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I. Letter from the Secretary-General

Most distinguished participants,

Firstly, I would like to welcome you all to the third edition of Koç University Model United Nations Conference (KUMUN). My name is Emre İlker Karataş and I have the honor and pleasure to serve you as the Secretary-General of this edition of KUMUN. Under the umbrella of the Koç University MUN Club, KUMUN has been growing ever since its start. In its third edition, we are proud to say that KUMUN will be a one-of-a-kind boutique conference of crisis simulations.

Bearing in mind the theme of “Bringing Order to Chaos”, we have chosen one of the most important historical events within the Middle East. Kashmir Conflict will simulate the tension between India and Pakistan preceding the second Indo-Pak War. Due to the fast-paced-crisis nature of this committee, the participants are expected to be highly interactive and the Crisis Team will work to integrate all participants to the proceedings.

At this moment, I would like to thank this great team composed of very successful MUNers. Not rejecting my offer although their university applications, these two are the most harmonious USGs, a Secretary-General may hope for: Ms. Monica Melisa Sajjad and Mr. Berke Giray. I would like to thank the Assistant USG of the committee Mr. Alp Arslan Öncel for being in the same team for the umpteenth time.

Lastly, I would like to say that even though these committees are designed to be of high quality, keep in mind that they are also designed for you to enjoy the academic content. Therefore, I would like to finish my words with saying that you should enjoy while you are bringing order to Kashmir Region. Should you have any questions regarding the content, you can contact the Academic Team through kumunsecretariat@ku.edu.tr

Sincerely,

Emre İlker Karataş

Secretary-General of KUMUN 2016
II. Letter from Under-Secretaries-General

Distinguished participants,

In the following months, we will have the grand pleasure of sharing a committee room, which will house some of the most hectic debates, and crises that will happen at KUMUN 2016. But prior to that, let this serve as a warm welcome to all of you future participants.

The Kashmir Conflict committee will be set in a point unlike any other crisis committee before. The committee will be starting in the days leading up to the Second Indo-Pakistani War. Ultimately, even the choice to start the war in the first place is upon the participants. With such an involving committee system, pivoting on the actions of the delegates within it, our sessions will be sure to involve multiple diplomatic games, turning tables, displays of power, and maybe even close conflict. The rapidly escalating crisis situations will test your decision-making abilities, while the steady debate will push delegates to display their ability to remain calm and diplomatic throughout a series of vital political debates.

To introduce ourselves more thoroughly, we are both freshmen at New York University. We are no foreigners to the concept of a fast-paced crisis committee, in regards to role-playing, props and assassinations, in addition to the experience we have had with the two previous KUMUN JCC editions.

I, Melisa, personally originate from Southeast Asia (not to mention knowing a few of the languages), and possess a more thorough insight and interest on the topic, so prospective participants should feel free to contact me at any point. As one of the Under Secretaries-General, I can guarantee that this will be an unforgettable committee experience as we delve into the lead-up to the elaborately prolonged feud known as the Kashmir Conflict.

As for me, Berke, I hail from the rainy and windy peaks of Bulgaria, but am currently residing in warm and sunny Antalya. Although I do not possess Melisa’s regional advantage, I will assure you that I have been tried and tested by the fast-paced crisis committee concept, and will be happily assisting you throughout our journey of shaping one of the most notorious conflicts of the modern era.
Be it the spirit of peace or the rage of fierce competition that guides the committee, your Chairs, Crisis Team, and Under-Secretaries-General will always be there to advise and introduce you to a number of surprises. To conclude, we are eagerly expecting you at Koc University’s beautiful campus, and can guarantee that your experience and effort will be vital in enriching the memories that the KUMUN 2016 Kashmir Conflict Committee will leave us with.

As a final note, we request all participants to frequently check their inboxes for further conference and committee information, and to get into character!

