



ACADEMIC POLISH MODEL UNITED NATIONS
UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL (UNSC)
14 – 17 SEPTEMBER, 2017

Executive Board of the Security Council

President Casandra Jagroop – University of Nottingham, England

President Joseph Botman – University of Oxford, England

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION TO THE SECURITY COUNCIL.....	1	5. Recommended sources	10
THE MEXICAN DRUG WAR.....	3	SITUATION IN KASHMIR	10
1. Introduction	3	1. Introduction	10
2. Background	4	2. Background.....	11
3. Recent developments.....	5	3. Recent Developments.....	11
4. Competencies of the UNSC	6	4. Questions to Consider.....	12
5. Recommended Readings.....	7	SITUATION IN DARFUR	12
ARMENIAN-AZERBAIJANI BORDER CONFLICT.....	7	1. Introduction	12
1. Introduction	7	2. Background.....	13
2. Background	7	3. Current Situation.....	14
3. Involved actors.....	9	4. Questions to Consider.....	14
4. Competencies of the UNSC	9		

Position Papers

All delegates admitted to the Security Council committee are required to submit a position paper no later than the **9th of September, at 15:00 (GMT)**. As positions on the Security Council are in high demand, delegates that fail to provide a position paper by this time may lose your country allocation and be moved to a less advanced committee. Delegates who fail to submit a position paper will also not be eligible for diplomacy awards in any committee.

The position paper should be anywhere from 800-1500 words, excluding the bibliography. An Open Agenda position paper should begin by stating the Country's position on recent events (no older than one month) that it finds exceptionally important, and then it should proceed directly to policy proposals for the four provisional agenda items. It can also be used to argue in favour of discussing a certain topic first, or introducing a new topic to the agenda all together. The format is flexible, and delegates are welcome to structure their paper differently to suit their country's foreign policy objectives.

INTRO TO THE SECURITY COUNCIL

The United Nations Charter established six main organs of the United Nations (UN), the Security Council makes up one of the six. The Council is mandated to maintain international peace and security in the world¹. The Charter also outlines three other responsibilities of the Security Council which include: developing friendly relations among nations; cooperating in solving international problems and promoting respect for human rights and finally to be the hub of harmonisation of the actions of nations². Each member of the UN concedes to and execute the decisions of the Security Council. Other organs of the UN can make recommendations: however, the Council stands as the only organ that has the power to make decisions which member states are obligated to enforce under the Charter.

The Security Council held its first session on 17th of January 1946 at Church House, Westminster, London. Since then the meetings have been held at the UN headquarters in New York City. The Council is made of permanent members (the P5) and ten non-permanent members who are elected for terms of two years. The P5 members are The People's Republic of China, France, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States³. The other ten members are elected by the General Assembly and are allocated to three African states; two Asia-Pacific states, two Latin American states, two Western European states and one Eastern European state. Every year, five of these ten positions are up for elections⁴. The Presidency of the Council rotates monthly amongst the members. For the purposes of authenticity, all the states represented in the Security Council at POLMUN 2017; are the current members of the Security Council.

Under Article 27 of the Charter, the Council decisions on substantive matters requires the affirmative votes of nine members, and the concurrent vote of the P5. This means a negative vote or "veto" by one of the permanent members immediately prevents the adoption of a proposal, even if it has the necessary nine votes⁵. In other words, if one of the P5 members, votes down a topic or resolution; the Council cannot approve that topic or resolution. Abstention, is not

seen as a veto power, even though the five permanent members must concur to change the Charter or to recommend the admission of a new UN member state. Procedural issues still require 9 affirmative votes, but the P5 concurrency rule does not hold, therefore the issue can at least be discussed and brought to the attention of the Council.

It should be however noted that the Security Council also has a unique precedent setting Motion to Entertain the Preliminary Question, the Preliminary Question being "was the previous motion procedural?" The substantive nature of this question means any motion can technically be vetoed, hence why it is sometimes called the "procedural veto" or "double veto". The same rulings could apply on the country that uses the double veto however, so it is only used for motions that lack precedence. For example, the motion to divide the question has never been used despite its existence – its use therefore would be precedent setting, and therefore informally writing the rules of the committee. That would arguably make the matter substantive, and that is exactly what the Preliminary Question was designed for.

The veto power was not highly favoured by the rest of the international community at first, but they finally conceded when the United Nations was at risk of failing without the presence of the US, UK, Russia, China and France. It is also noteworthy to point out that the Security Council is the only organ of the United Nations that can take binding actions. Their decision supersedes the national sovereignty of states in cases of imposing sanctions under Article 41 of the United Nations Charter or authorise military force under Article 42. However, the council can only invoke these articles if the issue is labelled as a "Chapter VII" Resolution, where the Council takes action with respect to "threats of peace, breaches of peace or acts of aggression." If any of these situations are explicitly acknowledged in the preambles of the resolution, it is considered a Chapter VII resolution. Certain resolutions discussing the situation in Darfur has been classified as

¹ UN Charter, Chapter V.

² Security Council Info Page, available at <http://www.un.org/en/sc/about/>

³ UN Charter, Chapter V, Article 23.

⁴ Rules and Procedures of the General Assembly, 142-144.

⁵ Kennedy, P. (2006) *The Parliament of Man*

chapter 7. Most council resolutions however are non-binding resolutions using pacific means of de-escalation, which are known as Chapter 6 resolutions, which include resolutions related to all four briefings discussed in this guide. Alternatively, the Security Council can also seek regional resolutions to conflicts through Chapter 8 of the Charter, which are also non-binding but are often based on a bilateral or multilateral security agreement between parties which would be included in the Annex section of the resolution.

