



History of the issue and UN involvement In Kashmir

The issue of conflict in Kashmir is one that is older than the UN itself as in 1845 it had its first major battle between the Sikh rulers and what was officially called the East India company, but really was the British, in the first Anglo-Sikh war that lasted till 1846 when Kashmir was given to the British in the treaty of Lahore and then was transferred to Gulab Singh under the treaty of Amritsar. The region was relatively stable during this time however despite 77 percent of the population being openly Muslim the ruling class were mainly Hindu and this meant that the Muslims in the region faced discrimination and higher tax rates than those of Hindu origin and this religious discrimination became a theme for issues in the region ever since. This was one of the first major issues between two non-P5 members that the UN had to face as during the partition of India Kashmir decided to stay independent however this caused unrest in the Muslim population (who wanted to join Pakistan) and the Hindu population (who wanted to join India). This resulted in multiple violent protests from both sides which ended with many deaths and a hostile takeover by Muslim rebels in west Kashmir on the 22nd October 1947. The Indian army sent troops into the region to try and take control of the rebels and the Pakistani army joined and this started the first Indo-Pakistani war. In January 1948 the UN agreed to consider the issue in the Security Council after India referred the issue to them. They passed resolution 47 which suggested an immediate ceasefire and a plebiscite in Kashmir on whether to join India or Pakistan (there was no option of independence). However, a ceasefire was only signed in January 1949 and even after the ceasefire both sides kept troops in the region. Ever since this moment there have been high levels of tension in the region and multiple wars between both countries with Kashmir at the heart of the conflict. With some parts being run by India and despite the official Indian rule of the whole region there is effective Pakistani rule in some parts of the region, this has caused protests against Indian and Pakistani rule and some cry for independence from both and the only current UN operation in the region are 45 unarmed UN military observers. But this may not be enough in such a dangerous region with two nuclear powers fighting over it.

Points for the delegate to consider

Both sides have large militaries, nuclear arsenals and a cultural hatred of each other that goes back further than the existence of Pakistan as a country due to their differing religions so any clause passed needs to be thought about carefully as to not anger one side and start a possible nuclear war.



Both sides claim that the whole of Kashmir is there with both having different reasons India claiming that it has been part of the Indian region for hundreds of years so should be part of India and Pakistan claiming that due to the high Muslim population it should be part of a Muslim country. Which claim is better? And even if one is better does handing it over to one side risk a much larger conflict. Is independence an option?

Questions the committee's resolution should answer

- Does any nation have a true right to rule over Kashmir due to its independence throughout the British rule of India it remained independent?
- Can we truly yet Kashmir become independent due to the conflicts it has caused previously in the late 1940's
- Does Kashmir have the right to make their own decision on what country they become apart of or if they want to be independent or does this cause more damage than good?