Best Regards,

Melisa Monica Sajjad & Berke Giray

Under-Secretaries-General of the KUMUN 2016 Kashmir Conflict Committee
III. Historical Background

A. Geography

Kashmir is regarded as the valley situated between the Himalayas and the Pir Panjal mountain range. The areas subject to dispute have spanned to include Jammu, the Kashmir Valley, Azad Kashmir, Gilgit–Baltistan, Aksai Chin and the Trans-Karakoram Tract (henceforth to be regarded as Kashmir). Geographically speaking, these regions are north of the Union of India and Dominion of Pakistan, and south west of the Republic of China. The disputed regions are comprised of over 100,000 square kilometers of land, utilized mainly for agriculture and tourism. The region has witnessed many regimes including Hindu rulers and Muslim Sultans; most notably the Mughal Empire, Afghan Durrani Empire, and the Sikhs, before becoming a princely state. The Kashmir region is also home to a myriad of historically valued Hindu and Muslim shrines, to which annual pilgrimages are made.¹

Kashmir and Jammu has significant political, economic, religious, and military potential due to its geographic borders and bountiful resources, which is what ultimately led to the power-struggle for the area.²

B. Partition and Dispute

The Jammu-Kashmir area is a land rife with wealth, and the subject of one of the greatest disputes between the Dominion of Pakistan and Union of India. After its conquest by Ranjit Singh in 1819, the Sikh ruler and Raja of Jammu at the time, Gulab Singh, encircled Kashmir in 1840. Following the Anglo-Sikh War and the acquisition of Kashmir by the East Indies Company as a result of multiple treaties, Gulab Singh was given control over Kashmir, then making him the Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir.³

Upon the partition of India in 1947, 526 Indian states were left to choose between becoming a part of one of two greater nations; the Dominion of Pakistan or the Union of India. Kashmir, despite having a predominantly Muslim population, was subject to the rule of a Hindu Maharaja. This religious dispute made it substantially more difficult for the

² ibid.
Dominion of Pakistan to appeal to Kashmir. After civil protests and attacks on Kashmir, fueled by Punjab authorities, Kashmir turned to India for aid and protection. As the invasion of Kashmir by Pakistani tribesmen (namely Pashtun and Pathan) grew, Kashmir signed an “Instrument of Accession” with India in exchange for military support. Thus, the conflict between India and Pakistan became direct and violent, and the value of Kashmir rose significantly.

Viceroy Louis Mountbatten, the First Earl of Burma, traveled to Lahore to meet with Jinnah, with intent to pursue a peaceful resolution to the conflict. He proposed to hold a vote amongst citizens (plebiscite) in the princely states that were independent of a chief Dominion in order to achieve a democratic resolution to the issue. Jinnah refused this offer, as the nature of the vote necessitated its enactment in Hyderabad and Junagadh as well as in Kashmir.

India later decided to pursue a resolve by referring the ongoing conflict to the United Nations Security Council with respect to the 35th article of the UN Charter, which dictates that UN member states may act to notify the Security Council of an ongoing situation, owing to said situation’s likelihood to ‘endanger the maintenance of international peace.’ As a result, the Security Council established the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan (UNCIP) where it worked on resolutions to prevent the First Indo-Pakistani War from advancing further.

After the passing of the Resolutions numbered 39 and 47 by the UN Security Council, the conflict is still present and an atmosphere of suspense is present in the region of Jammu-Kashmir.

__________________________________________________________________________

4 ibid.
5 ibid.
6 ibid.
C. First Indo-Pakistani War (1947)

The First Indo Pakistani War (1947-1948) began as a defense effort on the Indian side, with the help of Kashmir troops and National Conference members. The defense force mainly aimed to curb the advance of Pakistani tribesmen, referred to as ‘raiders’ or the ‘Azad Army,’ and to drive these raiders out of the Baramulla region of Kashmir. Pakistan employed high ranking Pakistani military officers and ex-Indian National Army commanders that agreed to command the Azad Army. In May 1948 the Pakistani Army officially joined the war by citing that the defense of Pakistani borders was *casus belli.*

The Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir, Hari Singh, pleaded to India for military aid. India proposed to accept, with the deciding condition of Singh signing an “Instrument of Accession.” Singh signed the Instrument of Accession, and India --along with some British officers who were in the subcontinent at the time-- joined the war on the side of Jammu and Kashmir. Following the Indian accession, Kashmir was legally declared Indian Territory. The outcome of the war was deemed indecisive, although it is argued that the Pakistani forced suffered greater losses than those of India and Kashmir. Pakistan also seized roughly one third of Kashmir while India retained the remaining land. A ceasefire was enacted on the night of the 1st of January 1949.