Intro to Open Agenda

This year, we have decided to entertain an Open Agenda. Our decision is based on the fact that conflicts are changing daily and, at times, dramatically. Allowing an Open Agenda respects the dynamic nature of the conflicts we face in the world and forces all of us to adjust as developments occur. What does this mean for you as delegates? We, as a dais, have provided you with four briefings on topics that are due up for discussion soon on the Security Council provisional agenda, and that are likely to be overlooked by MUN delegates.

THE MEXICAN DRUG WAR

1. Introduction

Since 2006, when President Felipe Calderon launched an extensive counternarcotics campaign, the war against drug trafficking in Mexico has cost the lives of more than one hundred thousand people, many among them innocent civilians¹. The United States of America have spent over \$2 billion in aid to their southern neighbour's effort. According to the U.S. Drug Enforcement Agency² Mexican drug trafficking organisations are the primary foreign source of the imports of heroin, methamphetamines, and cocaine into North America³. Cocaine is largely produced in countries

As experienced delegates, we are expecting that you are all familiar with the topics making the international headlines – Iraq, Syria, Libya, Ukraine, and Korea – enough so that in case there is a major escalation or de-escalation during our conference, you would be able to address it. In absence of major changes however, there is limited potential for new resolutions, and at these times the Council would get back to its regular work on monitoring, deescalating and preventing hostilities in a hundred or so areas of interest.

Although we will be providing you with these guidelines, in the spirit of Open Agenda, at the end of the day, it is up to you all as a whole to decide what topic(s) should be debated in committee. Any topics that are relevant to the Security Council once conference comes around will be fair game. In regards to position papers, you will have to write a position paper on your state's overall foreign policy concerning security measures. We are so very excited to embark on this journey with you! Please reach out if you have any question or concerns about Open Agenda or committee structure in general.

other than Mexico itself, such as Peru, Columbia, and Bolivia⁴.

According to the Mexican government, the goal of the war on drugs is not to end trade of narcotics, but rather to dismantle the powerful drug cartels and curtail the violence rampant in the country⁵. The strategy of arresting key leaders in order to reduce fighting proved to be ineffective, as the arrests of high-ranking members of primarily the Tijuana and Gulf cartels had only increased the bloodshed⁶. The war on drugs (and by extension the Mexican Drug War) is not contained to the Americas, as Mexico has become a hub for the world-wide smuggle of controlled substances⁷.

¹ Schaeffer-Duffy, C. (2014). Counting Mexico's drug victims is a murky business. National Catholic Reporter.

² Seelke, C. R. & Finklea, K. (2017). U.S.-Mexican Security Cooperation: The Mérida Initiative and Beyond, 12. Congressional Research Service.

³ Cook, C. W. (2007). Mexico's Drug Cartels, 7. Congressional Research Service.

⁴ No author. (2004). US anti-drug campaign 'failing'. BBC.

⁵ No author. (2011). Calderón: Estamos luchando en contra de los criminales. TeleSUR.

⁶ Carl, T. (2009). Progress in Mexico drug war is drenched in blood. Associated Press.

⁷ Lee, B. & Renwick, D. (2017). Mexico's Drug War. Council on Foreign Relations.

2. Background

Already during the prohibition in the 1920's, Mexican smugglers were heavily involved in the import of illegal alcohol into the United States, with narcotics taking the place of bootleg alcohol when prohibition ended and large-scale drug trafficking starting a few decades later⁸. While initially cocaine was mainly distributed globally by the countries producing the narcotic, an increase in enforcement along the U.S. border and in the Caribbean forced South American cartels to seek alliances with their Mexican counterparts, who in return were rewarded handsomely for their assistance⁸.

The main factor contributing to the escalation of drug-related violence, which was until relatively recently a rather minor factor in the conflict, was the governing Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI) losing their grip on power in the early 1990s. The PRI had an implicit agreement with the cartels, by which it largely let them go unchecked – the government lost de facto control over large areas of its own country – in return for civilians and authorities largely being kept out of the fighting⁹. Since the 2000s the fighting has steadily worsened.

2.1 Major cartels

According to a 2016 report by the American Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), there are six Mexican gangs that have the greatest impact on the United States: the Sinaloa Cartel, the Jalisco New Generation Cartel, the Juarez Cartel, the Gulf Cartel, Los Zetas, and the Beltran-Leyva Organisation¹⁰. The first of these, the Sinaloa Cartel, has the largest international footprint but its leader, Joaquin “El Chapo” Guzman, who has recently been arrested, leading to their loss in influence. The Gulf Cartel and the Beltran-Leyva Organisation have also suffered due to the deaths or arrests of high-ranking officers¹¹.

The Sinaloa Cartel is one of Mexico's oldest and still most influential cartels, based mainly along Mexico's Pacific

coast. The Jalisco New Generation Cartel splintered from this cartel in 2010, owing its subsequent expansion mainly to its willingness to engage in open confrontation with authorities and other gangs. The Beltran-Leyva Cartel also splintered from the Sinaloa Cartel, but all four brothers who originally broke off have since been killed and the cartel is ran by loyalists operating all over the country¹¹.



The Gulf Cartel is based in the state of Tamaulipas, but recent arrests and deaths of leaders have diminished the organisation's influence significantly. The incredibly violent Los Zetas, controlling large areas in eastern, central, and southern Mexico, once were a paramilitary group of the Gulf Cartel but broke free. They are notorious for killing civilians¹². The Juarez Cartel belonged to neither the Sinaloa Cartel nor the Gulf Cartel, but are ardent rivals of the former¹¹.

2.2 Important external factors

One of the primary factors driving the Mexican Drug War is the poverty rampant in the country, leading many individuals not otherwise able to sustain themselves into the employment of one of the cartels, which provide an easy and relatively stable flow of income. A total of 450,000 people depend directly on the cartels for their livelihoods, another 3 million do so indirectly¹³. In some cities it is possible that more than 50% of the economy depends on illegal activities, with the government unable to

⁸ Vulliamy, Ed. (2010). *Amexica: War Along the Borderline*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

⁹ Bussey, J. (2008). *Drug lords rose to power when Mexicans ousted old government*. McClatchy Newspapers.

