



QUINTESSENCE YOUTH SUMMIT 2022

UNGA BACKGROUND GUIDE

**Agenda - Deliberation on resolving
borderline disputes**

Letter from the Executive Board

Greetings Delegates,

Welcome to Quintessence Youth Summit and to the United Nations General Assembly I(DISEC), This committee addresses and deals with issues that are related to disarmament challenges to global security as well as threats to international peace.

We, being the Executive Board members, would like to show gratitude to the organizers for letting us be a part of this wonderful opportunity. We hope that by now your research is well on its way and you have formulated an idea about what, how, why, and when you want to discuss something. These questions form the very basis of the flow of debate and argumentation in the committee. This background guide will give you an overview of the topic at hand and the work of the Committee. It contains some basic elements on the topic that will guide your research. However, such mentions do not limit the scope of discussion in the committee at all. We expect from all delegates an active participation in the proceedings of this committee to have a fruitful discussion on a pertinent global problem.

For that purpose, extensive and thorough research is expected of you over and beyond this study guide. Think of this study guide as merely an initiation to your research, defining the broad aspects. A section with the questions to ponder has been added at the end of this document and can be utilized to that regard. UNA-USA Rules of Procedure shall be adhered to for the due course of this committee simulation.

Also, an important point here is that while criticism is encouraged, we expect constructive criticism in the committee. This will help you approach a problem differently and understand all perspectives. What needs to be noted here is that opinions are only different, but never wrong. An opinion is a product of multiple factors that an individual is exposed to during the course of life and hence needs to be deconstructed and not discarded.

While forming your arguments, take logical premises and not ludicrous ones as an argument is only as strong as the premise it is based on. Try to communicate your premises, followed by your arguments and then a conclusion keeping in mind the time limit. This will help you convey your message effectively. Many delegates make a mistake of quoting only articles or resolutions without explaining their relevance in the agenda.

Be rational like why this resolution is important or what a particular article of a convention implies to structure your research better. Your research should always answer “What” , “Why” , “How” and “When” . A common mistake Delegates make is simply quoting facts and figures(which can also be found on the internet), and making a logical premise out of it. Try to link these facts and figures and then direct your research.

We wish you All the very best.

Neel Taneja - neeltaneja321@gmail.com
(Chairperson)

Siddhant Magon - sid.magon@gmail.com
(Co-Chairperson)

Vanshaj Arora - beingvanshaj.07@gmail.com
(Rapporteur)

The Nature of Proof/Evidence in Council

Evidence or proof is acceptable from the following sources

→ News Sources:

State operated News Agencies – These reports can be used in the support of or against the State that owns the News Agency. These reports, if credible or substantial enough, can be used in support of or against any Country as such but in that situation, they can be denied by any other country in the council. Some examples are –

1. IRNA (Iran) <http://www.irna.ir/ENIndex.htm>,
2. BBC (United Kingdom) <http://www.bbc.co.uk/>
3. Xinhua News Agency and CCTV (P.R. Of China) <http://cctvnews.cntv.cn/>

→ Government Reports:

These reports can be used in a similar way as the State Operated News Agencies reports and can, in all circumstances, be denied by another country. However, a nuance is that a report that is being denied by a certain country can still be accepted by the Executive Board as credible information.

Examples are Government Websites like:

1. State Department of the United States of America:
<http://www.state.gov/index.htm> ,
2. Ministry of Defense of the Russian Federation:
<http://www.eng.mil.ru/en/index.htm> ,
3. Permanent Representatives to the United Nations Reports:
<http://www.un.org/en/members/> (Click on any country to get the website of the Office of its Permanent Representative.)
4. Multilateral Organizations like the NATO
(<http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/index.htm>) ASEAN
(<http://www.aseansec.org/>), OPEC (http://www.opec.org/opec_web/en/), etc.

→ UN Reports:

All UN Reports are considered as credible information or evidence for the Executive Board of the General Assembly.

1. UN Bodies: Like the SC (<http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/>), GA

(<http://www.un.org/en/ga/>), HRC
(<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/HRC/Pages/HRCIndex.aspx>) etc.