1. Instrument of Accession

The Instrument of Accession\(^ {11}\) is a document that signifies the allegiance of a princely state to one of the two major dominions in the Indian subcontinent, namely India and Pakistan. One of the more pivotal Instrument of Accession signings was that of the Princely State of Jammu and Kashmir. The Maharaja at the time, Hari Singh, contacted the Union of India for military aid against the Pakistani tribesmen in Kashmir. Following the plea, India demanded

---

\(^9\) A valid cause for war

\(^10\) 'Kashmir: Conflict Profile' (*Insight on Conflict*, 2016)  

that Singh would sign an Instrument of Accession, thus making Jammu and Kashmir Indian land.\textsuperscript{12}

The Pakistani reaction to this course of action was swift. Old Indian National Army officers that were on leave led unified militias of Pakistani Pashtun tribesmen in the western region of Kashmir, claiming that they were advancing to suppress unrest in the southeastern region of Kashmir.\textsuperscript{13} The forces moved to take Srinagar. Later, upon encountering resistance, the Pakistani troops began to fight against the Kashmiri officials and soldiers in the Uri area. Following India’s accession of Kashmir, Pakistan cited that the conflict had morphed into a border dispute and added that Pakistan was under direct threat from India. As a result, the Pakistani Military became directly involved with the war.\textsuperscript{14}

\textbf{2. Azad Army}

Companies and battalions consisting of mainly Pashtun and Pathan tribesmen within and around the western region of Kashmir were, and are still, utilized as a primary force by the Pakistani government. The tribesmen formed armed militias (referred to as the Azad Army)\textsuperscript{15} in 1947 under the mandate of the Pakistani government, at the beginning of the war, under the command of ex-Indian National Army officers. The army advanced throughout Kashmir, taking over roughly one third of the land.\textsuperscript{16}

The army consists of an independent training and recruiting structure from that of the Pakistan army, yet retained a similar ranking system. During this period, the battalions comprised the 12th Infantry Division of the Pakistan Army.\textsuperscript{17}

Sardar Muhammed Ibrahim Khan is a notable Colonel Commandant of the regiment.

\textsuperscript{12}ibid.
\textsuperscript{13}ibid.
\textsuperscript{14}ibid.
\textsuperscript{16}ibid.
\textsuperscript{17}ibid.

The United Nations Security Council Resolutions numbered 39 and 47 were passed after the end of the war as a measure to ensure peace and stability between India and Pakistan while bringing the Kashmir conflict to an end.\(^\text{18}\)

After the passing of the United Nations Security Council Resolution 47 Pakistan was instructed to initiate the withdrawal of the tribal militias. Pakistan refused, citing India’s demilitarization of Kashmir as a prerequisite for the withdrawal of the militias. Currently, various amounts of Pakistani tribesmen still reside within Kashmir.\(^\text{19}\)

D. Peace Talks Period (1950-1962)

During a “stagnation” period in Indo-Pakistani relations in the 1950’s, following the First Indo-Pakistani War, a series of peace talks and reconciliation efforts were made between officials from the Indian and Pakistani governments. Following the relatively ineffective enactment of the UN Security Council Resolutions 39 & 47, India and Pakistan continued to establish passive and dormant influence over the Kashmir region on their respective sides of the Ceasefire Line. Sometime after a proposal for a plebiscite was brought up, and Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru held talks with his Pakistani counterpart, Mohammad Ali Bogra, to reach a resolve on the plebiscite idea. Some records even show that Nehru had a Plebiscite Administrator lined up at some point around 1954.\(^\text{20}\)

Later, Pakistan joined the CENTO alliance, causing India to abandon plebiscite efforts. Indian officials reflected on the situation by stating that Pakistan’s pursuit for the CENTO alliance admission demonstrated its unwillingness to resolve the Kashmir issue, arguing that the action depicted a dissociative “uninvolved” mindset on Pakistan’s part.\(^\text{21}\)

India remained active in its policy of adapting multiple stances regarding the issue, and Nehru once again contacted Bogra, proposing a “partition of the state” along the Ceasefire Line, with some re-adjustments being made to the Ceasefire Line around strategic and


\(^{19}\) Ibid.


\(^{21}\) Ibid.
economically vital areas (1957). Pakistan refused such an offer, citing that such a division would be against the free will and socio-economic interests of the people in the region.\textsuperscript{22}

Despite its seemingly lenient approach towards a resolution based on the implementation of a plebiscite, India altered its stance again, and announced that the Kashmiri state had been willingly acceded to India. Therefore, a plebiscite or any further re-adjustment would be against the standing fact that Kashmir is, in fact, a legitimate part of India. India later dismissed all calls and pleas for alternative resolutions, and is to this day treating Kashmir as one of its provinces, and considers most Pakistani presence and displays of affection towards Pakistan in the area hostile.\textsuperscript{23}

E.  Sino - Indian War (1962)

The war took place between two of the most populous nations on the planet; India and China. The conflicted border region in question encompasses approximately 80,000 square meters of salt flat deserts and mountain ranges.\textsuperscript{24}

Aksai Chin was one of many border regions subjected to conflict between the Union of India and China prior to 1962.