¹⁰ Unknown. (2016). *2016 National Drug Threat Assessment Summary*. Drug Enforcement Administration.

¹¹ Lee, B. & Renwick, D. (2017). *Mexico's Drug War*. Council on Foreign Relations.

¹² Unknown. *Los Zetas – civilians*, General non-state conflict information. Uppsala Conflict Data Program

¹³ Chew Sanchez, M. (2014). *Paramilitarism and State -Terrorism in Mexico as a Case Study of Shrinking Functions of the Neoliberal State*. Perspectives on Global Development and Technology

provide enough citizens legal employment sufficient to make a livelihood¹⁴.

Another important factor is the inefficacy of the Mexican education system, which features rampant illiteracy and a large underclass of millions of dropouts now employed by the cartels as foot soldiers¹⁵. The World Economic Forum ranked Mexico's education system 116th out of the 134 countries it evaluated, even though spending as a proportion of GDP is relatively high. The problem in the education sector is more urgently that money is badly invested rather than that there would be no money at all¹⁶. Powerful teachers' unions prevent educational reform¹⁷.

3. Recent developments

In 2014, the heads of the Beltran-Leyvan Cartel and of the Juarez Cartel were apprehended by Mexican police, the leader of Los Zetas would follow in 2015, and in 2016 the escaped leader of the Sinaloa Cartel, El Chapo, is rearrested and extradited to the United States. In 2017, the arrested head of the Beltran-Leyvan Cartel pleads guilty to his charges and is sentenced to life in prison¹⁸. The arrests of drug lords, however, frequently give rise to even further conflict, as both internal and external rivals vie to fill the power vacuum left behind¹⁹. One of the most recent examples is the turf war that broke out within the Sinaloa Cartel after the arrest of El Chapo²⁰.

In June 2017, the homicide rate in Mexico had increased by 40% compared to the same period in 2016. Over the first half of 2017, the rise compared to the previous year was 33%²¹. 2016 already saw 22% more murders than 2015, which saw 35% more than 2014. Mexico has since deployed army, navy, and federal police to aid the state police forces too weak or ridden with corruption to fight the

cartels themselves. The defence forces are carrying out a "kingpin strategy", targeting mainly high-ranking members of cartels, and despite the wide-spread violence, their actions are credited with preventing Mexico from becoming a failed state entirely ruled by drug traffickers²².

3.1 United Nations involvement

During the United Nations General Assembly Special Session on Drugs (UNGASS) in 2016, a resolution was passed reaffirming joint commitment to counter the world's drug problem²³. The resolution's primary goals, in line with the general competencies of the General Assembly, were the humanitarian efforts, such as education and addiction treatment, required to reduce dependency on narcotics and therefore limit the market for trafficking and cut profits. Included were also clauses to promote international cooperation on law-enforcement and data-collection. In 1998, the UNGASS pledged to clear the world of illicit narcotics entirely by 2008, mainly through action plans to combat trafficking and measures to control substances necessary for production by restricting supply: a goal that has clearly failed²⁴.

3.2 International cooperation

The United Nations have recently established a task force to develop a UN-wide strategy coordinating and strengthening responses to illicit drugs and organized crime by building them into all UN peacekeeping, peace building, security, development and disarmament activities²⁵. Concretely, the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime adopted in 2000 already led to the harmonisation of trafficking criminalisation, the creation of frameworks for extradition, recently used to extradite El Chapo to the United States,

¹⁴ Blake, M. (2010). The Exchange: Charles Bowden on Juárez, "Murder City". The New Yorker.

¹⁵ Longmire, S. (2011). Cartel: The Coming Invasion of Mexico's Drug Wars, 103. Macmillan.

¹⁶ Hausmann, R. (2009). The Mexico Competitiveness Report 2009, 15. World Economic Forum.

¹⁷ Acevedo, L. O. (2013). Reforma educativa pega a maestras rurales. Cimacnoticias.

¹⁸ Unknown. (2017). Mexico Drug War Fast Facts. CNN.

¹⁹ Carl, T. (2009). Progress in Mexico drug war is drenched in blood. INSI.

²⁰ Imison, P. (2017). Deadly turf war for control of El Chapo's empire erupts in Mexico. USA Today.

²¹ Woody, C. (2017). Mexico's bloody drug-related violence has surged to a new record. Business Insider.

²² Linthicum, K. (2017). More and more people are being murdered in Mexico — and once more drug cartels are to blame. Los Angeles Times.

²³ UN General Assembly Resolution A/S-30/L.1

²⁴ Doward, J. (2016). The UN's war on drugs is a failure. Is it time for a different approach? The Guardian.

²⁵ No author. (2017). International Day against Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking: UN calls for integrated fight against drugs and organised crime. First Post.



and the establishment of law enforcement cooperation, primarily in joint training²⁶. The results of cooperation under the convention have been positive, with especially production of narcotics in underdeveloped countries dropping significantly, due to a strengthened crop-eradication effort and counter-trafficking infrastructure²⁷. The United Nations Security Council has not passed any substantial resolutions regarding the situation in Mexico.

The international character of trafficking routes makes this cooperation especially pressing.

4. Competencies of the UNSC²⁸

Under its charter, the United Nations Security Council is primary responsible for the world's peace and security,

meaning it can enact policies that the General Assembly, so far the body that has most occupied itself with the fight against illicit narcotics, cannot. Its usual role is arbitrage in international conflict, initially attempting to resolve disputes and restore the peace through recommending terms of settlement but in some cases resorting to sanctions or even the authorised use of force instead. The UNSC can also facilitate international cooperation on security issues, advising other countries what help can be provided to Mexico and other countries currently involved in a war on drugs. Many humanitarian efforts concerning the Mexican Drug War do not fall within the competencies of this body.

