

The Doon School Model United
Nations Conference 2017

BACKGROUND GUIDE



SPECIAL POLITICAL
AND DECOLONIZATION
COMMITTEE

CONTENTS

ABOUT DSMUN page 3

A LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY GENERAL page 4

A LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT page 5

A LETTER FROM THE CHAIRPERSON page 6

AGENDA 1: SELF-DETERMINATION OF THE KASHMIR VALLEY

History page 7

Previous Action Taken on the Matter page 9

Current Situation page 9

Key Events page 10

Bloc Positions page 11

Questions a Resolution Must Answer page 12

About the Committee page 12

AGENDA 2: MILITARIZATION OF OUTER SPACE

History page 13

Previous Action Taken on the Matter page 13

Current Situation page 14

Space Debris page 16

Action Taken by the United Nations page 16

Bloc Positions page 16

Questions a Resolution Must Answer page 17

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND FURTHER READING page 18

POSITION PAPER GUIDELINES page 19

SAMPLE DRAFT RESOLUTION page 19

PREAMBULATORY AND OPERATIVE CLAUSES page 20

ABOUT DSMUN

The Doon School Model United Nations Conference is one of India's biggest and most reputed high school MUN conference. Inaugurated in 2007, the Doon School Model United Nations Society has consistently hosted a series of engaging, entertaining and intellectually stimulating conferences, with each leaving a unique legacy behind it. DSMUN has grown to be one of the key entries in every MUNning calendar. DSMUN has a history of attracting the best of, both, the Indian and the international delegates from the Pan-Asiatic Region. Over the years, DSMUN has never failed to surprise, with an array of committees ranging from the orthodox to specialised and unconventional simulations, from the regional to the international and covering a range of time periods.

The Doon School, one of India's most reputed and prestigious institutions, is a member of the G20 Group of Schools, The Headmasters' and Headmistresses' Conference, The International Boys' Schools Coalition and the Round Square Conference. With its motto, "Knowledge our Light", the school aims to mold its students into leaders for the future and gentlemen of service. Model United Nations has now become one of the largest and most popular activities in school with over 200 students being involved in it. The beautiful and serene 72 acre Chandbagh estate, in which the school is set, creates a scenic backdrop to the challenging and pertinent issues being discussed.

The DSMUN Secretariat is proud to host The 11th Doon School Model United Nations Conference from the 18th to the 20th of August, 2017. Popularly referred to as DSMUN '17, this year's conference promises to engage delegates with 14 diverse committees, each of which will discuss various relevant, thought-provoking agendas.

We look forward to seeing you in Dehradun later this year as the rains drench the Chadbagh estate.

Crises to keep you on your toes, unforgettable memories, interesting new people to meet and an experience worth a lifetime! DSMUN '17 will have it all.

DSMUN '17



Divij Mullick
SECRETARY GENERAL

Deep Dhandhania
PRESIDENT

Vedant Mehra
CHAIRPERSON

Armaan Verma
Devansh Mittal
DEPUTY CHAIRPERSONS

A LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY GENERAL

Greetings!

It gives us great pleasure to welcome you all to the 11th Doon School Model United Nations Conference. Over the years, DSMUN has grown into one of the finest and most reputed high school MUN conferences in the country. This year too we hope to deliver the goods and make this year's session an unforgettable one. With agendas ranging from religious turmoil in the Middle East to the manhunt for Edward Snowden and Julian Assange, this year's simulations promise to be exciting, engaging and challenging.

I am a Humanities student and have a keen interest in Economics and History. Besides being a MUNner, I am a passionate theatre person and public speaker. I also have an interest in cricket and boxing.

I have served DSMUN in various capacities ranging from the Secretariat to being a delegate and eventually the Vice-president. DSMUN is an activity which has been very important to me during my school life and this time I am excited to head this very significant event.

I am indeed honoured to be working with such an accomplished and hard-working team on the Executive Board and look forward to a memorable time this fall!

Warm Regards,
(Divij Mullick)

SMUN '17



Divij Mullick
SECRETARY GENERAL

Deep Dhandhanian
PRESIDENT

Vedant Mehra
CHAIRPERSON

Armaan Verma
Devansh Mittal
DEPUTY CHAIRPERSONS

A LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT

Greetings!

It is an honour and privilege to welcome all of you to the 11th Doon School Model United Nations Conference. Over the years, DSMUN has grown to be one of the most prestigious and competitive high school conferences in the country, and we hope that this year's conference will be a bigger success. With fourteen different committees ranging from the All India Political Parties Meet to the United Nations High Commission for Refugees, we have strived to design an exciting and engaging conference for participating delegates.

I have been involved in DSMUN for the past 5 years in various capacities including Media and the Secretariat. I have an avid interest in history, politics and international affairs and wish to pursue international relations in college. I am also a passionate hockey player and the Editor-in Chief of The Doon School Yearbook.

This year, Divij and I hope to make this conference a successful and a truly memorable experience for one and all.

Looking forward to meet all of you at Chandbagh this August!

Warm Regards,
(Deep Dhandhanian)



Divij Mullick
SECRETARY GENERAL

Deep Dhandhania
PRESIDENT

Vedant Mehra
CHAIRPERSON

Armaan Verma
Devansh Mittal
DEPUTY CHAIRPERSONS

A LETTER FROM THE CHAIRPERSON

Greetings, Delegates! My name is Vedant Mehra and it is my privilege to serve as the Chairperson of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee at DSMUN 2017.

Before moving into the intricacies of committee, I'd like to tell you a bit about myself: I'm from Bombay and am pursuing the IBDP curriculum. My primary interests lie in Economics and History. Outside of academics, I frequently participate in debates, quizzes, MUNs and an array of sports. Most importantly, I am passionate about global affairs because in a globalised world such as ours, I feel that sustaining that connectivity is crucial for success.