\textsuperscript{22}ibid.
\textsuperscript{23}ibid.
\textsuperscript{24}Pike J, 'India - War With China' (\textit{Globalsecurity.org}, 2016)
The Sikh Confederacy was sovereign over Northern India up to the mid-19th century, along with having the borders set between China.\textsuperscript{25} With the conflict and subsequent victory of the British Empire over the Ladakh land, which comprised a part of Jammu and Kashmir’s territory, the borders were redrawn. Though the borders of the farthest points of the Pangong Lake and Karakoram Pass were distinct, the border of Aksai Chin was left unclear. In 1865, Aksai Chin was drawn within the northeastern border of Jammu and Kashmir by a worker within the Survey of India named W.H. Johnson under the British command. The Maharaja of Kashmir at the time accepted the “Johnson Line”, claiming the territory within.\textsuperscript{26}

The changing political climate within China from 1917 to 1933, including the Xinhai Revolution and the end of World War I, resulted in many distinct maps being published, specifically concerning Aksai Chin. By the end of World War I, British rule dictated that the Johnson Line be utilized. For China, Aksai Chin posed a strategic connection between its two independent states. In 1956, China constructed roads within and south of Aksai Chin, connecting the semi-independent states Xinjiang and Tibet. Access into Aksai Chin was easier for the Chinese, as opposed to the traverse and entry into China through the Karakoram Mountains for the Indians.\textsuperscript{27}

On 1st July, 1954, Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru stated that Aksai Chin had become a part of Indian land for centuries and was non-negotiable.\textsuperscript{28}

The Partition of India in 1947, and the establishment of the People’s Republic of China (PRC) in 1949, resulted in significant change for India, Pakistan and China. India and China had existing ties spanning centuries back, and India served as the first nation to officially recognize PRC. This diplomatic tie resulted in no initial retaliations or claims regarding Aksai Chin on the Chinese front. It was later argued by the Chinese Premier Zhou Enlai that the McMahon line, which was drawn in 1913 by the foreign Secretary to the British India as an

\textsuperscript{25}ibid.
\textsuperscript{26}ibid.
\textsuperscript{27}ibid.
\textsuperscript{28}ibid.
effort to bilaterally solve the Aksai Chin conflict, would be the only one accepted. The Premier later elaborated stating that there were no formal treaties binding the border.  

Tibet had a key role in tensions of Sino-Indian relations. Using India as a tool to gain independence, the Tibetan Dalai Lama sought exile in the Indian region of Daramsala. This prompted threats to China.

Relations between the nations further deteriorated when Mao Zedong gained power in China. The Soviet Premier Nikita Krushchev defended Nehru in a meeting with Zedong, giving cause for suspicion of an expansionist plan into China by India, the United States and the Soviet Union. Along with tensions, Nehru refused further meetings until the Chinese military force withdrew from the area. Though Nehru had the support of the international community, the Chinese refused to withdraw, viewing this as India securing the area. In 1959 India began sending troops and patrols to Aksai Chin and even further north of the perceived border in accordance with the Forward Policy, leading to minor conflicts. For

---

29 ibid.
China, this served as a confirmation to the suspicions of expansionism into Tibet. Both parties withheld from directly engaging in combat.³²

Direct military combat began in mid-1962, when the Indian intelligence service receives information about a build-up of Chinese forces at the border. In accordance to this, the Indian troops were stationed at the mountains to cut off supply to the opposing troops. The scope of India for the region was summed up by a diplomatic agent in Tibet as:

- Determining the intentions of China
- Testing the Soviet Union’s involvement in the potential Sino-Indian War
- Reestablishing support from the United States after deteriorated relations following the Indian annexation of Goa³³

In June 1962, Indian forces were given command to fire upon threat, leading to the start of combat. Following this, on the 20th October 1962, the Chinese People’s Liberation Army signed off on two attacks 1000 kilometers apart, along the border. After four days of combat, China secured large regions of land. A majority of the combat occurred at the high altitudes of the bordering mountain range Arunachal Pradesh, leading to highly impoverished conditions and higher death toll in comparison to previous conflicts.³⁴