²⁶ United Nations Convention against Transnational Organised Crime

²⁷ No author. (2009). *Successful Fight against Drug Trafficking, Transnational Organized Crime Requires Interlocking National, Regional, International Strategies, Third Committee Told. United Nations.*

²⁸ Assume all competencies are sourced from the relevant chapters of the United Nations charter

4.1 Issues to be addressed

- Discuss measures to reaffirm the territorial sovereignty of the United Mexican States
- Find ways to guarantee the bodily integrity and safety of the Mexican citizens
- Set guidelines for cooperation with other international bodies, inside and outside the United Nations, on the Mexican Drug War and the combat of illicit narcotics as a whole
- Build consensus on the UNSC's stance on the war on drugs
- Address the question of Transatlantic drug-trade
- Provide central coordination for international efforts in the war on drugs to end discord measures

5. Recommended Readings

- Council on Foreign Policy: Mexico's Drug War. <https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/mexicos-drug-war>
- US DEA: DEA History. https://web.archive.org/web/20060823025801/http://www.usdoj.gov/dea/pubs/history/history_part2.pdf
- Congressional Research Service: Mexico's Drug Cartels. <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL34215.pdf>
- Wilson Centre: U.S.-Mexico Policy Options for Confronting Organised Crime. <https://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/Shared%20Responsibility--Olson,%20Shirk,%20Selee.pdf>
- Trans-Border Institute: Drug Violence in Mexico. <https://justiceinmexico.files.wordpress.com/2013/02/130206-dvm-2013-final.pdf>
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime: UNGASS – Ten Years On. https://www.unodc.org/documents/wdr/WDR_2008/ungass_E_PRINT.pdf
- United Nations General Assembly: Resolution A/S-30/L.1. <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N16/110/24/PDF/N1611024.pdf?OpenElement>
- Foreign Affairs: The Rise of Mexico's Self-Defence Forces. <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/mexico/2013-06-11/rise-mexico-s-self-defense-forces>

ARMENIAN-AZERBAIJANI BORDER CONFLICT

1. Introduction

In April 2016, a conflict that had been frozen for more than two decades was suddenly reignited, as the army of the unrecognised Nagorno-Karabakh Republic backed by the Armenian army, situated on disputed territory between Armenia and Azerbaijan, clashed with Azerbaijani military. These clashes were the result of an attempt by Azerbaijan to regain territory under the de-facto control of the unrecognised state²⁹. The Nagorno-Karabakh Republic claims the disputed region of Nagorno-Karabakh and seven

surrounding districts: this land is internationally recognised as de jure part of Azerbaijan³⁰.

2. Background

As the fall of the Soviet Union neared, the Soviet Republic of Azerbaijan had de-jure control over the Armenian-majority Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast. In 1988, the local parliament of the oblast voted to secede and unify with Armenia, a vote later reaffirmed by a referendum boycotted by the Azerbaijani minority in the region, but forbidden by Azerbaijan. When the latter declared

²⁹ No author. (2016). Nagorno-Karabakh violence: Worst clashes in decades kill dozens. BBC.

³⁰ No author. (2013). *Stalin's Legacy: The Nagorno-Karabakh Conflict*. Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training.

independence from the Soviet Union, it revoked the autonomous status of Nagorno-Karabakh, prompting the



2.1 Original conflict

In 1992, war broke out in full and initial international mediation proved futile as 230,000 Armenians and 800,000 Azerbaijanis were displaced by the conflict. By 1994, the Armenian military had succeeded in occupying nearly all of the enclave and several parts of Azerbaijani territory outside of it³². A ceasefire was finally signed that same year, mediated by the Russian Federation, but a peace treaty has yet to be agreed upon even now. Clashes continued between 1994 and 2016, but not nearly on the same scale as before³³.

2.2 Collapse of the 1994 ceasefire

The ceasefire held more or less until it collapsed entirely in April 2016, when Azerbaijani forces invaded the unrecognised republic in an attempt to regain control over their de-jure territory. Both Armenia and Azerbaijan agree that by the time a new ceasefire was reached on the 5th of April, after four days of fighting, Azerbaijan had recovered some of its lands, with the former suggesting it was 800 hectares of no importance and the latter claiming they had regained 2,000 hectares³⁴. It is possible that Azerbaijan's worsening economy was the reason behind the renewed

region to declare the unrecognised Republic of Nagorno-Karabakh³¹.

escalation of the conflict, but different parties claim different causes³⁵.

2.3 Current status

In 2017, several soldiers on both sides have been killed by continued engagements along the line of contact, the de-facto border between Nagorno-Karabakh and Azerbaijan. This started with the death of a Nagorno-Karabakh soldier at the hands of the Azerbaijani military in February, followed by two more in yet another altercation at the border³⁶. Later in the same month, Azerbaijani soldiers employed artillery fire against Armenian servicemen near the village of Talish, resulting in a large firefight which saw five Azerbaijani fighters killed³⁷. In May, the Azerbaijanis have used mortars and anti-tank grenades against the Armenians, resulting in the death of another soldier³⁸ on the Armenian side and later another on the side of Nagorno-Karabakh³⁹.

In June, three Nagorno-Karabakh soldiers were killed by Azeri combatants, prompting retaliation leading to the death of four Azeri fighters⁴⁰. The same month, Azerbaijani army also killed several more Armenian soldiers⁴¹ and another fighting for the Republic of Nagorno-Karabakh⁴². The worst ceasefire violation for the year so far was July's shelling of a village in the disputed region resulting by the the Armenian military in the death of two civilians, one of which a 2-year-old girl⁴³.