2. UN Affiliated bodies like the International Atomic Energy Agency (<http://www.iaea.org/>), World Bank (<http://www.worldbank.org/>), International Monetary Fund (<http://www.imf.org/external/index.htm>), International Committee of the Red Cross (<http://www.icrc.org/eng/index.jsp>, etc.

3. Treaty Based Bodies like the Antarctic Treaty System (<http://www.ats.aq/e/ats.htm>), the International Criminal Court (<http://www.icc-cpi.int/Menus/ICC>) .

****Under no circumstances will sources like Wikipedia**
(<http://www.wikipedia.org/>), Amnesty International
(<http://www.amnesty.org/>) or newspapers like the Guardian
(<http://www.guardian.co.uk/>), Times of India
(<http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/>) etc. be accepted as credible.

Introduction to the Committee

The United Nations (UN) Disarmament and International Security Committee (DISEC) was created as the first of the Main Committees in the General Assembly when the charter of the United Nations was signed in 1945. Thus, DISEC is often referred to as the First Committee. DISEC was formed to respond to the need for an international forum to discuss peace and security issues among members of the international community. According to the UN Charter, the purpose of DISEC in the General Assembly is to establish 'general principles of cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments and also to give "recommendations with regard to such principles to the Members or to the Security Council.'" Although DISEC cannot directly advise the Security Council's decision-making process, the UN Charter explains that DISEC can suggest specific topics for Security Council consideration. Aside from its role in the General Assembly, DISEC is also an institution of the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA), formally named in January 1998 after the Secretary-General's second special session on disarmament in 1982. The UNODA is concerned with disarmament at all levels—nuclear weapons, weapons of mass destruction, and conventional weapons—and assists DISEC through its work conducted in the General Assembly for substantive norm-setting support to further its disarmament initiatives.

INTRODUCTION

Border regions are the hub for much of the tensions that define international conflict. This topic has a variety of subgenres that have great impacts on the surrounding people and place. Armed conflict is a very pressing problem, but also the immense problems created by violations of human rights, refugees, economic losses, property losses, and the list goes on.

To effectively craft a resolution, a delegate must be prepared to delve into the historical, political and military causes of border conflicts. Border conflicts constitute a significant cause of friction and tension in modern international affairs. This problem has far reaching implications for regional stability and the maintenance of diplomatic relationships. The recurring association of territorial disputes and violent conflict underscores the imperative of constructing a resolution to this problem.

This problem is so pressing in our current context, as it is the cause of so much instability and tension throughout the world. Disputes of a territorial nature are especially hard to resolve precisely because they engender a great degree of emotional responses. For example, the conditions of boundaries and borders may have its roots in the culture and beliefs that lie at the very core of a nation. Current conflicts demonstrate the erratic nature of such tensions.

More important perhaps is the clear correlation between unstable borders and the growth of terrorism. A lack of clarity on territorial rights can often enable the development of outlaw groups and illegal markets. The threat posed by such groups to the international community thus constitutes a significant rationale for a significant resolution. It is clear from these examples alone that any discussion of territorial claims will necessarily be subject to strong partisan divisions. Indeed, this topic engages profoundly with a wide range of issues. Beyond purely armed conflict, a resolution must address ancillary areas, including the influx of refugees and other consequences of direct conflict.

THE MODERN WORLD OF BORDER CONFLICTS

The modern world of border conflicts can be roughly segmented into three separate areas. Modern conflicts are largely motivated by: **a desire for security, competition for resources and correcting the errors of decolonization.**

Security has emerged as one of the principle concerns of modern international relations, as nations seek to establish internal stability in a world punctuated by terrorism and insurgency. Unstable border zones often constitute a breeding ground for the extremism that engenders large negative externalities for the global community. Border conflicts can arise from this geopolitical reality as one nation attempts to wrest control of a problematic area from an apparently incompetent or irresponsible neighbor. The border between Afghanistan and Pakistan – a known refuge for Al Qaeda – embodies the potential for such a conflict, as serious security concerns emerge from the mismanagement of this periphery area.