In November 1962, Zhou Enlai declared a unilateral ceasefire, successfully avoiding US intervention. The area of the line of actual control³⁵, which had been established in 1959, was to be demilitarized. Despite small conflicts, direct combat had ceased. Demilitarization did not lead to a formal treaty.³⁶

³²ibid.
³⁴ibid.
IV. Parties Involved

A. India

The Union of India became involved in the Kashmir dispute when Jammu and Kashmir acceded to the Union. The first interest in the region sparked following the formation of the two major states in the subcontinent, namely India and Pakistan. The aforementioned accession was done in exchange for military aid against the Pakistani forces and officially signed Kashmir into being a territory of India.

India played a defensive role in the First Indo-Pakistani War, and followed a war plan based more around holding down ground while legitimizing its authority over Kashmir. The timely nature of the ceasefire agreement aided India’s cause for retaining the maximum amount of territory possible. Following the drafting and adoption procedures of the UN Security Council Resolutions 39 and 47, India came to the point of a standstill with Pakistan, where Pakistan was unwilling to let up the control it maintained over regions in which Pakistani influence was dominant to Indian influence. Pakistan has accused India of not honoring the Standstill Agreement between the two nations.37

India has been urged to conduct a plebiscite in Kashmir on multiple occasions by various parties (e.g. United Nations, Pakistan, The United States), and was partial to the idea at some point prior to Pakistan’s alliance with CENTO. India has argued that Pakistan diminishes the importance of the Kashmir issue while still being a cause for the issue in the first place. India has also accused Pakistan of sabotaging its efforts for peace in the Kashmir region by causing civil unrest and direct attacks from locals and disguised Pakistani militia who attempted to defame the image of Indian rule in the eyes of the Kashmiri people.38

Currently India has multiple units of stationed military troops and public figures in Kashmir, and is doing municipality work to better cater to the Kashmiri people whilst immersing them into the lifestyle of the Indian nation.39

38 Ibid.
39 Ibid.
B. Pakistan

One of the chiefly involved parties in the dispute, the Dominion of Pakistan (Currently known as the Islamic Republic of Pakistan) is one of the three states bordering the Jammu-Kashmir Region. The main supporting cause for Pakistan’s claim over Kashmir is the vast Muslim majority that resides in Kashmir, which leads Pakistan to claim that the rule and accommodation that can be provided by the Pakistani Government is most fit for the inhabitants of Kashmir. Pakistan also supports the ‘two nation theory’ that applies to the Indian subcontinent, and argues that Kashmir should become a part of Pakistan due to negligence on India’s part, especially when it came to holding a plebiscite in order to let the Kashmiri people determine the dominion they would like to be the subject of.  

Pakistan is one of the two parties involved in the First Indo-Pakistani War, and its Government and Army are working closely with local tribesmen and Kashmiri residents who support Pakistani rule to dismantle Indian influence and presence in the region. Pakistan firmly believes and argues that India did not honor the Standstill Agreement. The Pakistani Government and officers in the Kashmir Region also state that Indian troops and officials have been maltreating the Kashmiri people and subjecting them to abuse and extrajudicial killings/punishments.

Pakistani politicians and influential officers in Azadi Kashmir are reportedly continuously arming citizens and tribesmen wishing to join their cause under the name “Azad Army.” Due to this behavioral pattern, India is also insistent on having its troops in the area in order to prevent any and all unexpected violent outbursts.

Following its alliance with CENTO, Pakistan has been unwilling to resort to any method of resolve except for a plebiscite, contrary to the Indian standpoint of actively refusing and not contributing to the enactment of a plebiscite.

---

41 ibid.
42 ibid.
43 ibid.
C. China

China is thoroughly involved in the Aksai Chin region disputed with Kashmir and Jammu. Tibet, a semi-independent state of China, also had a role in the deteriorating relations between China and the Indian Jammu and Kashmir. Initial contact began with positive diplomatic relations between the newly established People’s Republic of China and India prior to the Indo-Sino War. Following the war, however, tensions rose over the border.

Despite the ceasefire between the nations, no formal treaty is signed over the region.

With the succession of Communist Party leader Mao Zedong, China also experienced diplomatic issues with the USSR, USA and other nations it suspects of expansionist movement. The diplomatic conflict with the Indian Jammu and Kashmir is still existent.