While the territory is still internationally recognised as belonging to Azerbaijan, the country is far from able to exert its sovereignty over the entirety of the territory. The

³¹ Rieff, D. (1997). *Case Study in Ethnic Strife. (Nagorno-karabakh)*. Council on Foreign Relations.

³² No author. (2017). *CIA Factbook: Azerbaijan*. Central Intelligence Agency.

³³ Sanamyan, E. (2015). Loose Restraints: A Look at the Increasingly Shaky Karabagh Ceasefire. *The Armenian Weekly*.

³⁴ No author. (2016). Karabakh lost 800 ha that played no strategic role: Armenia. *PanArmenian*.

³⁵ Gafarli, O. (2016). *Secrets of the Four-Day Karabakh War*. *The National Interest*.

³⁶ No author. (2017). Armenian Serviceman Killed, another Wounded By Azerbaijani Fire. *Asbarez*.

³⁷ No author. (2017). Artsakh Forces Quell Largest Azerbaijani Attack Since Last April. *Armenian Weekly*.

³⁸ No author. (2017). Armenian Serviceman Karen Danielyan Killed by Azerbaijani Fire. *Armenian Weekly*.

³⁹ No author. (2017). Artsakh Serviceman Killed by Azerbaijani Fire. *Armenian Weekly*.

⁴⁰ No author. (2017.) 4 Azerbaijani Soldiers Killed after Artsakh Forces Rebut Attack. *Asbarez*.

⁴¹ No author. (2017). Azerbaijani army hits Armenian positions. *World Bulletin*.

⁴² No author. (2017). Karabakh soldier killed in Azerbaijani fire. *NEWS.am*.

⁴³ No author. (2017). Azeri woman and child killed by Armenian forces near Nagorno-Karabakh boundary: defense ministry. *Reuters*.

Council on Foreign Relations estimates the chance of renewed all-out fighting very high⁴⁴.

3. Involved actors

While the conflict is strictly-speaking a border conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan, complicated by the fact that the disputed region has declared itself an unrecognised republic, there are several more actors involved on either side of the conflict. Russia, which has before issued strong statements urging both sides not to escalate the conflict further⁴⁵, is providing arms to both sides of the conflict⁴⁶ and Israel is arming the Azerbaijani side⁴⁷. Meanwhile, Armenia is aided by the unrecognised Republic of Nagorno-Karabakh (or the other way around, depending on which of the two one considers the primary belligerent against Azerbaijan) and Azerbaijan can count on the support of Turkey⁴⁸ and Pakistan⁴⁹. However, neither of Azerbaijan's direct allies have so far been actively involved in combat. Russia is by treaty required to defend Armenia.

The United States do not recognise Nagorno-Karabakh as an independent country and supports the territorial integrity of Azerbaijan, but recognises that the future status of the disputed territory is dependent on the solution that is reached between the parties⁵⁰. The European Union also takes this position⁵¹. The United Nations General Assembly passed a non-binding resolution re-affirming unconditionally Azerbaijan's territorial sovereignty and demanding immediate retreat of all Armenian forces in the area. This resolution was opposed by all three leading members of the OSCE Minsk Group, founded to bring a diplomatic and mutually-beneficial resolution to the conflict, namely Russia, the United States, and France.⁵²

4. Competencies of the UNSC⁵³

Under its charter, the United Nations Security Council is primary responsible for the world's peace and security, being able to enact policies that Non-Government Organisations or organisations only backed by several governments cannot. Its usual role is arbitrage in international conflict, initially attempting to resolve disputes and restore the peace through recommending terms of settlement but in some cases resorting to sanctions or even the authorised use of force for non-compliance. This suggests that the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict falls squarely within the competencies of the council, being a conflict between, at its core, two parties that so far has not been possible to resolve through other means. The civilians in the region are not especially at risk, despite a few civilian casualties, and economic standards are not behind on surrounding regions, meaning that for now there is not much necessary that falls outside of the committee's mandate.

The United Nations Security Council has so far called four times for the withdrawal of Armenian troops from the Nagorno-Karabakh region, in resolutions 822, 853, 874, and 884, all of which were passed in 1993. The first three resolutions called for the withdrawal of Armenian troops from different regions recognised as belonging to Azerbaijan and the fourth resolution condemned the collapse of the short-lived 1993 ceasefire (before the longer-lived 1994 ceasefire was signed) and called upon the Armenian government to use their influence with the breakaway Republic of Nagorno-Karabakh to force them to cease hostilities. None of the resolutions had the desired effects

⁴⁴ Cavanaugh, C. (2017). *Renewed Conflict Over Nagorno-Karabakh*. Council on Foreign Relations.

⁴⁵ Mkrtychyan, H. & Bagirova, N. (2014). Five more killed in clashes between Azeris, ethnic Armenians. Reuters.

⁴⁶ Nemtsova, A. (2016). In Nagorno-Karabakh, a Bloody New War With Putin on Both Sides. The Daily Beast.

⁴⁷ Murinson, A. (2014). *The Ties between Israel and Azerbaijan*. The Begin-Sadat Centre for Strategic Studies.

⁴⁸ No author. (2013). 'Nagorno-Karabakh is Turkey's problem too,' says Erdoğan. Sunday's Zaman.

⁴⁹ No author. (2015). 'Pakistan will continue supporting Azerbaijan on Nagorno-Karabakh'. Daily Times.

⁵⁰ No author. (2007). *Nagorno-Karabakh*. US Department of State.

⁵¹ No author. (2003). *Bulletin EU 7/8-2002: Common foreign and security policy (5/39)*. European Commission

⁵² No author. (2008). *General Assembly adopts resolution reaffirming territorial integrity of Azerbaijan, demanding withdrawal of all Armenian forces*. UNO Department of Public Information.