The second category of territorial disputes arises out of competition for rare or valuable resources. This form of conflict is particularly prevalent in our modern world, characterized by the capitalist interactions between sovereign states. Indeed, while ambiguity in border definitions does not necessarily result in conflict, the presence of valuable resources can serve as the impetus for heightened rivalry. The South China Sea constitutes a theater for this form of intense competition for resources. Originally an irrelevant backwater, the region has soared to the top of national priorities for many of the surrounding nations due to the recent discovery of substantial resource deposits in the area. Disputes based on resources thus engage the strategic dimension of national governments as they seek to maximize wealth and national endowment.

The final category of territorial disputes is motivated by the mismanagement of decolonization. Indeed, nations that instigate claims to this end generally underscore social or cultural realities that were overlooked by Western powers in their delineation of national borders. In justifying their stances, the parties involved in the conflict generally appeal to a historical narrative that underpins their ideal state of the world. The resolution of these disputes is often a very convoluted and complex process. Delegations should consider methods of evaluating the validity of sovereign claims and successful resolutions will provide guidelines to mediate, if not resolve, these conflicts.

CASE STUDIES

The following case studies should be used as supplements to this end. These are intended to prompt the delegations' own research and each should provide another practical frame through which to examine political principles and suggested reforms. Importantly, delegations should – both in their own research and in scrutinizing the examples provided seek to segment border conflicts into different categories. Understanding the different motivations and conflicting interests that instigate territorial disputes will allow for the construction of a more substantial proposal.

CASE STUDY 1

The Turmoil in the Middle East: Israel-Palestine Border Issue

The Israeli-Palestinian conflict is older than the United Nations itself. The recent surge of violence and attacks between Israelis and Palestinians has brought new attention to an old problem. The roots of the conflict and mistrust are deep and complex, often predating the establishment of the state of Israel in 1948. The past seven decades have witnessed war, uprisings and, at times, glimmers of hope for compromise.

Timeline:

1948: A regional conflict grows amid the end of the British mandate for Palestine and Israel's declaration of independence in May 1948. A coalition of Arab states, allied with Palestinian factions, battle Israeli forces. In the end, Israel controls a large portion of territory. Hundreds of thousands of Palestinians flee or are driven from their land.

July 1956: Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser nationalizes the Suez Canal, a vital trade route connecting the Red Sea and Mediterranean. Israel invades Egypt, followed by forces from Britain and France. A peace deal, backed by the United States and Soviet Union, ends the fighting. But the canal was blocked by sunken ships and did not reopen until 1957.

June 1967: The "Six-Day War" begins with Israeli warplanes striking Egyptian airfields and Israeli ground forces entering the Sinai Peninsula. The war broke out amid lingering conflicts, including Egypt's continued block of shipping into the Gulf of Aqaba. Jordan joins the fighting alongside Egypt, but Israeli forces have the upper hand after nearly wiping out Egypt's air power. Israel takes control of the Gaza Strip, Sinai, the West Bank, the Golan Heights and predominantly Arab East Jerusalem. Hundreds of thousands of Palestinians flee or are displaced.

October 1973: A coalition of Arab nations, led by Egypt and Syria, launch a surprise attack on Israel. The Arab forces initially gained ground, but were driven back by an Israeli counteroffensive aided by supplies from allies, including the United States.

1978: A peace deal between Egyptian President Anwar Sadat and Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin, known as the Camp David accords, is brokered on Sept. 17, 1978, by President Jimmy Carter. Potential Palestinian peace proposals were discussed, but never carried out.

December 1987: A Palestinian uprising, or intifada, brings clashes and protests in the West Bank, Gaza and Israel. Unrest continues for years, with many killed or injured on both sides.

1993: The first of two pacts, known as the Oslo accords, are signed between Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization, setting out a peace process based on previous U.N. resolutions. (A follow-up accord was signed in 1995.) The agreements created the Palestinian Authority, to oversee most administrative affairs in the West Bank and Gaza. The PLO is recognized by Israel and the United States as a negotiating partner. Left unresolved, however, are key issues such as Israeli settlements in the West Bank and the status of Jerusalem, which is viewed by the Palestinians as the capital of any future state.