As for the committee; I discourage flashiness and showmanship and would advise delegates to focus on presentation, but not prioritize it over content.

Agendas:

- Our primary focus will be 'Self-determination of Kashmir Valley', which will require decisive thinking; something I expect delegates to bring along with their research binders. Thus, delegates are encouraged to be thorough in their research on the topic as well as their portfolio. You will be required to act based on this and this alone, regardless of personal views.

- Our second agenda shall be the 'Militarisation of Outer Space', which demands updated information on activities on the interstellar front.

All that is left is for me is to wish you luck with your preparations and remind you that participation in the committee's proceedings is key to enjoying the experience.

I look forward to working with each one of you this fall!

Sincerely,
(Vedant Mehra)
Chairperson- SPECPOL

AGENDA 1: SELF-DETERMINATION OF THE KASHMIR VALLEY HISTORY

In 1846, the First Anglo-Sikh War ended and brought about the creation of the Princely State of Jammu and Kashmir under the rule of Gulab Singh, simultaneously creating a disparate blend of regions, races, and religions. In 1947, when India underwent partition and the nation-state of Pakistan was formed, the Maharaja of Kashmir chose to remain sovereign, not bound to either country's laws. The reason given for this by Maharaja Hari Singh was the dissatisfaction of the Muslim majority population on joining India and the potential vulnerability of the Hindu and Buddhist minorities on joining Pakistan, but it created an avenue for the invasion of Pathan and Pashtun tribesmen that later took place. Their transgression into Kashmiri territory was Pakistan's first attempt to occupy the region. Kashmir then called upon the armed forces of India as well as numerous other resources to aid it in such circumstances and agreed to fulfil its demands of accession, along with appointing Sheikh Abdullah as the first Prime Minister. India, however declared the accession to be temporary since the government at the time believed it was the people, not the Maharaja, who decided to which country they belonged. Conditions worsened following an armed revolt in the Poonch district in southern Kashmir, believed to be instigated by Mian Iftikharuddin. He was reportedly tasked with the duty by Liaquat Ali Khan, the Pakistani Prime Minister himself.

Prior to Partition, the two prevalent parties in Kashmir were the National Conference and the Muslim Conference, the former being led by the popular Sheikh Abdullah standing in favor of accession to India. When Kashmir finally merged with the Union of India, National Conference workers helped the Indian army drive out insurgents. The First Indo-Pakistani War ended in 1948, ultimately sealing the fate of Kashmir. Although, there was a brief period that witnessed UN mediation at the Indian government's request, which complied with the desires of both India and Pakistan. The United

Nations intervened and declared the need for the Indian government to hold a plebiscite and let the people of Kashmir decide whether or not they wished to be part of India. This, along with many other details was addressed in Resolution 47, passed by the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan in 1948.

Pakistan ignored the UN mandate and persisted with their skirmishes, gripping the portion of Kashmir that it controlled with an iron fist. On January 1, 1949, a ceasefire was agreed upon, with 65 per cent of the territory under Indian control and the remainder with Pakistan. The ceasefire was intended to be temporary but the Line of Control continues to be the de facto border between the two countries. An uneasy peace prevailed while a solution to the question of a Kashmiri plebiscite was sought. From India's point of view, Pakistani transgression was seen as a hostile act and an invasion of Indian territory and the plebiscite merely a confirmation of its already legalized administration over Jammu and Kashmir by virtue of its accession. The Pakistani government, on the other hand, claimed that Jammu and Kashmir had executed a Standstill Agreement with Pakistan, which prohibited it from entering agreements with other countries. It also pronounced openly that the Maharaja had neither any authority nor means left to execute an accession because his subjects had risen in revolt and he was compelled to flee the capital. Pakistan was of the belief that the Azad Kashmir movement as well as the tribal incursions was indigenous and sudden, and the assistance it provided them with was very well justified.



During the 1950s, at which all parties involved in the conflict awaited point in time a plebiscite, the flight of the genocide-fearing Hindus and Sikhs took place, displacing them to several other corners of India. A military standoff also occurred as both India and Pakistan moved their troops to the border in what they saw as a deterrence to attack from each other. However, in July 1953, Jawaharlal Nehru, the Prime Minister of India, declared the beginning of preparations to hold a plebiscite in Jammu and Kashmir not only for the benefit of the Kashmiri people but also to seek an end to the conflict that had ensued after Partition. He offered Pakistan such a settlement, but Pakistan, by such time, had progressed in its strategy regarding Kashmir. Taking advantage of the circumstances created by the Cold War, Pakistan actively pursued American military aid to reinforce its claim on Kashmir. The Pakistan government was convinced that a military alliance with the United States was an assured way of gaining control over the region, resulting in the withdrawal of Nehru's offer and the conclusion that the status quo was the only remaining option. Sheikh Abdullah, after taking up a stance that supported self-determination and delaying accession to India was dismissed and arrested. The formation of a new government in Jammu and Kashmir finally ratified the kingdom's accession to India.



The status quo remained until 1962, when the Sino-Indian War broke out as troops from both the People's Republic of China and India clashed in their claim to the northeast region of Kashmir. This was mainly due to the Chinese annexation of Tibet and the ambiguity of the boundary it shared with Kashmir. China overpowered Indian efforts to defend

the area and captured it, resulting in its new name; Aksai Chin. Chinese involvement in the issue further complicated things as now, it owned territory claimed by Pakistan as well as India. The region known as the Trans-Karakoram was demarcated as the boundary between Chinese and Pakistani territory.