⁵³ Assume all competencies are sourced from the relevant chapters of the United Nations charter

4.1 Issues to be addressed

- Discuss means to ensure stability in the region and prevent localised clashes from resulting in further conflict in bordering countries
- Find a resolution of the border conflict that is acceptable to all directly-involved parties
- Provide for a framework that brings the Nagorno-Karabakh region back into a state of territorial legitimacy
- Address the question of sovereignty over the disputed areas
- Build consensus among co-belligerents over a desirable outcome

5. Recommended sources

- Council on Foreign Policy: Renewed Conflict Over Nagorno-Karabakh. <https://www.cfr.org/report/renewed-conflict-over-nagorno-karabakh>
- Council on Foreign Policy: Nagorno-Karabakh: The Crisis in the Caucasus. <https://www.cfr.org/background/nagorno-karabakh-crisis-caucasus>
- International Crisis Group: Armenia and Azerbaijan: Preventing War. <https://web.archive.org/web/20160520105841/http://www.crisisgroup.org/~/media/Files/europe/caucasus/B60%20Armenia%20and%20Azerbaijan%20---%20Preventing%20War.pdf>
- United Nations Security Council: Resolutions 822, 853, 874, and 884.
- Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training: Stalin's Legacy: The Nagorno-Karabakh Conflict. <http://adst.org/2013/08/stalins-legacy-the-nagorno-karabakh-conflict/>

SITUATION IN KASHMIR

1. Introduction

In late 2015, and early 2016 observers of Kashmir reported a growth in home-grown Islamic militancy and radicalization of the Kashmiri Muslim population. Scholars have argued that this new trend is due to the lack of a political dialogue, economic opportunities, high unemployment and exorbitant militarization of public areas and constant human violations by the security forces.¹ Others believe the increasing radicalization is a counter-reaction to India's rising middle class and Hindu nationalism.² The forceful Hindu nationalists had negative effects on how Kashmiri Muslims perceived the Indian state and dramatically shifted their Kashmiri Muslim identity.

The Kashmiri region continues to be a potential trigger ground for armed conflict that runs the risk of becoming a nuclear war between Pakistan and India. Pakistan has claimed the territory since the Partition of British India in 1947 which created the borders of India and Pakistan. The conflict has led to three wars in 1947, 1965 and 1999; leaving Kashmir divided between Pakistan and India along a Line of Control. On the Line, the Pakistani and Indian armies confront each other in an ongoing and uneasy stalemate. There are constant artillery exchanges along the Line of Control, contrary to the 2003 cease-fire agreement. There have been reports of these military outbursts to have significant military and civilian casualties.

In an effort to place increasing pressure on India to give up Kashmir, Pakistan supported Kashmiri insurgents and used

¹ Trehan, J. 2002. "Terrorism and the Funding of Terrorism in Kashmir", *Journal of Financial Crime*, Vol. 9 Issue: 3, pp.201-211, <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb026018>

² Hansen, TB. 1999. *The Saffron Wave: Democracy and Hindu Nationalism in Modern India*. Penguin: NY.

Islamist militants to launch attacks over the Line of Control. In September 2016, a group of militants killed 18 soldiers during an attack on an Indian army base in Kashmir. The Indian authorities held Pakistan responsible and there were several demands for a decisive response, from journalists and even Majors in the Indian army. Radicalisation and the ever-looming nuclear threat between the two states have once again reinvigorated the tensions within the region.³

2. Background

The Kashmir disputes dates back from 1947 with the partition of the Indian sub-continent along religious lines, establishing the states of India and Pakistan. However, there were over 650 states, run by princes, existing within the two newly independent states. Theoretically the princely states would choose which state they want to be a part of, in practice the uneasiness of the population of each province proved decisive. The people just gained their independence from British rule, and they were not willing to let the princes fill the vacuum. Due to the overwhelming sometimes violent protests, the princes conceded to the will of their people and become members of the new states. However, due to its geographical location Kashmir refused to join either India or Pakistan. Maharaja Hari Singh, the ruler of Kashmir was Hindu while most of his subjects were Muslims. The Maharaja choose to remain neutral, rather than choose a side.⁴

However, his dreams of neutrality proved futile. When the Pakistanis sent Muslim tribesmen into the capital Srinagar. Hari Singh pleaded to the Indian government for military assistance and fled to India, there he signed the Instrument of Accession, ceding Kashmir to India on 26 October. Thus, the first war over Kashmir began. India referred the dispute to the United Nations on 1 January, 1948 and on 13 August, 1948 the UN asked Pakistan to remove their troops from the region and as a result India withdrew a bulk of their forces. After the removal, the Kashmiri people were allowed a “free and fair” plebiscite which allowed them to decide their own future. India was overly confident of winning the plebiscite since the most influential leader Sheikh Abdullah was pro-India and he was in charge of the

emergency government as Prime Minister. Pakistan continued to ignore the UN mandate and continued fighting for the portion of Kashmir still under their control.⁵

In 1965, fighting broke out again but a ceasefire was established that September with the signing of the Tashkent agreement on 1 January, 1966. The death of the signatories, Indian Prime Minister Shastri and the rise of General Yahya Khan resulted in a stalemate instead of a resolution. In 1971, a third war occurred resulting in the formation of the state of Bangladesh, formerly known as East Pakistan. Once the war begun in March 1971, India was facing a major refugee problem.⁶ India declared war on 3 December, 1971 after Pakistani Air Force planes attacked Indian airfields in the Western sector. Eventually, domestic issues dominated the concerns of both governments and the issue of Kashmir was left on the back burner.

