, Salvador Allende, led many on the left toward an increasingly anti-American position.



A final dimension leading to anti-Americanism appeared in the mid-1980s and 1990s in the form of U.S. support for economic reform programs. As mentioned earlier, Latin

American countries had from the 1930's on industrialized products by relying on economic intervention by the government, a process known as "import substitution industrialization." ISI did indeed help to industrialize many Latin American economies, but it came with a price: mounting debt caused by high borrowing.

PROXIMATE SOURCES OF ANTI AMERICANISM

- The failure of neoliberal economic reform to benefit large sectors of these societies and worsening economic inequality
- Weak, corrupt political institutions
- U.S. immigration policy, especially toward Mexico and Central America
- U.S.-led intervention of Iraq in 2003
- The continuing hegemonic position of the United States in relation to the region culturally, economically, and politically

These conditions have led a larger number of people, particularly poor voters who feel disenfranchised by the current political system, to begin supporting politicians such as Hugo Chávez in Venezuela, Evo Morales in Bolivia, Rafael Correa in Ecuador, and Andrés Manuel López Obrador in Mexico. These politicians often used populist political strategies when campaigning, and routinely critiqued U.S. supported economic policies, immigration policy, and U.S. unilateralism when campaigning.

Neoliberalism has often been perceived as one of the causes for increasing economic inequality in the region. Latin America generally has one of the most lopsided wealth distributions in the world. The richest 10% of the population earns 47% of the income in the region, while the poorest 10% accounts for just 2-4% of the income, making Latin America vastly more unequal than the developed nations, eastern Europe, most of Asia, and even parts of Africa.

The nationalist foundation of populism and anti-Americanism directed toward market reforms has also led to new ways of organizing the economy. In Venezuela and Bolivia (under populist politician Evo Morales), a new round of nationalization (or the purchase of private companies by the state) has occurred. While both countries have paid for their acquisitions, many – particularly those in the U.S. business community, U.S. government, and IMF – have been concerned about these recent trends.

There have also been political changes associated this new type of politician. Most, including Chávez, Morales, and Ecuador's populist president Rafael Correa, have sought to reorganize the constitutions of their respective countries to

grant the poor or indigenous inhabitants (in the cases of Ecuador and Bolivia) more political powers. These groups, traditionally slighted by the ruling elite, certainly have cause for optimism in the region.

Suggestions for further research:

- US involvement in installing pro-US dictatorships in Latin American countries
- Anti-US sentiment in Latin American countries
- Anti-imperialism and populism in Latin America

2. The Theatre of Conflict in South China Seas

Introduction

The South China Sea is a 3.5 square km stretch of water ranging from Singapore to Taiwan and due to its geographical position is one of the most important trade routes for the countries surrounding it and additionally possesses a large number of natural resources. Due to this there have been tensions by all the surrounding countries as to the territory each one claims over the area. Most notably there are concerns regarding the Spratly Islands, the Paracel islands, the Diaoyu/Senkaku Islands and multiple reefs all of which estimated to contain large oil reserves. These territorial disputes have repeatedly led to colliding claims of sovereignty. In accordance with international law, the first 12 nautical miles from a state's shores are considered its territorial sea, over which the state in question has full sovereignty. The 200 nautical miles beyond the territorial sea are considered to be the state's exclusive economic zone and continental shelf, an area over which the state has exclusive rights for managing economic activities such as fishing, drilling, and shipping. However not only do these zones overlap but states have ventured to make historical claims over the area which further enhances the disputes. While there has been no armed conflict yet, there has been heavy militarization in the area which is still increasing and could lead to an armed conflict in the future.



General overview of the conflict

Shortly after World War II China issued the nine-dash line as an attempt of the Nationalist Chinese government to claim the waters surrounding it. This originally appeared as an eleven-dashed line but was changed to settle disputes with Vietnam. It has not been clarified whether this denotes ownership of the waters or just of the land included in it. Currently China is using this as a historical claim to the waters. As can be seen in the figure here it encompasses a large area of the South China Sea. Recently, in 2014 tensions flared up as China began reclaiming various areas in this line, which is not recognized by any of the surrounding states, by beginning dredging operations in the Spratly islands. While Vietnam, Malaysia, Philippines and Taiwan have also reclaimed land, China has been doing so in a much larger scale. In fact, according to a US defense department report it is projected that China has reclaimed over 2900 acres since December 2013 which amounts to more than all the other states combined. More specifically, from December 2013 to June 2015 China had reclaimed 2900 acres of land whereas the other 4 countries had reclaimed a total of 172 acres combined over 40 years.