In 1965, Pakistan deemed circumstances ripe for a hostile takeover of Kashmir. Under the codename 'Operation Gibraltar', it sent an estimated 30,000 troops across the border for the main purpose of inciting a rebellion among the Kashmiri populace. This resulted in the Indo-Pakistani War of 1965. However, contrary to Pakistani expectations, 'Operation Gibraltar' ended in failure since the Kashmiris did not revolt. Rather, they reported the presence of Pakistani infiltrators to the Indian authorities in considerable numbers, and the Indian Army ended up fighting the Pakistani invaders head-on. Pakistan claimed that the captured men were Kashmiri 'freedom fighters', which was contradicted by the international media. The war finally ended with the Tashkent Agreement, following which both sides agreed to keep out of each other's internal affairs and withdraw to their own previous positions. The 1971 Indo-Pakistani War, fought over the creation of the state of Bangladesh, had allowed old concerns to resurface and in the Simla Agreement that was finally signed, it was concluded by both the Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi and the Pakistani Prime Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, that bilateral negotiations and peaceful means of settling disputes were the only way of lessening hostilities and ending conflict. A clause of the Simla Agreement declared that multilateral negotiations initiated by one nation would not take place without the other's consent. There exists a widespread belief that India used this to keep the UN uninvolved in the conflict. Realizing that dialogue and reconciliation, rather than confrontational politics and hostility in negotiations, were now required to resolve the Kashmir conundrum, Sheikh Abdullah changed his approach to the situation. In 1975, he came to an accord with Indira Gandhi to end all demand for a plebiscite and focus on self-rule of the Kashmiri people by a democratically elected government. The

National Conference was revived and in 1977, known as the first “free and fair” election in the state, it won 47 out of 74 seats, thereby making Sheikh Abdullah Chief Minister of Jammu and Kashmir once again. The year 1989 witnessed the beginning of a popular and widespread-armed insurgency. There is evidence to suggest that the Mujahedeen that poured into the region after the Soviet-Afghan War, though

there is speculation that they are members of the Jammu Kashmir Liberation Front trying to organize militancy in the Kashmir Valley, incited it; many are of the belief that it was due to both. This insurgency continues today and is the main reason for such extents of public unrest in the region, aside from the already present tensions between India and Pakistan.

PREVIOUS ACTION TAKEN ON THE MATTER

In the 1950s, Sir Owen Dixon, the UN-appointed mediator on the matter, who is believed to have come the closest to solving the Kashmir dispute by many critics and historians, did mediation. Dixon arrived in the subcontinent in May 1950 and, after a single visit to Kashmir, propounded the idea of a summit between India and Pakistan. The summit lasted five days, at the end of which Dixon declared that organizing a statewide plebiscite would be impossible. He clarified that people in Jammu and Ladakh were clearly in favour of acceding to the population of Azad Kashmir and the Northern Areas wished to be part of Pakistan. This left the Kashmir Valley and a more or less small part of adjacent territory in highly uncertain political terrain. Nehru then brought forward a partition-cum-plebiscite plan wherein Jammu and Ladakh would be given to

India, Azad Kashmir and Gilgit-Baltistan to Pakistan, and a plebiscite would be held in the Kashmir Valley. Dixon favoured the plan, which bears his name till this day, however he did express his concern, that Kashmiri people would be driven to vote under external influences.

The primary obstruction in this scenario was that Dixon proposed, despite Liaquat Ali Khan’s objections, that Sheikh Abdullah’s administration should be held in “commission” (in a state of suspension) while the plebiscite was being held. This was not acceptable to India under any circumstances. At that point, Dixon conceded and declared failure of the plan. He came to the conclusion that India would not agree to conditions governing the plebiscite that prevent the involvement of influence and abuse, which would have ensured a free and fair plebiscite.

CURRENT SITUATION

Kashmir today is divided into the Pakistan-administered Azad Kashmir and Gilgit-Baltistan, the Trans-Karakoram Tract and Aksai Chin under Chinese control and finally the are encompassing the Kashmir Valley, Jammu and Ladakh. It is a volatile melting pot of human rights violations, territorial claims, and repression. There are many terrorist groups (such as the Al-Qaeda) that are believed to operate in the Kashmir Valley. The Indian Army and the Pakistani Army both have an increased presence in the area despite the ceasefire agreement of 2003 along the Line of Control, due to a rise in violence and cross-border insurgent activities.

In 2016, the United Nations General Assembly reaffirmed the right of every group of people to

self-determination as a fundamental aspect of the sovereignty propagated by the UN Charter. Bearing this in mind, it is quite easy to state Kashmir requires the plebiscite it was promised long ago, but the repercussions that would follow could be catastrophic. To lessen the consequences of the same on not only the geopolitical level, but also on the international scale, SPECPOL wishes countries to band together and come to a definitive conclusion on the matter. It will require much more than rhetoric and imparting ethics to others to resolve the conflict since any kind of diplomacy will need to satisfy the wants of not just the Indian and Pakistani governments, but also the Kashmiri people, not even mentioning the various minorities and external third-parties involved.

Another critical issue is the indiscriminate human rights violations that have taken place in the region. Organizations such as Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch have reported that, in the past, the Indian Army has used rape as an intimidation strategy on the Kashmiri population. Other

reports have implicated Indian military forces for disappearances of persons as well as extrajudicial killings. SPECPOL is of the belief that such outrageous crimes against humanity need to be addressed and dealt with.

KEY EVENTS

1947 – End of British rule and partition of sub-continent into mainly Hindu India and Muslim-majority state of Pakistan.

1947 – The Maharaja of Kashmir signs a treaty of accession with India after a Pakistani tribal army attacks. War breaks out between India and Pakistan over the region.

1948 – India raises Kashmir in the UN Security Council, which in Resolution 47 calls for a referendum on the status of the territory. The resolution also calls on Pakistan to withdraw its troops and India to cut its military presence to a minimum. A ceasefire comes into force, but Pakistan refuses to evacuate its troops. Kashmir is for all practical purposes partitioned.