The states continue to live in strenuous relations but they each focused on their domestic stabilities. Every now and again an issue of Kashmir would occur but never to warrant major concern, until May 1998 when both India and Pakistan tested nuclear devices and then fire missiles in April 1999. With the fear of nuclear war escalation, the then Indian Prime Minister Vajpayee set out for Lahore by bus in an attempt to lower tensions along the Line of Control in Kashmir. However, all hopes of diplomacy disappeared when the cross-LOC firing in Kargil began in the mid-1990s. The death toll rose to more than 30,000. The conflict in Kargil ended with the help of US President Bill Clinton’s intervention in the conflict. Eventually, the conflict died down; however, the fear of full scale war with nuclear capability adding a deadly dimension, in addition to the economic effects as well as international sanctions have caused both India and Pakistan to think twice about their actions taken in the Kashmiri region.

3. Recent Developments

In the last decade, the international community has been severely concerned with the rise of insurgents and terroristic ideals in the Kashmiri region. The Kashmiri insurgency conflict is between the Kashmiri separatists

³ Ibid.

⁴ Dalrymple, W. 2015. *The Great Divide*. The New Yorker: New York.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ganguly, S. 1995. “Wars without End: the Indo-Pakistani Conflict” *Sage Journals*. 541 (1) pp. 167-171.

and the Indian government. Some groups who are a part of the separatist movement favour Kashmir's accession to Pakistan while others seek out complete independence for Kashmir. Since 2002, squabbles with local insurgents culminate around the main conflict in the Kashmir region which also incorporates strong Islamist elements amongst the insurgent fighters who identify themselves with Jihadist movements.⁷

The Inter-Services Intelligence of Pakistan has been accused by India of supporting and training mujahideen members to fight in Kashmir and Jammu as well. In 2015, former President of Pakistan Pervez Musharraf admitted that Pakistan has supported and trained insurgent groups in the 1990s. The amount of insurgency related violence left more than 47,000 people dead. However, that number

has fallen since the start of a slow-moving peace process between India and Pakistan.⁸

In the summer of 2017, India address the Human Rights Council and highlighted Pakistan's role in support of terrorism in Kashmir and pleaded for the world to understand that Pakistan utilises terrorism as an instrument of state policy. India's representative at the UN reminded the world that the Indian portion of Kashmir has an elected democratic government which represents all sections of the people, unlike the Pakistani occupied portions. The representative went on to emphasise that cross-border terrorism and Pakistan's terroristic state policies need to be addressed by the international community, Without this the issue in Kashmir would be a continuous and bloody conflict.⁹

4. Questions to Consider

1. Is the threat of nuclear war enough for the insurgents in Kashmir to stop their extreme rhetoric?
2. Would the use of peacekeepers in the Kashmiri region alleviate the issue? And if yes, how can the Security Council justify it to the international community?
3. How can we cause Pakistan and India to disarm their nuclear weapons

SITUATION IN DARFUR

1. Introduction

The situation in Darfur began with a major armed conflict which began in 2003. Since then, the Security Council has worked tirelessly to rectify and end the tragedies occurring in the Darfuri region. The most recent form of large-scale military offensive occurred last year in Jebel Marra which is the home of roughly 1,500 villages. The nine-month operation clearly targeted civilians and the Sudanese government thus far was able to successfully hide their violations. When people such as journalists, human rights

investigator, humanitarian actors and peacekeepers tried to enter the region; they were immediately denied access.¹

Through exhaustive efforts, Amnesty International was able to conduct their own remote investigations. Through the testimonies of 250 individuals Amnesty International estimated that between 200 to 250 people may have died as a result from exposure to the chemical weapon agents. The report went on to find at least 30 alleged chemical attacks in the region, most recent occurring on the 9th of September 2016.² Amnesty's report consisted of photographs, interviews and assessments by two experts in non-conventional weapons. The testimonies painted a

⁷ Rajghatta, C. (2011) "US Exposes ISI subversion of Kashmir Issue: FBI arrests US-based lobbyist" *The Times of India*. Retrieved 3 August, 2017.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ani. 2017. "Cross Border Terrorism is the Main Problem in Kashmir, Says India at UNHRC" *HuffPost*. Available at:

http://www.huffingtonpost.in/2017/06/07/cross-border-terrorism-is-the-main-problem-in-kashmir-says-india_a_22130822/

¹ "Scorched Earth, Poisoned Air" *Amnesty International Report*. Available at: <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2016/09/chemical-weapons-attacks-darfur/>

² Ibid.

vivid and gruesome image of what the civilians were forced to go through. Fifty-seven of the people interviewed described the direct use of chemical weapons in 32 different attacks.

The Sudanese officials continuously to strongly deny the fact that they were the perpetrators of the attacks. The Sudanese Ambassador to the United Nations, Omer Mohamed Stood claimed that Sudan has no chemical weapon capabilities and could not have been the ones who initiated the attack. He believes it to be a fabricated scenario.³

2. Background

From 2003, the Darfur region of western Sudan has been the site of violence, death, displacement and what the United States government has labelled 'genocide'. Despite being the receiver of the largest relief operation, attempts to quell the conflict and assist the approximately five million suffering Darfurians have been unsuccessful.⁴ The causes of this conflict can be found in the ethnic conflicts within the region.

In the Darfuri, there is a mix of black Africans and Arab Muslims present. However, the state's Arab Muslim leadership always treated the black Africans in the region unfairly and in 2003 they rebelled against the government. The Sudanese government retaliated by sending government forces to suppress the rebellion. It is also a well-known fact that the government organised and supplied the Janjaweed militia to combat the rebels.⁵ The military groups involved in the conflict are the Sudan Liberation Army/Movement (SLA/M) and the Justice and Equality Movement (JEM). Both groups constantly demand equal representation in the government and an end to the economic disparity between black Africans and Arabs in Sudan.