In 2016, the Permanent Court of Arbitration (PCA) presented a ruling to a case pertaining to the South China Sea between the Philippines and the PRC. In its ruling on this case, commonly known as the South China Sea Arbitration, the court came to the conclusion that both parties must follow

UNCLOS in settling their territorial disputes. While a ruling was made, it has not settled the dispute and regional tensions remain high.

The situation in the South China Sea received renewed attention through the PCA Case No. 2013-19: The South China Sea Arbitration. The case began when the Philippines declared that the PRC's nine-dash line was in violation of UNCLOS and infringed upon Philippine sovereignty. Even though the PRC refused to actively take part in the proceedings, the PCA determined that the PRC's argument of historic sovereignty of islands throughout the South China Sea was incompatible with UNCLOS and that the PRC's claim to sovereignty of these islands was invalid. As opposed to the PRC's historical claim of the nine-dash line, the PCA referred to the borders outlined in UNCLOS. According to UNCLOS, the Philippines' exclusive economic zone and continental shelf would include the area up to 200 nautical miles off its coast. While the PCA ruled on the matter of the


Asia.

Additional cause for concern is the building of multiple facilities that could potentially host military forces causing concern for the militarization of the area. Therefore, there are worries about the scenario that China decides to establish its power over the area with the use of military. There are even allegations that China has threatened surrounding states to halt their work in the area and furthermore, the US has conducted various Freedom of Navigation operations claiming to be ensuring the safe passage of ships passing through the area.

Legal background

The UNCLOS proposes a variety of solutions for the solution of disputes in cases where the EEZ of two states overlap and negotiations fail. These include:

- the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea established in accordance with Annex VI [of the UNCLOS];
- the International Court of Justice;
- an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VII [of the UNCLOS];
- a special arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VIII [of the UNCLOS] for one or more of the categories of disputes specified therein.”.



Philippines' claim to sovereignty, tension in the South China Sea has continued as the PRC – and to a lesser extent Vietnam – have been reclaiming land around small islands and sand banks by creating thousands of acres of new land.

The acts of land reclamation and opposing claims of sovereignty have been posing a growing threat to peace and security in the region since the freedom of navigation, which is crucial for trade and is dependent on the coastal state's benevolence, is endangered. The contentious claims of sovereignty over the island chains and sand banks in the South China Sea have in recent years led to the militarization of some of these islands; most involved states argue that their militarization is in reaction to unilateral aggressions from other states. Despite ASEAN's Declaration on the Conduct of Parties in the South China Sea which underlines the importance of trust and confidence building measures between the involved parties, the above-mentioned arguments supporting the militarization of the South China Sea have led to regional instability and growing sentiments of hostility in Southeast

However, China has refuted these solutions claiming that negotiations are the “most direct, effective and universally used means for peaceful settlement of international disputes”. This was demonstrated in a case initiated in 2013 by the Philippines against China regarding the Matter of Jurisdiction in the South China Sea Arbitration, which China disputed with the argument that it did not fall under the rulings defined by Article 287 and Annex VII of the UNCLOS. The Permanent Court of Arbitration however undertook the issue and ruled against China deciding that the nine-dash line is not a legal claim over the area. However due to the lack of enforcement of this ruling, China has stated it does not accept it and has had no repercussions.

Main disputed territories

This map provides a clear overview as to which states claim which part of the South China Sea. While China lays claim to nearly the entirety of the area the other states also lay claim to various parts based on various arguments. Vietnam claims the Spratly and Paracel islands based on having actively ruled them since the 17th century and claims to have documents to prove it. Taiwan also lays claim to the entirety of the area based on the nine-dash line similarly to China, it has however focused more on the landmasses themselves rather than the waters. Brunei, Malaysia and the Philippines all lay claim only to specific parts of the area as can be seen on the map based on geographical proximity and their EEZs.