1951 – Elections in the Indian-administered state of Jammu and Kashmir back accession to India. India says this makes a referendum unnecessary. The UN and Pakistan say a referendum needs to take into account the views of voters throughout the former princely state.

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

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

1950s – China gradually occupies Eastern Kashmir (Aksai Chin). Sino – Indian War.

1962 – China defeats India in a short war for control of Aksai Chin.

1963 – Pakistan cedes the Trans-Karakoram Tract of Kashmir to China.

1965 – A brief war between Indian and Pakistan over Kashmir ends in a ceasefire and a return to the previous positions.

1971-72 – Another Indo-Pakistani war ends in defeat for Pakistan and leads to the 1972 Simla Agreement. This turns the Kashmir ceasefire line into the Line of Control, pledges both sides to settle their differences through negotiations, and calls for a final settlement of the Kashmir dispute. The Agreement forms the basis of Pakistani-Indian relations thereafter.

1974 – The Opposition Plebiscite Front in Indian-administered Jammu and Kashmir drops demand for a referendum in return for extensive autonomy in an agreement with the Indian government. Sheikh Abdullah becomes chief minister, and his political dynasty continues to dominate the National Conference and state after his death in 1982.

1984 – The Indian Army seizes control of the Siachen Glacier, an area not demarcated by the Line of Control. Pakistan makes frequent attempts to capture the area in the following decades.

Start of insurgency

1987 – Disputed state elections in Indian-administrated Jammu and Kashmir give impetus to a pro-independence insurgency centred around the Jammu and Kashmir Liberation Front (JKLF). India accuses Pakistan of fomenting the insurgency by despatching fighters across the Line of Control, which Pakistan denies.

1990 – The insurgency escalates after the Indian Army kills about 100 demonstrators at Gawakadal Bridge. Attacks and threats lead to the flight of almost all Hindus from the Kashmir Valley area of the state. India imposes Armed Forces Special Powers Act (AFSPA) in Jammu and Kashmir.

1990s – The insurgency continues, with Kashmiri militants training in Pakistan and India deploying hundreds of thousands of troops in Jammu and Kashmir. Violence against civilians by both sides is widespread.

1999 – India and Pakistan go to war again after militants cross from Pakistani-administered Kashmir into the Indian-administered Kargil district. India repulses the attack, accuses Pakistan of being behind it, and breaks off relations.

2001–04 – Moves to boost relations between the two countries are punctuated by continuing violence, notably an attack on the parliament of Indian-administered Jammu and Kashmir in Srinagar in 2001.

2010 – Major protests erupt in the Kashmir Valley of Indian-administered Jammu and the Indian army kills Kashmiri over the summer after a demonstrator. The protests abate in September after the government announces measures to ease tension.

2011 August – Chief Minister Omar Abdullah announces an amnesty for the 1,200 young men who threw stones at security forces during the anti-government protests in the Kashmir Valley the previous year.

Indian State Human Rights Commission (SHRC) confirms presence of more than 2,000 unidentified

bodies in unmarked graves near the Line of Control. Activists say many may be people who disappeared after being arrested by security forces.

2011 September – Indian forces kill three Pakistani soldiers in firing across the Line of Control. India accuses Pakistan of opening fire first.

2012 August – The Chief Minister of Indian-administered Jammu and Kashmir, Omar Abdullah, says that the security situation there is not yet conducive to the revoking of the Armed Forces Special Powers Act (AFSPA) in the state.

2012 September – Indian President Pranab Mukherjee visits Indian-administered Jammu and Kashmir within two months of taking up office. Despite the threat of protests from separatists, the visit passes off without serious incident.

2013 March – Curfew imposed in Indian-administered Kashmir following a day of violence in which at least eight people were killed.

2013 September – Prime ministers of India and Pakistan meet and agree to try reduce the number of violent incidents at their disputed border in Kashmir.

BLOC POSITIONS

India: In terms of the immediate border conflict with Pakistan, India declares that the entire state of Jammu and Kashmir is a part of India. In response to international calls for a plebiscite to decide the fate of the region, India maintains that the continued participation of Kashmiri people in Indian national elections amounts to recognition of Indian sovereignty. As a result, any unrest in the region is considered an internal issue, so India is unlikely to accept much international intervention (military, economic, or otherwise) in the region. India also emphasizes that Chinese-controlled Aksai Chin is part of India, and has long asked for negotiations with China to establish a Line of Actual Control (de facto border) and prevent future conflict.

Pakistan: Pakistan is likely to reiterate calls for a plebiscite (referendum) to decide the future of Kashmir. They are likely to support foreign intervention in the area, as this internationalizes the Kashmir issue and gives their claims greater credibility. This applies to both political recommendations and humanitarian

aid. Pakistan is also unlikely to support active efforts to limit the influence of grassroots political or militant groups in Kashmir—many are popular in Pakistan and some have links with Pakistani intelligence services.

China: Because of its conflict with India over Aksai Chin, China has generally quietly sided with Pakistan in the border conflict—China and Pakistan signed a deal that settled their own border dispute long ago.⁹⁸ However, China has long resisted agreeing to a Line of Actual Control (de facto border) with India, which leaves the possibility open of spontaneous conflict between the two powers there. However, China is also eager to sign trade and investment deals with India, which dampens any incentive to engage in diplomatic hostility.