D. United Nations

1. UNCIP (United Nations Commission for India & Pakistan)

Established upon the adoption of United Nations Security Council Resolution 39 (1948), the United Nations Commission for India & Pakistan (UNCIP) served as the first international meditative measure for this dispute. Both parties initially objected to the mission and mandate of the UNCIP, thus it was amended and enacted with United Nations Security Council Resolution 47 (1948). In the amended statement, the UNCIP recognizes strict principles of impartiality, and reiterates its mandate as a non-interception based force. The goal of the UNCIP is to assist the conflicted nations, specifically India and Pakistan in reaching an accord over the disputed state. The UNCIP conducts decisions through adopting resolutions.44

The members of the UNCIP first arrived in the region on July 7th, 1948 with the consent of both parties. The ceasefire between India and Pakistan on January 1st, 1949 was proposed

---

44 'Resolution Adopted By The United Nations Commission For India And Pakistan On 13August 1948.' (Mtholyoke.edu, 2016) 
<https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/uncom1.htm> accessed 5 May 2016
in the resolution unanimously adopted on November 9th, 1948 by the UNCIP. Part III of the resolution is as follows: 45

“The Government of India and the Government of Pakistan reaffirm their wish that the future status of the State of Jammu and Kashmir shall be determined in accordance with the will of the people and to that end, upon acceptance of the Truce Agreement both Governments agree to enter into consultations with the Commission to determine fair and equitable conditions whereby such free expression will be assured.” 46

The commission branched out to further create the United Nations Military Observer Group in India & Pakistan.

2. **UNMOGIP (United Nations Military Observer Group in India & Pakistan)**

The United Nations Military Observer Group in India & Pakistan (UNMOGIP) was formed to serve the UNCIP in finding preventative and mitigating measures in the region. The full mandate of the UNMOGIP also encompassed investigating, reporting, and resolving the dispute, especially through the usage of observers, as well as assisting the Military Adviser to the UNCIP. The first unofficial mission was embarked upon in January 1949 with the first team of unarmed military observers supervising the mission area of Kashmir and Jammu. 47

E. **United States of America**

The United States happened to become a third party in the regional conflict owing to its dialogue with India on the Sino-Indian border issues. Prior to active conflict, the Indian government was working on bettering its relations with the United States in order to create a positive opinion on India in the United States, as it was planning on further strengthening its relations with the United States, while also requesting various forms of aid in order to gain an upper hand in the border dispute with China. The United States government

45 ibid.
46 ibid.
responded negatively to the pleas of the Indian government when India requested a number of troops and armaments to help support India’s offensive against China.  

Opting to assume a passive stance, the United States administration decided against sending a number of aircrafts, aircraft personnel and weaponry needed to secure an Indian victory, as it was already preoccupied with smoothing out strained relations with the Soviet Union. The Indian government turned to the Soviet Union for help, which the Soviet Union did provide, after the United States rejected India’s request.

Despite its passive stance, the United States clearly voiced its opinion regarding the border dispute by stating that China’s acts were “a blatant projection of aggressive Chinese communism” and were signs of Chinese hostility. The United States also remarked that China’s approach towards the conflict was evidence that China does not pursue a constructive approach based on expansion, but a militant and strict approach that pertains more to the idea of rigid and often violent solutions that permanently define the outcome of an issue. Yet, the United States also stands firmly by the idea that any large-scale Chinese military aggression or intervention necessitates a nuclear weapon-based intervention by the United States.

F. British Empire

Before the partition, India and Pakistan were directorates of the United Kingdom, with most of their resources and functions, including executive and legislative, being directed by the East India Company. Following the partition of India and Pakistan, the United Kingdom continued to play a significant role in the region in multiple aspects.

First and foremost, the United Kingdom offered consultancy on the issue of the unification, partition, alliance and independence of the many states in the sub-continent. Some high

---

49 ibid.
ranking British officials also opted to remain in the region, as they were appointed to executive duties that were not affiliated with the East India Company. These British officials worked either in government of army branches, and were directly involved in trying to find a middle way solution for the Kashmir conflict. Louis Mountbatten, the Earl of Burma, personally met with Pakistani executives and Jinnah multiple times to ensure a peaceful resolve, for which the offer was ultimately rejected.  

Currently, the United Kingdom maintains a relatively distanced approach to the issue, following the discharge of the East India Company in the area. After the first Indo-Pakistani War, there is yet to be any direct form of contact or initiation by the United Kingdom towards neither India nor Pakistan.  