While for a long time Indonesia was not part of the dispute in the South China Sea it has had 3 maritime skirmishes with China in 2016 including one occasion where a Chinese fishing vessel and its crew were seized. Following these skirmishes, China announced that its nine-dash line contains areas contain fishing grounds inside Indonesia's EEZ sparking more conflict between the states. Joko Widodo the Indonesian president has authorized the destruction of any fishing vessel illegally fishing on Indonesian territory.

PHILIPPINES

Until 2016 the Philippines were one of the main opposition forces against China's claims on the South China Sea which is clear from the PCA case it initiated. However, after the election of Rodrigo Duterte it has seen a radical change in

policy in attempts to improve ties with China, essentially rendering the PCA ruling meaningless.

VIETNAM

Vietnam is also contesting a large amount of the territories, laying claim to both the Spratly and the Paracel Islands and claims that it is able to procure the necessary documents to prove it. It has voiced approval for the PCAs ruling. However, since then it has remained silent on the issue due to China's increasingly strong stance on the issue.

MALAYSIA

While Malaysia has remained largely silent on the issue, in 2017 the foreign minister Anifah Aman, stated that China's nine-dash line is not in accordance with international law and is not recognized by Malaysia, stressing that Malaysia cannot remain neutral on the issue despite its reliance on China for trade and investment.

BRUNEI

Brunei is the least vocal of all involved parties and only lays claim to a small area within its EEZ.

USA

The USA has shown to be interested in the dispute, considering its Defense Department published a report detailing every aspect of it. It has opposed the ninedash line

by China and has also claimed other states involved have violated international law. Furthermore, it has used the conflict as a reason to dispatch Freedom of Navigation missions, claiming to wish to ensure safe passage in the area.

Parties to the conflict

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

This is the country with the biggest impact on the situation. Remaining firm on its ninedash line, acknowledged by a select few countries and ignoring the rulings of the PCA it has provoked multiple concerns. It has furthermore developed an increasingly strong stance on the issue, notably in an ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations) meeting stating, "China is a big country and other countries are small countries, and that's just a fact". Since 2014 it has started reclaiming a large amount of the area and building artificial islands and infrastructure which could potentially lead to militarization of the area.

REPUBLIC OF CHINA (TAIWAN)

Similarly, to China, Taiwan remains steadfast on the nine-dash line since it was part of China when the claim was issued so it continues to have claims on it. It has also declared it does not accept the ruling of the PCA on this issue. It has placed a greater focus however on the landmasses in the nine-dash line and not to the entirety of the waters in it.

INDONESIA

It is worth noting that it is the only state involved not having ratified the UNCLOS.

ASSOCIATION OF SOUTH EAST ASIAN NATIONS (ASEAN)

ASEAN's goal is strengthening cooperation between Southeast Asian Nations. It consists of 10 states including the Philippines, Malaysia, Brunei, Indonesia and Vietnam. In 2002 together with China, ASEAN states signed a Declaration of Conduct on the South China Sea aiming to promote cooperation and peaceful resolution of disputes, which has not however been achieved.

Suggestions for further research

- Legal issues of the South China Sea concerning UNCLOS agreements and other International law tribunal.
- Understanding of the ASEAN declaration on the conduct of parties in South China Sea
- PCA case of South China Sea arbitration
- Mandate and functioning of UNCLOS
- Increased militarisation of South China Sea by the various involved parties
- Historical claim to the nine-dashed line by PRC
- US involvement and conduction of Freedom of Navigation operations
- Economic and Strategic importance of South China Sea

2.The Kashmir Conflict

Introduction

Complex as it is, the issue of Kashmir has been troubling the international community for decades and still remains unresolved. The region Kashmir is claimed by three major countries, namely India, Pakistan and China. The territorial claims of these countries have caused political instability and uncertainty that are yet to be addressed. In addition, this political instability in the region has allowed for certain non-state actors to become involved resulting into a worsening of the situation, and further plunging Kashmir into turmoil and political uncertainty. Being located in the heart of much territorial dispute, it is needless to say that the Kashmiri populous is torn between several different national and psychological fronts, as well

as religious identities. Despite Kashmir being a territory of the Indian government, territorial disputes throughout the centuries have resulted in a three-way division of Jammu/Kashmir. The southern-most territory of the region, generally known as Jammu/Kashmir continues to belong to India under legal frames. The eastern territory known as Aksai Chin has belonged to China since 1962. Finally, the northern and western-most territories known as Azad Kashmir and Gilgit-Baltistan have belonged to Pakistan since 1947.