United States of America: While the US has traditionally maintained a neutral point of view in the Kashmir conflict, its allegiances have shifted over the years. During the Cold War, it was a strong backer of Pakistan; in recent years, while its relationship with

Pakistan has grown in importance post-9/11, India's economic growth has also made it a key regional partner. The US is also likely to be concerned about global terrorism, so it will be eager to stop any Islamic fundamentalists, particularly those from abroad, from causing havoc in Kashmir. Western European countries are likely to follow the US's lead on these issues, particularly out of an eagerness (given recent events) to limit the growth of terrorism. They are also likely to be the most concerned about potential human rights violations and the lack of prosecution of them, so the reported use of excessive force by the Indian military is likely to be of interest.

Russia and the Eastern Bloc: Russia and its allies also refrain from expressing an official policy on the issue. However, Russia is a longtime military ally of India, and many of the weapons and strategies in place on the Line of Control are originally Russian. Given that Russia and its allies are generally more protective of national sovereignty and give less legitimacy to international intervention on the basis of human rights, they are also less likely to support active intervention in Kashmir

Middle East and Africa: This region is primarily Muslim, and therefore is likely to support the rights of Muslim Kashmiris. Most will advocate for a political solution such as the long-awaited referendum. Some may tacitly approve covert action—for instance, it is suspected that some of the militant groups active on the border are funded by citizens of the oil-rich Gulf States (UAE, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, etc.).⁹⁹ While support for Kashmiri independence is not as prominent a cause across the Muslim world as, for instance, the fate of Palestine, it is likely that in the case of a larger flare-up these countries would come to the protestors' aid.

Latin America: While most other countries do not have a direct stake in the conflict, their policy is likely to be influenced directly by the diplomatic and economic relationships they have with India and Pakistan. As Indian economic growth continues to impress, its diplomatic sway will increase as well. Given past experiences with colonialism, most of this group of countries will likely be wary of intrusive military interventions but should support peacekeeping and diplomatic efforts.

QUESTIONS A RESOLUTION MUST ANSWER

- Will the people of Kashmir qualify for self-determination and on what grounds?
- In case of independence being granted to Kashmir, what measures will be taken to ensure that Kashmir is helped in its pursuit to become a stable independent state?
- What measures will be taken to address the alleged human rights violations within Kashmir?
- How will a settlement be made between India and Pakistan to prevent further threat to regional security?
- How will the interests of neighboring nations and the stake of the international community be protected given the delicate situation in Pakistan?

ABOUT THE COMMITTEE

The Special Political and Decolonization Committee, also known as the Fourth Committee of the UN General Assembly, was established to deal with decolonization, human rights, peacekeeping, and in rare cases, outer space. This session of the SPECPOL will discuss the deployment of weapons in outer space. This conference will address potential regulations and norms that need to be set in place in order to regulate the militarization of outer space. Moreover, it will endeavor to foster bilateral dialogue between nations in order to realize their obligations

towards each other and to the future of humanity. Simultaneously, it will address the age-old dilemma of self-determination within the Kashmir Valley. This particular issue has plagued both the Republic of India and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan since their very independence. The matter is known to be highly convoluted and the nations of SPECPOL will exercise their authority in order to come to a conclusive decision as to whether the people of Kashmir deserve a referendum and if not, whether Kashmir is rightfully a part of either State.

AGENDA 2: MILITARIZATION OF OUTER SPACE

HISTORY

The idea of war in space is not new. The idea was conceptualized when, fearing orbit-launched Soviet nuclear weapons, the U.S. initialized testing anti-satellite weaponry in the late 1950s, even going to the extent of testing nuclear weapons in space before orbital weapons of mass destruction were banned by order of the United Nations' Outer Space Treaty of 1967. Following the Treaty's introduction, space-based surveillance became a vital part of the Cold War; satellites became part of elaborate early-warning systems keeping a close watch on the deployment as well as launch of ground-based nuclear weapons. Throughout most of the Cold War, the USSR developed and tested "space mines," self-detonating spacecraft that could seek and destroy American spy satellites by releasing shrapnel. In the 1980s, the militarization of space peaked as Ronald Reagan's administration brought forward the multibillion-dollar Strategic Defense Initiative, dubbed Star Wars. Its aim was to develop orbital countermeasures against ICBMs. Furthermore, in 1985, the US Air Force staged an open demonstration of its formidable capabilities when an F-15 fighter jet launched a missile that destroyed a weak US satellite in low-Earth orbit.

All around the globe, as the memories of the Cold War faded and nations such as China rose to power, the space race continued, albeit in a less militarily destructive manner. This was observed in the form of television satellites, weather reporting satellites, the deployment of space stations and space shuttles



for scientific purposes, etc. More recently in 2007, however, China launched a missile that destroyed its own weather satellite, essentially serving as a wake-up call for the United States. Ever since, both sides have launched several more projectiles into outer space, having provided the public with the excuse of strengthening their individual defensive capabilities in space.

PREVIOUS ACTION TAKEN ON THE MATTER

For decades now, it has been internationally agreed upon that space should be used for peaceful purposes, primarily focusing on the betterment and progression of mankind. Examples of such peaceful benefits include weather monitoring with the help of satellites, aids in search and rescue operations, help in potential natural disaster detection, coordinating efforts on detecting and dealing with issues of space debris and minimizing harmful impacts on Earth. It boosts research in the fields of science and health as well.

The United Nations, realizing this, took several steps towards ensuring that the militarization was curbed. The first form of action taken was the UN Outer Space treaty of 1967. For its time, the agreement

was comprehensive and dealt with issues such as accountability on the part of member states with regard to damage caused by space debris and contamination of space and celestial bodies. Moreover, it also stated that the use of celestial bodies such as the Moon will be strictly peaceful in nature, that the placement of nuclear weapons in orbit or any other position, and that outer space was a platform for exploration to be used freely by all States.