The violence has devastated the arid desert region and driven millions of Darfuri villagers from their homes. Most have been forced to live in the disease riddled refugee camps along the border; where the children are most vulnerable at being raped or recruited as child soldiers. Others have fled the camps into neighbouring Chad, causing a migration crisis in the state. The US Agency for International Development has deemed the crisis in Darfur as the "worst humanitarian crisis in the world today".⁶

In 2007, the Security Council unanimously approved a resolution to send a joint UN/African Union peacekeeping force, UNAMID to the Darfur region. However, there was a slow deployment of the forces and numerous criticisms arose from this action. Representatives for UNAMID and even a special envoy to Darfur were sceptical about the forces goal to "keep a peace that does not exist".⁷ Other scholars like Stephen Faris, have claimed that the conflict is not just amongst ethnic lines but between settled farmers and nomadic herders fighting over failing lands. In his work, Faris tells the tale of warlord Musa Hilal who was once the son of a sheikh. Faris explains that the distinction between Arab and African lies in their lifestyle, Arabs are typically herders while Africans are typically farmers. Hilal grew up in a Sudan where the nomads were always welcome passers-through, who were allowed to graze their camels in allotted areas. Once the drought hit the region, the farmers were forced to fence off their lands, some tribes left the area but the Arab herders stuck to their fraying livelihoods.⁸

The word **Darfur** means "land of the Fur" which is the home of the largest single tribe of farmers. However, the **dars** is the region which holds the tribal lands of numerous tribes. In the late 1980's, landless and desperate the Arabs began banding together to protect their lands from the African farmers in the region. In 1987, the Arab herders published a manifesto of racial superiority and clashes broke out

³ Loeb, J. "Sudan Has Been Accused of Using Chemical Weapons Against Civilian". *Time*. 03 of October, 2016. Available at: <http://time.com/4514851/darfur-sudan-conflict/>

⁴ Salama, D. 2016. "Is Hybrid Peacekeeping a Model of Success? The Case of UNAMID" *United Nations University*. Available at: <http://www.merit.unu.edu/is-hybrid-peacekeeping-a-model-of-success-the-case-of-unamid/>

⁵ Darfur Crisis-Brief History, Analysis and Strategies. Available at: <https://www.untilall.org/Darfur.htm>

⁶ Nwazota, K. 2008. "Origins of the Darfur Crisis" *PBS* Available at: http://www.pbs.org/newshour/updates/africa-july-dec08-origins_07-03/

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Faris, S. 2007. "The Real Roots of Darfur" *The Atlantic*. Available at: <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2007/04/the-real-roots-of-darfur/305701/>

between the Africans and Arabs broke out. In these disputes, Sudan's central government constantly supported the Arabs politically, financially and occasionally supplied them with weapons as well. All of these tensions came to head in 2003, with the rebellion in Darfur which was a clear reaction against Khartoum's neglect and political marginalisation of the region.⁹

On 9th of July, 2011 South Sudan became an independent state as a result of peace dealing which was supposed to end Africa's longest civil war. However, South Sudan continues to face tensions with Sudan. Despite the Comprehensive Peace Agreement, the president of Sudan and wanted war criminal President Al-Bashir actively supports instability efforts in South Sudan.¹⁰ His forces have bombed across the border on several occasions, including refugee areas. In 2012, the Sudan's People Liberation Movement shutdown the oil wells in order to stop the flow of oil into the pipelines of Sudan; cutting off South Sudanese oil from the international market. South Sudan has further been destabilised by an influx of 220,000 refugee majority of whom originate from Darfur.

3. Current Situation

As of 2016, several Non-Governmental organisations and journalists have been investigated the allegations of chemical weapons used against the Sudanese population in the Jebel Marra region of Darfur. Since the release of the report, the Security Council has worked tirelessly to take action and bring the responsible parties to justice. The 7833rd meeting of the Security Council discussing the Situation in Sudan and South Sudan, recognised the chemical weapons attack in the region and renewed the UNAMID mandate another year.

The representative of the International Criminal Court (ICC) announced that the Court are taking steps to verify these claims. However, due to the fact that international entities including the UN, ICC, journalists and other human rights group have restricted access in the Darfuri region; obtaining verification is rather difficult task. The representative then went on to plead to the council to make greater strides in combating the impunity that occurs within Darfur. Other organisations such as the Integrated Regional Information Networks (IRIN) also uncovered the use of chemical weapons by Khartoum in the Nuba Mountains and as early as 2000. Members of Doctors without Borders reports during that time parallel the claims made by the IRIN.⁴

Scholars such as Eric Reeves, has criticised the Western states on their involvement with al-Bashir as a way of handling the migration crisis from Africa. The European Union has funded registration equipment to the Sudanese National Intelligence and Security Services. The United States in an effort to limit the influx of Islamic extremists have enacted a travel ban on several states including Sudan.⁵

4. Questions to Consider

- Discuss future efforts the council can make to deal with the issue of chemical weapons in the region.
- Re-evaluate the UNAMID mandate.
- Address the question of Western state's motives in Sudan.
- Provide central coordination for international efforts in the ongoing conflict in Sudan.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Taha, H. 2011. "Darfur and South Sudan: United in Struggle, Divided by Future" *E-International Relations*. Available at: <http://www.e-ir.info/2011/09/09/darfur-and-south-sudan-united-in-struggle-divided-by-future/>

⁴ UN Web TV. 7833 Security Council Meeting: The Situation in Sudan and South Sudan. Available at: <http://webtv.un.org/watch/7833rd-security->

[council-meeting-situation-in-sudan-and-south-sudan/5246289096001?page=5](http://webtv.un.org/watch/7833rd-security-council-meeting-situation-in-sudan-and-south-sudan/5246289096001?page=5)

⁵ Reeves, E. "Chemical Weapons Use in Darfur: The World Walks Away" *Huff Post*. Available at: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/eric-reeves/chemical-weapons-use-in-d_b_12545798.html