Brief History of the land

Early History

Kashmir (province Jammu/Kashmir), like the rest of India, was under British rule since 1858. Under the period of British rule, there was no special designation for the territory, and it existed purely as a part of India. When India was decolonized in 1947, the event led to the creation of two independent states: India and Pakistan. Rulers of the relating Princely States were given the option of acceding their state to either of the two countries. However, there existed a region between the two nations that shared characteristics of both these nations and was divided on many fronts. This territory, Kashmir, was thereby partitioned between Pakistan and India, with approximately forty percent of the region being reserved to Pakistan, and the remaining sixty percent being reserved to India. The main territorial possessions of Pakistan included the two regions of Gilgit-Baltistan and Azad Kashmir. India received the territories of Jammu and the Kashmir Valley (oftentimes referred to in tandem as Jammu/Kashmir).

The partition of Kashmir was mainly attributed to major religious differences between its northern and southern territories. During India's existence as a British colony, two main religious affiliations were noted within the populous: Hinduism and Islam. With Hindu India and Muslim Pakistan

being at odds, Kashmir itself was divided between the two based on the presence of each respective religion in the territory. These were the circumstances under which Kashmir was partitioned between the two nations. Since Kashmir was a princely state prior to its partition in 1948, it was ultimately independent from control of either Pakistan or India at the time of decolonization. It was therefore this state's option to divide itself between Pakistan and India. In theory, Kashmir could have remained autonomous and not have divided itself between the two rising nations. However, the polarized population, divided based on cultural and religious traits, ultimately sealed the deal of partition. Despite the fact that the princes of this state did not wish to indulge in such division of their state, the will of the people in this event to join two democratic unions defeated any princely resistance at the time. However, the partition was not as simple as it may seem at first sight.

The princely leader of Kashmir at the time, by the name of Maharaja Hari Singh, was himself a Hindu supporter. However, his own religious affiliation stood against the religion of the majority of his state; the majority of Kashmir's population was Muslim. Therefore, this particular period of decision-making, whether or not to join one of two other independent, democratic unions, not only contravened his prince-hood, but also his religion. By remaining neutral in the matter in an attempt to avoid scrutiny, great uprising occurred in Kashmir, and the prince fled to India for sanctuary, where he pleaded for the Indian government to intervene militarily in Kashmir. As compensation for this request, and in order to secure Kashmir's Hindu establishment, Prince Hari Singh agreed to cede Kashmir to the Indian nation. On October 26th of 1947, Kashmir was signed over to India.

The first Indo-Pakistani War


Hereafter began the armed conflict between India and Pakistan over the princely state of Kashmir. The war lasted for the better part of a year, from October 26th, 1947 to August 13th, 1948. Wishing to terminate conflict and to secure its occupation of Kashmir, the Indian government approached the United Nations for assistance on the matter. Since the prince, being the legal governor of Kashmir had signed the state over to India, the United Nations had no option but to sanction Indian actions. On

August 13th, 1948, the UN officially declared its request for Pakistan to withdraw its troops from Kashmir, with promises that India would do so immediately after the cease-fire. However, Pakistan refused to withdraw its

troops.

During this time, with Kashmir in turmoil and without a governing figure, an emergency government was instigated on October 30th, 1948, headed by Prime Minister Sheikh Abdullah, an Indian statesman. However, since this government was purely provisional, it was not a definitive solution to the conflict in Kashmir. Hence, the United Nations and India pushed for a plebiscite to determine the will of the Kashmiri people in pertinence to their national identity. However, no such plebiscite occurred, mainly due to the unwillingness of Pakistan to comply. It is commonly understood that Pakistan believed it would lose the plebiscite, due to the fact that provisional Prime Minister Abdullah of Kashmir was obviously in favour of an Indian Kashmir, hence having a certain influence upon the voting figures.

Finally, Pakistan and India agreed to a cease-fire, and bilaterally signed a declaration for the withdrawal of troops in Kashmir on January 1st, 1949. Seeing that at the time there had been no plebiscite and as such the will of the people was not to be heard, territorial occupation at the end of the conflict was held as the de facto designation of territorial belonging. This resulted in India being in occupation of the Southern 65% of Kashmir, and Pakistan being in control of the remainder in the North. The approximate borders defined at that moment are still roughly those in existence today.