The UN General Assembly went even further and passed a resolution in 2000 known as the "Prevention of Outer Space Arms Race" Resolution that, it is important to note, received the abstention of Micronesia, Israel and most importantly, the United States. It is also worth mentioning that, prior

to the Treaty of 1967, the United States did possess nuclear weapons that orbited Earth. Again in 2006, the Space Preservation Treaty was passed, with the United States voting against and Israel abstaining. At present, with the quickened pace of developments

CURRENT SITUATION

Having taken into account the history of military activity in space and past events that provide insight on the matter, the visible trend is that major superpowers have turned their eyes to beyond just the aerial front for warfare. Since the Cold War brought with it new technologies and new thirst for exploration, countries such as the US and Russia have wasted no time in developing programs to accommodate their own weapons in outer space. Speculations are underway that an arms race is likely on the space front, mainly owing to the fact that the Outer Space Treaty technically only prevented nations from putting nuclear weapons in space. As a result, the United States, China, and Russia, refrained from nuclear armament in space but continued to launch other kinds of missiles into orbit. Jonathan Power, a well-known analyst of international affairs in relation to advances in outer space technology and exploration, made the following argument on the matter—

“How will the rest of the world take to being dominated from above? One doesn’t have to be particularly unfriendly to the US to feel uncomfortable. More naturally hostile or suspicious countries could well feel they have been given no choice but to develop their own antisatellite weapons in an attempt to blind US satellites, even though, since the US will far outspend them, the effort would become an ever receding goal.”

It is a worry shared by many that conflict in space can result in an all-out war back on Earth. This is mainly due to the introduction of ground-to-space antisatellite weapons. Space warfare as a concept only encompasses combat that takes place outside the atmosphere, specifically ground-to-space combat and space-to-space combat. Therefore, space-to-ground warfare i.e. shooting missiles from satellites do not come under the purview of the term “space warfare”, but since it presents an equal threat

in space-faring as well as military technology, the UN has decided that the issue of militarization of outer space and the possibility of an arms race deserved deliberations on the platform provided by SPECPOL.

to global peace, SPECPOL will count it as a subject necessary for discussion. The committee also felt it necessary to include matters relating to satellite-aided communications (in a military context), espionage, and surveillance. In the past, the United States has used its Hexagon spy satellite to keep count of Soviet tank and troop numbers to ensure no arms control treaties were being violated. Even today, NATO forces used orbit-positioned cameras to provide detailed imagery of the positions of terror organizations like ISIS and Al-Qaeda. In fact, the Pentagon says there have been more than 700 surveillance flights so far in an air campaign of more than 300 bombing raids on ISIS.



Although the United States is considered the leading force in the field of space-based surveillance, other countries are not behind. Russia and China, for example, are only a step behind, and countries such as France and Israel are equally technologically equipped but only lack the numbers to stand at equal rank with other superpowers. India is also a country that is speedily gaining ground in the space race with new satellite launches every day.

In the days of the Cold War, the goals of the Indian Space Research Organization, or ISRO, were significantly different from those of the United States and the Soviet Union, which mainly focused on human space exploration. Instead, India was eager to

first develop its satellite capabilities for mapping and surveying crops and damage from natural disasters and erosion; and this is only one instance of many other scientifically oriented ventures. It also used satellite communication to allow the pioneering of telemedicine and telecommunication in remote rural areas. However, under present circumstances, even India has begun shifting its priorities to more militaristic designs when it comes to its space program.

While it can easily be said that there are enough treaties that curb the abilities of powerful nations in space and place a check on expanding developments in the field of space warfare, there is little evidence to show that countries have adhered to such agreements and will do so in the future. This is precisely why SPECPOL has decided to meet and discuss the matter, expecting to find a new solution to the myriad conflicting interests of States. It is the need of the hour.



China is specifically focusing on a certain technology that needs to be discussed by the committee; Anti-Satellite Weapons (ASAT). Alongside direct-ascent ASAT weapons, there is widespread belief that China is also developing other space weapons. In June 2016, China launched the Aolong-1 spacecraft on a Long March 7 rocket. China claimed that the Aolong-1 was assigned the task of clearing up space junk and collection of man-made debris in space. However, other reports suggest that the spacecraft, equipped with a robotic arm, is a dual-use ASAT weapon. The Aolong-1 was believed to be the first in a series of spacecraft that will be tasked with collecting man-made space debris. ASAT missiles are primarily the forms of weaponry used by nations to assert their control in space, but for targets that require a launch from outer space itself, Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) Systems, which include long-range ICBMs, as an auxiliary system capable of destroying assets located in space itself. The difference between BMD and ASAT weapons lies mainly in the software and control algorithms used to detect, track, and home in on a satellite, when compared to a warhead.

Commercially, however, even smaller countries have begun to get ahead with cutting-edge technology. Nigeria, for instance has used its satellites to help deal with several of its agricultural problems. Luxembourg is also advancing its capabilities, followed by France and UAE.

Another crucial point of interest is the increasing threat to cyber security with advancements in military technology. As thousands, if not millions, of devices, networks, radio signals are linked with the help of satellites, it is not just nuclear warheads or ICBMs that are capable of dealing widespread damage to Earth and its residents. The United States has often cited its reason for increased storage of military equipment in orbit being in preparation for conflict brought about by the activities of a rogue state of cybercriminal organization.

SPACE DEBRIS

Besides creating a new arms race, the weaponization of space means proliferation of space debris. Such debris, resulting from 50 years of space activity, already poses a considerable hazard to spacecraft. This crowding problem could worsen as a large number of space weapons could be deployed in Low Earth Orbit (LEO). The launching and testing of weapons would also increase space debris. Moreover, deploying space-based weapons in the increasingly

crowded realm of LEO would leave less room for civilian systems. Those problems would also occur during periods of peace. If a number of satellites were to be destroyed during the course of a war, some scientists warn, they would create so much debris that it would prevent future satellites from being stationed in space and generally limit space access.