G. USSR

India first contacted the Soviet Union in order to request military assistance against China. Nehru spoke with Nikita Khrushchev in an effort to further strengthen Russo-Indian relations, whilst requesting military assistance for the army to secure a victory against China in the Aksai Chin region. Khrushchev, who had interpreted the Chinese border politics as an effort for expansionist policies, agreed to supply the Indian forces with the weapons they need.

Due to Khrushchev's actions, Mao Zedong criticized his behavior, stating that Khrushchev was willing to stand in the way of true communism and defy communist principles for financial gain. Due to the strain on its relations with China, and the impending threat of the Cold War with the United States, the Soviet Union refused to deploy any form of military forces in the area. Currently the Soviet Union maintains a state of neutrality on the issue between India and Pakistan, and has not carried out any other actions following the military aid gift to India.

---

52 ibid.
53 ibid.
55 ibid.
V. Timeline

1846: Maharaja Gulab Singh buys the Kashmir Valley from the East India Company, thus forming the State of Jammu and Kashmir under the Treaty of Amristar.\(^{56}\)

1857: Indian Rebellion of 1857 against the British employed East India Company. The first significant revolt in the past of the region.

1931: The movement against the Maharaja in Kashmir begins but is suppressed by State forces.

1932: The ‘All Jammu and Kashmir Muslim Conference’ is formed by Sheikh Mohammed Abdullah as a measure to fight for Kashmiri freedom from the Maharaja’s rule. This conference eventually transforms into the National Conference in 1939. A report is published in 1932 by the Glancy Commission\(^ {57}\) regarding the inequalities the Muslim population faces, especially in terms of inadequate representation in the state’s services.

1939: The National Conference starts the ‘Quit Kashmir’\(^ {58}\) movement, protesting the sovereignty of the people of Kashmir.

1940: The Pakistan Resolution is passed. Thus the establishment of an independent state is called for Muslims majority areas.

1947: In March an internal revolt is launched in the Poonch region. This is retaliated by the Maharaja’s forces. In August, the Partition for independence is given. The British Indian Empire is dissolved. The Muslim-majority regions located in the East and West are partitioned to form the separate state of Pakistan.

1947: The Standstill Agreement is signed between Kashmir and Pakistan. In October, the Indo-Pakistani War of 1947 begins. Thousands of Pashtuns, comprising the Azad Army, attack Kashmir and the Maharaja’s forces. The Maharaja asks India for help, who abides under the conditions that he relinquish control over defense, communication and foreign affairs to India. The Instrument of Accession is signed.

---


1949: A ceasefire is called upon between India and Pakistan on January 1st. The demilitarization of the valley leaves India in control of most of the valley, including Jammu and Ladakh. Pakistan takes control of Azad Kashmir and Northern territories.

1950: In January, India gains independence and becomes a republic.

1957: India’s Minister of Home Affairs Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel declares that the State of Jammu and Kashmir belongs to India. The question of a plebiscite is rejected. Protests of self-determination continue.

1962: Beginning of the Sino-Indian War over Aksai Chin.

1963: In December, large uprisings occur in the Kashmir Valley. Protests occur specifically against Articles 356 and 357 of the Indian Constitution. The Indian army attacks the protesters.

VI. Possible Solutions

With tensions still high in the region, the future of the regions face great risks. Conflicts have reigned the region, including countless wars and deaths, spanning from the partition period. Though many attempts at peace have been made, the best results yielded stalemate. A review of previous attempts include international interventions, binding resolutions passed by the Security Council, bilateral talks, unilateral actions, demilitarization, and so forth.

There are specific routes that can be followed in order to at the minimum de-escalate the tensions between the nations. The recommendations for minimizing combat begin with permanent demilitarization in the region. The retraction of military forces stationed along the borders of Kashmir and Aksai Chin (specifically the Line of Actual Control) would

effectively end active or potential direct combat. This is also in accordance with the United Nations’ and international community.\textsuperscript{60}

Further solutions rely essentially on bilateral talks between the nations in question. Face to face meetings between high ranking leaders representing both sides must be realized with the notion of compromise.