2000: The second intifada, or Palestinian uprising, begins after riots broke out following a visit by right-wing Israeli political figure Ariel Sharon (and later prime minister) to a compound in Jerusalem venerated in Judaism, Christianity and Islam. Clashes and other violence continue until 2005, leaving hundreds dead on both sides.

2006: The Palestinian militant group Hamas wins elections in Gaza, leading to political strains with the more moderate Fatah party controlling the West Bank.

December 2008: Israel begins three weeks of attacks on Gaza after rocket barrages into Israel by Palestinian militants, who are supplied by tunnels from Egypt. More than 1,110 Palestinians and at least 13 Israelis are killed.

November 2012: Israel kills Hamas military chief Ahmed Jabari, touching off more than a week of rocket fire from Gaza and Israeli airstrikes. At least 150 Palestinians and six Israelis are killed.

Summer 2014: Hamas militants kill three Israeli teenagers kidnapped near a Jewish settlement in the West Bank, prompting an Israeli military response.

Hamas answers with rocket attacks from Gaza. A seven-week conflict leaves more than 2,200 Palestinians dead in Gaza. In Israel, 67 soldiers and six civilians are killed.

December 2017: The Trump administration recognizes Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and announces that it plans to shift the U.S. Embassy from Tel Aviv, stirring outrage from Palestinians.

2018: Protests take place in Gaza along the fence with Israel, including demonstrators hurling rocks and gasoline bombs across the barrier. Israeli troops kill more than 170 protesters over several months. In November, Israel stages a covert raid into Gaza. At least seven suspected Palestinian militants and a senior Israeli army officer are killed. From Gaza, hundreds of rockets are fired into Israel.

May 2021: After weeks of tension in Jerusalem led to Israeli police raiding al-Aqsa Mosque, one of the holiest sites in Islam, Hamas fired rockets toward the city for the first time in years, prompting Israel to retaliate with airstrikes. The fighting, the fiercest since at least 2014, saw thousands of rockets fired from Gaza and hundred of airstrikes on the Palestinian territory, with more than 200 killed in Gaza and at least 10 killed in Israel.

Lastly the Israel-Palestine conflict is intense, controversial, complex, and violent. Although different plans have been tried and failed, negotiations are restarting on both sides. Now is an important time for the international community to act and help both sides come to an agreement that will lead to peace.

CASE STUDY 2

India and Pakistan Conflict

October 1947 – January 1949: The first Indo-Pakistani war began following an invasion of Kashmir by armed tribesmen from Pakistan. Kashmir turned to India for military assistance and in return agreed to hand over powers of defense, communication and foreign affairs, acceding to India. A ceasefire was arranged on Jan. 1, 1949 and a ceasefire line was established – now called the Line of Control.

August 1965: The second Indo-Pakistani war was sparked by a series of clashes across the India-Pakistani border. Hostilities broke out in August when Pakistani soldiers crossed the Line of Control into Indian-administered Kashmir in an attempt to start an insurgency against India (Operation Gibraltar). The war ended in January 1966 when officials from India and Pakistan signed a declaration affirming their commitment to peace.

December 1971: When India and Pakistan became their own countries, Pakistan was split into two parts – East Pakistan and West Pakistan. The third Indo-Pakistani war took place when Pakistan erupted into civil war, pitting West Pakistan against East Pakistan, who demanded independence. Millions of east Pakistanis fled to India, and quickly the West Pakistani army surrendered. East Pakistan earned independence on Dec. 6, 1971 and changed its name to Bangladesh.

May 1974: India successfully tested its first nuclear weapon, code named “Operation Smiling Buddha.” It took place on the army base Pokhran Test Range, close to its border with Pakistan.