After ceasing its operation and declaring its failure in 1949, the UN Commission for India and Pakistan (UNCIP) appointed its successor, Sir Owen Dixon, to implement demilitarization prior to a state-wide plebiscite on the basis of

General McNaughton's scheme, and to recommend solutions to the two governments. Dixon's efforts for a state-wide plebiscite came to naught due to India's constant rejection of the various alternative demilitarization proposals, for which Dixon rebuked India harshly. Dixon then offered an alternative proposal, widely known as the Dixon plan. Dixon did not view the state of Jammu and Kashmir as one homogeneous unit and therefore proposed that a plebiscite be limited to the Valley. He agreed that the people in Jammu and Ladakh were clearly in favour of India; equally clearly, those in Azad Kashmir and the Northern Areas wanted to be part of Pakistan. This left the Kashmir Valley and "perhaps some adjacent country" around Muzaffarabad in uncertain political terrain. Nevertheless, Pakistan did not accept this plan.

Kashmir became an official part of the Indian Union in 1957. In addition, the Indian government recognized the great diversity of Kashmir, both on cultural and religious terms. Therefore, the government outlined several special rights for the territory of Kashmir in article 370 of the Indian constitution. The basic derivative of this article is Kashmir's special independence under the Indian union, and its right to partial self-government giving it a semi-autonomous status, meaning that all official state acts have to be in accordance to the Indian government and its laws. In addition, the Parliament requires the state government's concurrence for applying all laws, excluding the ones pertaining to defence, foreign affairs, finance and communications.

The Indo-China War of 1962

The Sino-Indian war was sparked in 1962, with its roots in the 1959 Tibetan Uprising when India offered asylum to Dalai Lama. However, the main pretext of the conflict was the sovereignty of the regions Aksai Chin and Arunachal Pradesh. As far the region of Aksai Chin is concerned, it was claimed by China for being a part of Xinjiang and by India for belonging to Kashmir. The war ended on the 20th of November 1962, with China occupying the region of Aksai Chin. The line that separates India from China in this region is known as the "Line of Actual Control".

Sino-Pakistan Agreement

The Sino-Pakistan Agreement is a document created in

1963 between the governments of Pakistan and China, which establishes the border between these two countries. China gave Pakistan between 1,942 and 5,180 square kilometers, and Pakistan recognized China's sovereignty

over hundreds of square kilometers of land in northern Kashmir and Ladakh. The agreement is controversial, since India also claims sovereignty over part of the land.

The Second Indo-Pakistani War

The Second Indo-Pakistani war is divided into two phases. The first phase unfolded on August 5th, when Pakistani troops, dressed as Kashmiri civilians, crossed the borders (Line of Control, established in the year 1949) and entered the Kashmir Valley. Often referred to as Operation Gibraltar, the first phase comprised the attempt of Pakistan to spark an uprising in regions where the majority of the population was Muslim. However, the response of the civilians was not expected. Most of them remained neutral and only four districts ended up supporting Pakistan in the war against India. India, having a strong military force at the time responded to the invasion with the crossing of the Line of Control and the captivity of several Pakistani outposts.

Pakistan then, in order to regain its troops and its prestige, implemented the Operation Grand Slam, which also comprised the second phase of the war. It was initiated on September 1st of the same year and its purpose was to cut off supplies of the Indian army and to seize the city of Akhnoor in the region of Jammu. Initially the Operation was successful, but eventually the army never reached the city due to its halt by the Indian Air Force.

Hostilities between the two countries ended after a United Nations mandated ceasefire was declared following diplomatic intervention by the Soviet Union and the United States, and the subsequent issuance of the Tashkent declaration. Indian Prime Minister, Lal Bahadur Shastri, and Pakistani President, M. Ayub Khan, signed the Tashkent Declaration on January 1, 1966. They resolved to try to end the dispute, but the untimely death of Mr Shastri and the rise of Gen Yahya Khan in Pakistan resulted in stalemate.

Kargil War of 1999

In the summer of 1999, India found to its horror during a patrol that infiltrators occupied many key posts vacated in the winter. A patrol was ambushed in the first week of May 1999. India belatedly realized the magnitude of the occupation — around 10 km deep and spanned almost 100 km of the LOC. India responded with Operation Vijay, a mobilisation of 200,000 Indian troops. However, because of the nature of the terrain, division and corps operations could not be mounted; subsequent fighting was conducted mostly at the brigade or battalion level involving around 30,000 Indian soldiers in total.