Potentially, mediation with United Nations representatives or international interference could serve as objective catalysts within these meetings. The meetings can only be held under party-neutral conditions, with the aim of ceasefire, damage-control, peace, good-will, disaster prevention and constructive goals.\textsuperscript{61}

Unlikely solutions that must be considered also encompasses the previously rejected plebiscite. By having a majority citizens of the region vote on the side they wish to accede to based on religious, political, social, and economical views, the general satisfaction and stability is guaranteed. An extra measure in this direction would even lead to the division of the region based on majority referendum. This is the situation applied in 1949 upon the ceasefire when the Muslim-dominant Azad is under the control of Pakistan, and in retrospect when the rest of Jammu and Kashmir, Aksai Chin and Ladakh are under Indian

---


\textsuperscript{61} ibid.
control. The map below depicts the religious representations in the regions (omitting data from the Chinese dominated Aksai Chin). Religion would play a large determining role in a plebiscite and potential division of the state would form treaties of regions accordingly to the visual.\(^{62}\)

The final suggestion to the solution lies in the independence of Jammu and Kashmir. This would result in the retraction of the claims of both Pakistan and India on the region as a whole. Within this, all military personnel, political and economic claims would also be lifted. The state would also be internationally recognized, locally represented, and run. In regards to this aspect, economic independence, unbiased state representation and citizens with conflicting identities must be established.\(^{63}\)

VII. Conclusion

Currently, India and Pakistan are in a stand-off state regarding Kashmir. Both nations maintain their respective parts of Kashmir on either side of the Ceasefire Line. While the Azad Army is recuperating and attempting to incite unrest amongst citizens, India is further militarizing the Kashmir region, especially areas close to the Ceasefire Line, while also working to integrate Kashmir into the Indian rule and lifestyle. It can be said that both nations are currently in a state of extremely alert tranquility.

Despite UN mediation, calls for a plebiscite, and talks with Pakistan regarding the possibility of a plebiscite, India is currently fully against a plebiscite or any sort of action that could potentially detach Kashmir from India. India firmly stands by its belief in the inseparability of Kashmir from India. Pakistan, on the contrary, believes that the people have the right to determine their fate, and is hosting many demonstrations to promote Kashmiri nationalism.

\(^{62}\)ibid.  
\(^{63}\)ibid.
and to strengthen the relations between itself and Kashmir. Pakistan is also still adamant about preserving its influence over the region called Azad Kashmir.

Kashmir poses great significance for both states due to its high economic potential and critical geographical location. Serving as a junction between many nations, the Kashmir region is also home to a vast amount of agricultural and touristic opportunities, while also boasting a considerably large and extremely diverse population. Kashmir also possesses high energy production potential, something both India and Pakistan are looking for as nations that are in a period of rapid development.

The long lasting, and seemingly almost impossible to resolve, nature of the Kashmir conflict can be attributed to many things, but the chief factor is the demographics present within the population. Home to a primarily Muslim population comprised of many Indian and Pakistani natives who also belong to various other cultural and ethnical sub-divisions, Kashmir is one of the areas in the sub-continent in which the boundaries between what sets the residents apart are more indiscernible and open to questioning. Its citizens torn between India and Pakistan, while some even rally for autonomy, Kashmir is in a wildly uncertain state that is open to changing in the shortest period of time.64

With no permanent solution tried and implemented, Kashmir can also be regarded as an obstacle; an obstacle barring development and peace in the region. Formally under Indian rule, yet very close with Pakistan in terms of culture, religion and demographics, Kashmir is the burning topic of debate and quarrel between India and Pakistan. The constant, and sometimes violent, rivalry between the two states is also troubling to other nations in the region. The bordering states view the conflict as a threatening situation that could, in a way, also affect them. The presence of the Kashmir issue is also driving third parties to make attempts to intervene, which is grounds for more political turmoil and possible conflicts worldwide.

VIII. Committee Matrix

## UNITED NATIONS REPRESENTATIVES

### Representative Stanfield

### Representative Volyankov

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDIAN CABINET</th>
<th>PAKISTANI CABINET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jawaharlal Nehru</td>
<td>Prime Minister of India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Mountbatten</td>
<td>Earl of Burma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brij Mohan Kaul</td>
<td>Chief of Staff for the Indian Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulzarilal Nanda</td>
<td>Minister of Home Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VK Krishna Menon</td>
<td>Minister of Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karan Singh</td>
<td>Ex-Governor of Jammu and Kashmir, Son of Hari Singh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheikh Abdullah</td>
<td>Head of Government in Kashmir</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commander-in-Chief of the Pakistani Army (Defacto Prime Minister)

Chief of Army Staff

President of Azad Kashmir

Minister of Foreign Affairs

Minister of Internal Affairs

Head of Intelligence and Police

Military Representative, Rajput Tribe Representative