July 1989: Armed resistance against Indian rule began in Kashmir when Muslim parties complained that the 1987 elections were rigged against them. Some citizens demanded independence while others wanted a union with Pakistan. Pakistan supported the movement, calling for the issue to be resolved by the United Nations. India called for Pakistan to end cross-border terrorism. Since 1989, several new radical Islamist groups have emerged, shifting the movement from a nationalistic and secularist one to an Islamic one. The insurgency has continued until present day.

May 1998: India and Pakistan both conducted nuclear tests. India’s underground nuclear test was conducted near its border with Pakistan. In response, Pakistan conducted six tests. The international community condemned India and Pakistan for the testing, and urged the two nations to stop their nuclear weapons programs.

May 1998: India adopted a No First Use (NFU) policy, meaning the state would not use nuclear weapons unless it was attacked with a nuclear weapon first. Despite questions around the policy, India remains faithful to the NFU doctrine.

May 1999: After nearly 30 years, India launched air strikes against Pakistani-backed forces that had entered Indian-administered Kashmir. As fighting increased toward a direct conflict between the two nuclear states, Pakistan’s troops were put on high alert. At least 38,000 people fled their homes on the Pakistani side of the Line of Control.

September 2016 : Suspected terrorists sneak into an Indian army base in Kashmir's Uri and kill 18 soldiers. 11 days later, Indian Army carried out "surgical strikes" to destroy terror launch pads across the Line of Control in Pakistan.

February 2019: Pakistani-based terrorist group Jaish-e-Mohammed carried out a suicide car bomb attack in Indian-controlled Kashmir which resulted in

the deaths of over 40 members of India's paramilitary forces. India retaliated with air strikes across the Line of Control, and Pakistan shot down an Indian aircraft and captured a pilot. These actions significantly increased tensions between the two nuclear states but two days later, the Indian pilot was released and tensions relaxed.

August 2019: In a controversial and unexpected move, the Indian government revoked Article 370 which grants Indian-administered Kashmir autonomy. Article 370 gave Kashmir the rights to its own "constitution, a separate flag and freedom to make laws" regarding residency, property ownership, and fundamental rights. Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi argued that the Article needed to be scrapped in order to put Kashmir on the same footing as the rest of India. Pakistan stayed relatively silent following this decision but did highlight the violence Kashmiris have experienced since August.

The India-Pakistan relations are one of the most complex associations that India shares with any of its neighboring countries. In spite of the many contentious issues, India and Pakistan have made major strides in reducing the "trust deficit" over the past few years.

CASE STUDY 3

Russia and Ukraine Conflict

The current situation between the Russian Federation and the state of Ukraine has reached a major tipping point as Russian troops are now pouring over the borders of Russia as well as Belarus. Satellite Imagery has shown a massive buildup of the military might of the Russian Federation. The situation in Ukraine has reached dire straits as President Volodymyr Zelensky has been forced to install martial law due to the impending savage attacks on Kyiv and other major Ukrainian cities such as Kharkiv, Odessa, and Mariupol.

Timeline:

Dec. 1, 1991: Ukraine Becomes Independent

Shortly after the fall of the Soviet Union, Ukraine voted for independence. The Ukrainian people overwhelmingly support becoming a sovereign state. Ukraine is the second-largest country in Europe by land-mass and has a sizable population of ethnic Russians.

Dec. 5, 1994: The Budapest Memorandum Is Signed

The Budapest Memorandum on Security Assurances was signed in late 1994. This document was signed following Ukraine's agreement to transfer all nuclear weapons from the Cold War to the Russian Federation, making Ukraine a non-nuclear power. Prior to this, Ukraine had physical possession of

the world's third-largest nuclear stockpile. In addition to Ukraine, the Budapest Memorandum was signed by the United States, the United Kingdom and Russia. All the signatories committed to honoring Ukraine's sovereignty and its rights to its territory.

November – December 2004: The Orange Revolution Overturns Election Results

A presidential election between Viktor Yushchenko, a western-oriented candidate, and Viktor Yanukovych, who was supported by Russia, creates a massive controversy. Yushchenko was mysteriously poisoned before the election but was able to recover. Victory was declared in favor of Yanukovych but the election was widely seen as fraudulent. Ukrainians take to the street wearing orange, which was Yushchenko's campaign color. By December, protestors were able to force a re-vote, resulting in a victory for Yushchenko.