India contended that the infiltrators were trained and armed by Pakistan and that Afghan and other foreign mercenaries accompanied them. Pakistan insisted that those involved were freedom fighters from Kashmir and that it was giving only moral support. The conflict ended only after Bill Clinton, the US President, and Nawaz Sharif, Pakistan's Prime Minister, met in Washington in 1999. Meanwhile, the Indian Army had made significant advances, re-capturing vital territory and re-establishing the Line of Control.

The last two decades in Kashmir

Directly proceeding from this event, Pakistan and India began to reconsider rebooting relations in 2001. Between then and 2004, however, the first substantial signs of conflict once again began to emerge in Kashmir. Muslim uprising in the area began to increase exponentially, with Indian police units in the area having much difficulty in suppressing the violence.

After an exponential intensification of Muslim violence up until 2010, protests began to erupt all around the Kashmir valley, with Muslims demanding for secession. Indian police personnel were regularly deployed to ease the uprisings spreading throughout the territory and to suppress any violent activity. However, there came a day in 2010 where a Muslim protest march had an unwanted result: a protestor was shot dead by the Indian military force. With this event as a catalyst, the situation escaped all control.



Shortly afterwards, the Indian government ensured that police intensity would be decreased in the Kashmir valley through certain regulatory measures. In addition, chief minister Omar Abdullah of Jammu/Kashmir was led to declaring amnesty for the protestors the previous year that had turned violent and resulted in the death of said citizen. Though such measures promised to decrease police presence and military activity in the area, the Armed Forces Special Powers Act (AFSPA), calling for the special license of armed forces in the zone to decrease

violence, was still not revoked. Abdullah claimed that the region had still not reached a promising state of stability, and could therefore not be absolved entirely of the presence of Special Forces.

Additionally, the death of three Pakistani military personnel at the LoC in 2011 caused further upheaval. During this period, questionable occurrences led to a special investigation, leading to the discovery of 2,000 unidentified bodies in the region. Though evidence is still lacking, these people were assumed to be former prisoners of the police in the area. Security forces stated that these citizens had gone missing, but their remains were to be no definitive proof of any confirmation of this fact or another.

In September of that year, seeing no other choice but peaceful resolve, the Prime Ministers of both India and Pakistan met to discuss measures to decrease the violence in Jammu/Kashmir. Negotiations did not transpire smoothly, due to several accusations and abrasive claims by both sides. India was the first to speak out, cancelling talks in August of 2014 for what it claimed to be “Pakistani interference in India’s affairs,” and the engagement of a proxy war by Pakistan. Since then, multiple skirmishes have taken place involving the armed forces of both the parties and various militant organisations.

Abrogation of article 370 and Censorship in Kashmir

On August 5th, 2019 the Indian government passed a bill in parliament, scrapping article 370 and 35(a) of the Indian Constitution which grants a semi autonomous status to the state of Jammu and Kashmir.

NO ARTICLE 370 WHAT CHANGES IN J&K?	
BEFORE	NOW
• Special powers exercised by J&K	• No special powers now
• Dual citizenship	• Single citizenship
• Separate flag for J&K	• Tricolour will be the only flag
• State in-charge of policing	• Centre supervises policing
• Article 360 (Financial Emergency) not applicable	• Article 360 (Financial Emergency) applicable
• No reservation for minorities	• Minorities will be eligible for reservation
• Indian citizens from other states cannot buy land or property in J&K	• People from other states will now be able to purchase land or property in J&K
• RTI not applicable	• RTI will be applicable
• Duration of Legislative Assembly for 6 years	• Assembly duration in Union Territory of J&K will be 5 years

Furthermore, a second resolution moved by the Home Minister concerned reorganisation of the border State into two Union Territories: the Ladakh division without legislature and the remaining areas of Jammu and Kashmir with legislature to maintain internal security. This was followed by a communication blackout throughout the Kashmir valley, restriction on movement of individuals and temporary house arrest of prominent local leaders which is claimed to still persist till date in a smaller scale. This measure has received criticism by the International Press for denial of human rights.