ACTION TAKEN BY THE UNITED NATIONS

In January of 1967, the “Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies” (commonly known as the “Outer Space Treaty of 1967”) was signed and put into effect through the United Nations. This landmark treaty set the foundation for international regulation of outer space. Among its provisions, the treaty forbids the installation of weapons of mass destruction in Earth’s orbit, on the Moon, or on any other celestial body. However, the treaty does not prohibit the placement of conventional weapons in orbit. In early 1981, heated debate over the weaponization of space led the United Nations to begin talks regarding a “Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space” (PAROS) treaty. While this treaty did not mention specific limits on weapons in outer space, it did emphasize the need for “further measures with appropriate and effective provisions for verification to prevent an arms race in outer space.” States with “major space

capabilities” are called upon to “contribute actively to the objective of the peaceful use of outer space and of the prevention of an arms race in outer space and to refrain from actions contrary to that objective and to the relevant existing treaties in the interest of maintaining international peace and security and promoting international cooperation” . The United Nations was successful in establishing a committee on PAROS in 1985. However, opposition, particularly from the United States, halted negotiations, and the committee was dissolved in 1994. Since Puri 6 1994, the committee on PAROS has not reconvened despite an annual, highly popular vote by the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA). The United States, using its veto power, has been the only country to vote against the resolution, and Israel has been the only country to abstain. The United States has presented its argument against PAROS as the belief that the committee is unnecessary because there are no weapons currently in outer space.

BLOC POSITIONS

Since this committee is set a few years into the future, this Background Guide will provide an overview of the various stances that a few nations have, making it easier to understand the dynamics of the changed scenario.

European Union: Members of the European Union have argued for a draft ‘Code of Conduct’ that would govern all matters pertaining to Outer Space. This ‘Code’ aims to enable the adoption of all existing treaties, declarations, and principles in order to prevent an armaments race in outer space.

,principles, and declarations, as well as aim to prevent an arms race in outer space and control space debris.

Russia and China: Both China and Russia have propagated a “Treaty on the Prevention of the Placement of Weapons in Outer Space”, and consider the banning of weapons their highest priority in order to prevent an armament race and defuse a threat to international security. Russia, China, and strategically allied nations believe that this treaty will fill gaps in international law that might permit the placement of weapons in space. These nations

must also find ways to advance the capabilities of developing countries in matters pertaining to satellite launching capabilities.

United States of America: The United States is an advocate for a ban of all weapons in outer space. The United States has a highly developed space program and must maintain progress while simultaneously helping developing countries.

Asia: Over recent years, several Asian countries have seen advancement in their national space capabilities, including Japan, South Korea and India. These countries are competing in an increasingly intense

international space race. For example, India has had a space program for many years and is looking towards beneficial space applications, while South Korea recently attempted to launch its first satellite.

Nations without Advanced Space Capabilities: A great number of South American and African nations are heavily dependent on developed nation to assist them in developing a viable national space program. These nations may look to increase global funding, and endeavor to keep all nations committed to the betterment of humanity.

QUESTIONS A RESOLUTION MUST ANSWER

- The definition of a space weapon; still a very hotly contested debate in the UN, since almost anything can be used to damage orbital equipment
- Is demarcation of territory required to avoid a full-blown arms race in space?
- If demarcation is required, how is it to be implemented?
- How nations with relatively lesser-equipped space programs should respond; do they have a right to

their own arms in space or should they avoid military involvement?

- What should be done about the already existing missiles and other weapons that have been installed in space?
- Should there be a limit to the amount of weaponry that can go up in orbit? If so, what should it be and who should be in charge of creating it?

DSMUN '17

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND FURTHER READING

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/1399992/A-brief-history-of-the-Kashmir-conflict.html>
<http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/features/2017/03/mirza-waheed-violence-kashmir-conflict-170329051029132.html>
<http://www.bbc.com/news/10537286>
<http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/how-isi-funds-stone-pelters-via-hurriyat-in-kashmir-times-now/articleshow/58546402.cms>
<http://www.thehindu.com/news/national/other-states/jammu-and-kashmir-crisis-if-anyone-can-resolve-kashmir-problem-it-is-prime-minister-narendra-modi-says-mehbooba-mufti/article18400646.ece?homepage=true>
<http://www.ndtv.com/topic/mehbooba-mufti>
<https://www.vox.com/2016/9/22/13024586/vox-sentences-kashmir-attack>
<http://brighterkashmir.com/demand-for-right-of-self-determination-in-kashmir/>
<https://kashmirobsvr.net/2017/local-news/right-self-determination-our-goal-pak-prez-14986>
https://irc.princeton.edu/pmunc/docs/SPECPOL_FinalBG-1.pdf
<https://www.dawn.com/news/1307299>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kashmir_conflict
<https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/war-in-space-may-be-closer-than-ever/>
<http://www.globalissues.org/article/69/militarization-and-weaponization-of-outer-space>
<http://www.nydailynews.com/news/world/u-s-expands-war-terror-outer-space-article-1.2757896>
<https://www.un.org/press/en/2005/gadis3310.doc.htm>
<http://thedi diplomat.com/2017/01/how-china-is-weaponizing-outer-space/>
<http://www.unidir.org/files/publications/pdfs/prevention-of-an-arms-race-in-outer-space-a-guide-to-the-discussions-in-the-cd-en-451.pdf>
<http://spacenews.com/commentary-why-the-u-s-should-be-a-leader-in-space-weaponization/>
<https://qz.com/516141/is-space-warfare-inevitable/>
<http://www.independent.org/newsroom/article.asp?id=2227>
<https://www.stratfor.com/analysis/real-danger-space-weapons>
<http://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-buzz/get-ready-america-russia-china-have-space-weapons-15027>

DSMUN '17

POSITION PAPER GUIDELINES

Position papers are usually one to one-and-a-half pages in length. Your position paper should include a brief introduction followed by a comprehensive breakdown of your country's position on the topics that are being discussed by the committee. A good position paper will not only provide facts but also make proposals for resolutions.