April 3, 2008: Russia Fights Ukrainian NATO Membership

In early April of 2008, a NATO summit began with intense debate about extending a Membership Action Plan (MAP) to Ukraine. In order to gain membership to NATO, a military alliance between 28 European countries and two North American countries dedicated to preserving peace and security in the North Atlantic area, countries must first have a MAP. Putin makes his opposition to Ukrainian membership known to NATO leaders, at one point allegedly telling President George W. Bush that Ukraine is "not even a real nation-state." NATO does not offer Ukraine a MAP.

November 2013 to February 2014: Euromaidan Protests Prompt Sudden Change in Government

After promising to work toward a relationship with the European Union, President Yanukovych, who ran for president again and won in 2010, changes political direction and begins to orient Ukraine toward Russia. This, combined with the controversial arrest of political opponent Yulia Tymoshenko, spark widespread protests about perceived government corruption. There are protests across the country, centering on Maidan Square in Kyiv. At least 130 people, primarily civilians, are killed. Yanukovych flees to Russia, the new leadership commits to orienting Ukraine toward the European Union.

February 2014 to March 2014: Russia Seizes Crimea, Creating International Outrage

Russia seizes Crimea, a Ukrainian peninsula with a predominantly ethnic Russian population, in the aftermath of the Euromaidan protests. Russian troops occupy key sites on the peninsula, wearing military uniforms with Russian insignias removed. The annexation prompts international outrage and is condemned by the United Nations and the European Union.

December 2021: Putin Demands Security Guarantees

Early in 2021, Zelenskyy cracked down on pro-Russian Ukrainian oligarchs, including Viktor Medvedchuk, a close friend of Putin. Subsequently, Putin deploys increasing numbers of troops near the Ukrainian border and publishes an article claiming that Russians and Ukrainians are “one people.” By December, tens of thousands of Russian troops are deployed to the borders and Putin issues demands to NATO and the United States. Among these demands is that Ukraine never be admitted to NATO – a request rejected by the Biden administration.

Feb. 21, 2022: Russia Recognizes Breakaway Ukrainian Regions as Sovereign

In 2014, the Ukrainian regions of Donetsk and Luhansk broke away from Ukraine, under the leadership of what the Ukrainian government considered to be Russian-backed terrorists. Following the breakdown of relations with NATO and the West in late February, Putin recognized these territories as independent states and sent troops in to “keep the peace.”

Feb. 24, 2022: Russia Launches Full-Scale Invasion of Ukraine

Days after recognizing the breakaway territories, Russia launched a full-scale invasion of Ukraine. The invasion began in the eastern Ukrainian territory of Donbas. Zelenskyy declared martial law in Ukraine and officially broke diplomatic ties with Russia. Putin’s actions were condemned across the world and within Russia.

Sept. 11, 2022: Ukraine Forces Russian Retreat

After months of Russian encroachment, Ukrainian forces pushed the Russian military back, reclaiming over a thousand square miles. Russia lost nearly all of the northeastern region of Kharkiv, infuriating Putin and demonstrating Ukraine’s ability to repel the Russian military by force. In response, the Russians attacked Ukrainian infrastructure, leaving many without power and water.

Sept. 21, 2022: Putin Calls Up Reservists

Putin delivered a speech outlining his plan to mobilize an additional 300,000 troops in an effort to reclaim lost territory. The decision was highly controversial, with reports of men who were past the age of conscription being told to turn up for conscription. In response, by some estimates thousands of young Russian men fled the country, many with no plan to return.

Oct. 5: Russia Annexes Four Ukrainian Regions

Putin signed final papers to annex four regions of Ukraine – Donetsk, Luhansk, Kherson and Zaporizhzhia – following Kremlin-orchestrated

“referendums” in Ukraine that the West dismissed as shams. In response, the U.S. and its allies slapped sanctions on more than 1,000 Russian people and companies, building on significant financial penalties already imposed on the nation since the invasion.