Modern Day Jammu & Kashmir

Violence continues on both fronts. The Muslim population of the Kashmir Valley and Jammu continue to engage in both peaceful and non-peaceful uprising and protests. Indian Special Forces presence continues to be present in the region, and negotiations between India and Pakistan continue to remain at a dead standstill, with neither side being intent on inconveniencing itself in the face of the other. India and Pakistan have gone as far as to threaten each other with promises of war as a result of a heated conflict at the Indian and Pakistani border in Jammu/Kashmir. With such difficulties arising on a constant basis, it is essential that this issue be resolved with the utmost caution.

Major Countries Involved

INDIA

India has been facing massive upheaval in Jammu/Kashmir, with constant Muslim uprising and protests of both the peaceful and violent nature. Several military actions have resulted in a less-than-favourable position in Jammu/Kashmir for India, and public opinion of the state's home nation has fallen at stages to a status of hatred. However, the results of the 2014 elections seem to suggest that the people of the area have come to terms with India's dominant presence instead of Pakistan. It is worth noting at this stage that India is capable of making war, and is also in the position of using nuclear weaponry.

PAKISTAN

Pakistan maintains that Kashmir is the "jugular vein of Pakistan" and a currently disputed territory whose final status must be determined by the people of Kashmir. Pakistan's claims to the disputed region are based on the rejection of Indian claims to Kashmir, namely the Instrument of Accession. Pakistan insists that the Maharaja (Hari Singh) was not a popular leader, and was

regarded as a tyrant by most Kashmiris. It has managed to discretely employ the use of military operations to have accessible force if further armed conflict erupts in the region. In addition, Pakistan has threatened India with possible war if the people in Jammu/Kashmir are not taken into account and allowed to secede.

CHINA

China states that Aksai Chin is an integral part of China and does not recognize the inclusion of Aksai Chin by India as part of the Kashmir region. China did not accept the boundaries of the princely state of Kashmir and Jammu, north of Aksai Chin and the Karakoram as proposed by the British. It settled its border disputes with Pakistan under the 1963 Trans Karakoram Tract with the provision that the settlement was subject to the final solution of the Kashmir dispute. The PRC seems to be leaning towards the Pakistani interests as regards the issue, although it is part of the BRICS (Brazil, Russian Federation, India, China, and South Africa) alliance.

USA

The relations between USA and India have improved drastically over the last decade and the United States of America are considered to be economic and political allies of India. Therefore, should conflict arise, it is probable that the United States sides with India as seen recently across various international forums.

Suggestions for further research

- Cultural and religious history of the Kashmir Valley
- Regional politics of Jammu and Kashmir
- Presence and involvement of Militant organisations in the disputed area
- Role played by the intelligence agencies of the states involved
- Tashkent and Shimla agreement
- Secessionist claims by the civilians of Kashmir
- Siachen Glacier conflict
- Various armed operations conducted by involved parties post Kargil war
- Consequences of abrogation of Article 370

POINTS TO PONDER

- Foreign policies of your nation
- Defence laws and military strength of your country
- Emergency response of your country during armed conflicts
- International law, its principles and working

- Political awareness of current affairs **not limited** to the above-mentioned areas of conflict
- Incentives your nation may propose in order to negotiate with other countries with different policies.
- Involvement and importance of International Organisations in solving conflicts.

NOTE: Delegates need to note that, in hybrid crisis committees such as CCC, the crisis and agenda of debate will not be limited to topics discussed in the Study Guide. While this Background Guide gives a base for delegates to research, please remember that it is nothing more than a reference point to help direct your research. As the situation changes, the crisis will evolve accordingly, not limited by the topics covered in this guide but by the underlying theme of this committee.