A good position paper will include:

- A brief introduction to your country and its history concerning the topic and committee;
- How the issue affects your country;
- Your country's policies with respect to the issue and your country's justification for these policies;
- Quotes from your country's leaders about the issue;
- Statistics to back up your country's position on the issue;
- Actions taken by your government with regard to the issue;
- Conventions and resolutions that your country has signed or ratified;
- UN actions that your country supported or opposed;
- What your country believes should be done to address the issue;
- What your country would like to accomplish in the committee's resolution; and
- How the positions of other countries affect your country's position.

SAMPLE DRAFT RESOLUTION

General Assembly Third Committee

Authors: United States, Austria and Italy

Draft Resolution GA/3/1.1

Signatories: Greece, Tajikistan, Japan, Canada, Mali, the Netherlands and Gabon

Topic: "Strengthening UN coordination of humanitarian assistance in complex emergencies"

The General Assembly,

Reminding all nations of the celebration of the 50th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which recognizes the inherent dignity, equality and inalienable rights of all global citizens, **[use commas to separate perambulatory clauses]**

Reaffirming its Resolution 33/1996 of 25 July 1996, which encourages Governments to work with UN bodies aimed at improving the coordination and effectiveness of humanitarian assistance,

Noting with satisfaction the past efforts of various relevant UN bodies and nongovernmental organizations, Stressing the fact that the United Nations faces significant financial obstacles and is in need of reform, particularly in the humanitarian realm,

1. Encourages all relevant agencies of the United Nations to collaborate more closely with countries at the grassroots level to enhance the carrying out of relief efforts; **[use semicolons to separate operative clauses]**
2. Urges member states to comply with the goals of the UN Department of Humanitarian Affairs to streamline efforts of humanitarian aid;
3. Requests that all nations develop rapid deployment forces to better enhance the coordination of relief efforts of humanitarian assistance in complex emergencies;
4. Calls for the development of a United Nations Trust Fund that encourages voluntary donations from the private transnational sector to aid in funding the implementation of rapid deployment forces;
5. Stresses the continuing need for impartial and objective information on the political, economic and social situations and events of all countries;
6. Calls upon states to respond quickly and generously to consolidated appeals for humanitarian assistance;
7. Requests the expansion of preventive actions and assurance of post-conflict assistance through reconstruction and development;
8. Decides to remain actively seized on the matter. **[end resolutions with a period]**

PREAMBULATORY AND OPERATIVE CLAUSES

PREAMBULATORY CLAUSES

The preamble of a draft resolution states the reasons for which the committee is addressing the topic and highlights past international action on the issue. Each clause begins with a present participle (called a perambulatory phrase) and ends with a comma. Preambulatory clauses can include:

- References to the UN Charter;
- Citations of past UN resolutions or treaties on the topic under discussion;

- Mentions of statements made by the Secretary-General or a relevant UN body or agency;
- Recognition of the efforts of regional or nongovernmental organizations in dealing with the issue; and
- General statements on the topic, its significance and its impact.

SAMPLE PREAMBULATORY PHRASES

Affirming

Alarmed by

Approving

Bearing in mind

Believing

Confident

Contemplating

Convinced

Declaring

Deeply concerned

Deeply conscious

Deeply convinced

Deeply Disturbed

Deeply Regretting

Desiring

Emphasizing

Expecting

Emphasizing

Expecting

Expressing it's appreciation

Fulfilling

Fully aware

Emphasizing

Expecting

Expressing its appreciation

Fulfilling

Fully aware

Further deploring

Further recalling

Guided by

Having adopted

Having considered

Having examined

Having received

Keeping in mind

Noting with deep concern

Nothing with satisfaction

Noting further

Observing

Reaffirming

Realizing

Recalling

Recognizing

Referring

Seeking

Taking into consideration

Taking note

Viewing with appreciation

Welcoming

DSMUN '17

OPERATIVE CLAUSES

Operative clauses offer solutions to issues addressed earlier in a resolution through the perambulatory section. These clauses are action oriented and should include both an underlined verb at the beginning of your sentence followed by the proposed solution. Each clause should follow the following principles:

- Clause should be numbered;
- Each clause should support one another and continue to build your solution;
- Add details to your clauses in order to have a complete solution;
- Operative clauses are punctuated by a semicolon, with the exception of your last operative clause which should end with a period.

SAMPLE OPERATIVE PHRASES

Accepts	Endorses	Further requests
Affirms	Expresses its appreciation	Further resolves
Approves	Expresses its hope	Has resolved
Authorizes	Further invites	Notes
Calls	Deplores	Proclaims
Calls upon	Designates	Reaffirms
Condemns	Draws the attention	Recommends
Confirms	Emphasizes	Regrets
Congratulates	Encourages	Reminds
Considers	Endorses	Requests
Declares accordingly	Expresses its appreciation	Solemnly affirms
Deplores	Expresses its hope	Strongly condemns
Designates	Further invites	Supports
Draws the attention	Further proclaims	Takes note of
Emphasizes	Further reminds	Transmits
Encourages	Further recommends	Trusts

DSMUN '17

© The Doon School Model United Nations Conference 2017

THE DOON SCHOOL,

Mall Road,

Dehradun—248001,

UK, India

Phone: +91 8279824714

e-Mail: chair.specpol@doonschool.com

dsmun@doonschool.com

Website: www.dsmun17.com