Lastly, How far Russia is willing to go to achieve its aims remains an open question. Even though there has been mention of bolstering NATO forces in other parts of Europe, this could actually inflame the situation and push Russia to launch an attack, especially if Moscow considers the alliance’s actions escalatory or destabilizing. In this context, NATO might do well to make public commitments that may give Russia pause. Engaging in dialogue about the security architecture of Europe may be the only way to de-escalate the crisis.

ISSUES TO CONSIDER

Boundary and territorial disputes often stem from material and/or cultural claims; sometimes they may also emerge as a result of fundamental changes in domestic and international environments. In certain circumstances, boundary and territorial disputes may even evolve into geopolitical games of big-power rivalry and competition. This chapter analyzes five factors (resource scarcity, locational feature, domestic politics, geopolitical competition, and cultural difference), as well as how they have decisively influenced cross-border tensions in disputed territories. In addition, a roadmap to peaceful development is provided for policymakers involved in territorial disputes.

- *Territorial disputes and cross-border resource management*
- *Cross-Border Conflict Prevention and Management*
- *Economies off the scale*
- *Infrastructure*
- *Nuclear Warfare*
- *Terrorist Organisations*

WHAT THE UN HAS DONE

The UN has made several attempts to address the diverse issue of border conflicts in the past. These actions must be supplemented by an effort that includes ways to address both the important cases which are most dramatically dangerous today and the general issues which border conflicts have in common. While there have been several resolutions dealing with border conflict in general, this portion of the guide will focus

on the development of issues in the Middle East from early on in the history of the UN as a case study of actions taken regarding previous border conflict scenarios in the region. Because a new state was created, Israel, several border conflicts have erupted, and continue to erupt, in the region. It will also discuss other instances of border conflicts and the steps taken to remediate those in general.

UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 242

The Security Council adopted Resolution 242 on 22 November 1967. Along with dealing with border conflicts, this is one of the most significant and frequently cited UNSC resolutions. The resolution was written in response to the situation in the Middle East in the wake of the Six-Day War. The Six-Day War was between Israel and neighboring countries in the Middle East--Egypt (then the United Arab Republic), Jordan, and Syria. In six days, Israel had gained control of several territories taken from these neighboring nations. It was frightening because of the speed and ease with which the border conflict had escalated into the formation of new territories. The resolution itself delineates the position of the United Nations in responding to border conflicts, underlying some of the exchanges and compromises necessitated from either side (in this case, Israel and various Arab states who were parties to the conflict.) The resolution decried the gains of territory of war, and asked for the withdrawal of Israeli troops in the region. It also mentioned several important aspects which arose because of the nature of this border conflict and border conflicts in general: the freedom of navigation in waterways, the refugee problem, the notion of political independence, and more. It also emphasized the use of dialogue in establishing a long-term solution to the topic.

UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 1862

Recently, and outside the Middle East, issues have erupted along the border between Djibouti and Eritrea. On 14 January 2009, the Security Council adopted a resolution which sought to address that border dispute. This resolution committed itself to the territorial integrity of both parties, called for restraint on both sides, and invited the restoration of the status quo. This resolution is important because it is an example of a response which takes place when several initial measures to address a border conflict have failed. The resolution was concerned about the lack of dialogue, bilateral discussions, and mediation, creating a situation where a problem was not resolved by the initiation of talks, which are usually the first step in border conflicts. This resolution was also concerned about the proliferation of regional instability, and the fact that Eritrea had declined to grant entrance visas to UN officials or an envoy of the Secretary-General. In response, the

Security Council asked for the respect of Eritrea's obligation as a member of the UN and complies with the repeated requests to initiate peace.

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER

- How can decolonization be managed to mitigate the escalation of territorial disputes?
- What are some solutions committee can come up with to stop the influx of insurgent groups?
- How can the Human Rights violations arising out of military presence in the region be mitigated?
- How the conciliation from the UN can be stronger?