- Tisdall, Simon (25 March 2015). "Iran-Saudi proxy war in Yemen explodes into region-wide crisis". The Guardian.
<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/mar/26/iran-saudi-proxy-war-yemen-crisis>
- Marcus, Jonathan (16 September 2019). "Why Saudi Arabia and Iran are bitter rivals". BBC News.
<https://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-42008809>
- "Iran, Saudi spar over running of haj pilgrimage". Reuters. 6 September 2016.
<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-saudi-haj-iran-idUSKCN11B0Y0>
- "Saudi prince says Turkey part of 'triangle of evil': Egyptian media". Reuters. 7 March 2018.
<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-saudi-turkey/saudi-prince-says-turkey-part-of-triangle-of-evil-egyptian-media-idUSKCN1GJ1WW>
- "Khashoggi murder: Turkish leader blames Saudi state directly". BBC News. Retrieved 3 November 2018.
<https://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-46077894>
- "Hezbollah confirms it sent drone downed over Israel". Reuters. Retrieved 6 December 2014.
<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-lebanon-israel-drone/hezbollah-confirms-it-sent-drone-downed-over-israel-idUSBRE89A19J20121011>
- "Turkey rallies to Gaza's plight" Archived 19 January 2009 at the Wayback Machine BBC.
http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/7831496.stm
- "UN: Hezbollah has increased military strength since 2006 war". Haaretz. 25 October 2007.
<https://www.haaretz.com/1.4990474>
- "Castro marks Bay of Pigs victory" BBC News
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/4925262.stm>
- US-Latin America Relations
<https://www.cfr.org/report/us-latin-america-relations>
- "U.S. declares Venezuela a national security threat, sanctions top officials". Reuters. 10 March 2015.
<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-venezuela/u-s-declares-venezuela-a-national-security-threat-sanctions-top-officials-idUSKBN0M51NS20150310>
- Akhtar, Rais, and William Kirk. "Jammu and Kashmir." Encyclopædia Britannica, Encyclopædia Britannica, inc., 24 Oct. 2017,
www.britannica.com/place/Jammu-and-Kashmir.
- "Aksai Chin: China's disputed slice of Kashmir." CNN, Cable News Network,
edition.cnn.com/2002/WORLD/asiapcf/east/05/24/ak.sai.chin/.
- "Kashmir Profile - Timeline - BBC News." BBC News. BBC News, 26 Nov. 2014. Web. 23 July 2015.
<<http://www.bbc.com/news/world-south-asia-16069078>>.
- "UNITED NATIONS INDIA-PAKISTAN OBSERVATION MISSION (UNIPOM) - Background." UN News Center. UN, n.d. Web. 24 July 2015.
<http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/past/unipombackgr.html>
- "United Nations Official Document." United Nations, United Nations,
www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S%2FRES%2F38%281948%29.
- Who are the Kashmir militants? (2012, August 01). Retrieved July 2, 2019, from
<http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-18738906>
- "Article 370 scrapped, Jammu & Kashmir to be carved into two Union Territories"
<https://www.livemint.com/news/india/jammu-kashmir-amit-shah-moves-rajya-sabha-to-scrap-article-370-1564984999538.html>
- United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. (1982). United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. Retrieved 22 April 2017 from:

- http://www.un.org/depts/los/convention_agreements/texts/unclos/unclos_e.pdf
- Permanent Court of Arbitration. (2016). PCA Case No. 2013-19 In the Matter of the South China Sea Arbitration before an Arbitral Tribunal Constituted under Annex VII to the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea between the Republic of the Philippines and the People's Republic of China. Retrieved 10 April 2017 from: <https://pca-cpa.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/175/2016/07/PH-CN-20160712-Award.pdf>
- Association of Southeast Asian Nations. (2002). Declaration on the Conduct of Parties in the South China Sea. Retrieved 20 April 2017 from: http://asean.org/?static_post=declaration-on-the-conduct-of-parties-in-the-southchina-sea-2
- Holmes, O. (2017, March 28). Warning that Beijing's military bases in South China Sea are ready for use. The Guardian. Retrieved 8 June 2017 from: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/mar/28/beijing-military-bases-south-china-sea-ready>
- "Territorial disputes in South China Sea" <https://www.cfr.org/interactive/global-conflict-tracker/conflict/territorial-disputes-south-china-sea>
- "Explained: South China Sea dispute" <https://www.scmp.com/week-asia/article/2186449/explained-south-china-sea-dispute>
- A timeline of what happened in the South China Sea dispute. [online] Business Insider. Available at: <http://www.businessinsider.com/a-timeline-the-china-philippines-south-china-sea-dispute-2016-7>
- Taiwan: South China Sea Ruling 'Completely Unacceptable'. [online] The Diplomat. Available at: <https://thediplomat.com/2016/07/taiwan-south-china-sea-ruling-completely-unacceptable/>
- UNSC Resolution 47: <http://unscr.com/en/resolutions/doc/47>
- Tashkent declaration: <http://unscr.com/en/resolutions/doc/47>

