



GEMS Cambridge International School Abu Dhabi Model of United Nations 2020

CIAMUN

United Nations General Assembly First Committee (DISEC) Background Guide

Chair: Arkhat Almetayev
Co-chair: Tiana Govender

GEMS Cambridge International School Abu Dhabi
www.ciamun.org

INDEX

- Letter from the Chairs
- Introduction to the committee

Topic A: Limiting the Presence of Military Vessels in the Strait of Hormuz

- Overview
- Introduction
- Background/History
- Current Situations
- Questions to consider

Topic B: Disarmament of the Jammu and Kashmir Region Overview

- Introduction
- Background/History
- Current Situations
- Questions to consider

- **Further readings**



LETTER FROM THE CHAIRS

Greetings!

Welcome to the Disarmament and International Security Committee for CIAMUN 2020. As delegates of DISEC, you will have to work hard to discuss issues regarding disarmament of regions and resolving conflicts in order to maintain international security. Our committee's focus will encompass problems that endanger safety of international communities.

Dear delegates, our names are Arkhat Almetayev and Tiana Govender, your chair and co-chair for DISEC this year.

My name is Arkhat, I'm a Sixth Form student at GEMS Cambridge International School Abu Dhabi, this is my first-time chairing at a real conference. I've been doing MUN for almost two years now and I have a great interest in Geopolitics. I'm excited about our schools first MUN conference and I hope you will enjoy the debates and make new friends!

My name is Tiana Govender, co-chair for DISEC. I am also a Sixth Form student at GEMS CIA, and this is my first-time co-chairing at a proper conference. I've been doing MUN for a year now and am eager to see how the debate will work out.

We believe we have a good set of topics which involves majority of countries and we look forward for each delegate to participate in the debate. Both of us will aid you in case you don't understand the topics and want everybody to have a good time and make new friends. This is our first time to have the privilege to chair and co-chair and we are open to any feedback for improvement, but we will do our best to keep you all motivated to have the best debate possible.

If you have any questions regarding the topic, conference or about our school please don't be afraid to email either of us. We are already counting days until the conference and are excited to see how the debate will turn out!

Kind regards, Chair and Co-Chair of DISEC

If you want to get in contact with any of the chairs email us to our MUN email at ciamun.disecc@gmail.com.

INTRODUCTION TO THE COMMITTEE

The Committee on Disarmament and International Security (DISEC) serves as the First Committee of the General Assembly (GA) of the United Nations. The committee works in conjunction with the Security Council and the Conference on Disarmament to take measures in pursuing one of the fundamental goals of the UN: the promotion of international security and relative peace among nations.

DISEC decisions are held in high regard because, as part of the GA, each nation is afforded equal representation in voting procedures while the Security Council is frequently stagnated by the veto powers of the five permanent members. Recent terrorist actions have shifted the world's attention to issues of international security and prevention of further attacks. This responsibility falls largely on the three-part security foundation of the UN and, therefore, places increased importance on DISEC proceedings. With greater attention and urgency, DISEC will facilitate discussion on issues with major implications for all nations and attempt to ensure the safety of the global community.

TOPIC A: LIMITING THE PRESENCE OF MILITARY VESSELS IN THE STRAIT OF HORMUZ

Overview

In recent years, the U.S. and Iranian navies have had numerous tense encounters in the Persian Gulf, where 30 per cent of the world's seaborne-traded crude oil passes through the Strait of Hormuz every day. An international or inadvertent incident at the sea could quickly escalate into a direct military confrontation, and risk shipping through the critical energy chokepoint. The world's economy is at danger with Iranian activities in the region. How will the UN stop the tension in the region? Should Iran be persuaded to stop? Should an ultimatum be given?

Introduction

The Strait of Hormuz is known as the “jugular of the world's economy”, the strait holds an economic and political value since it's a passage for 21 million barrels of oil which pass through every day. It's the world's busiest shipping lane, mostly because there are limited alternatives to bypass the strait. About one-third of the world's sea-traded oil passes through the strait which makes it vital for countries around the globe. Currently the country of Iran threatens to close the international oil shipments in the strait ever since sanctions that were put up by United States of America. If the threats were to follow through, it would likely cause huge disruption to the global oil trade. As the strait is so narrow, any sort of interference in tanker traffic could decrease the world's oil supply, and send prices shooting up.

Background/History

The Gulf has for decades been an arena for U.S.-Iran friction. This was most dramatically highlighted during the last days of the Iran-Iraq war, when the U.S. navy launched Operation Earnest Will in 1987 to protect U.S.-allied vessels in the area. In Operation Earnest Will in April 1988, U.S. forces sank or severely damaged half of Iran's operational fleet days after a U.S. frigate was badly hit by an Iranian mine. Iranian officials have complained about both the U.S. presence and “harassment” by the U.S. navy. The Gulf largely falls within the purview of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps' (IRGC) navy, though the regular army's navy operates there as well.

Adding to the sensitivities around the area is the strategic importance of the Strait of Hormuz: the U.S. Energy Information Administration refers to the Strait as “the world's most important chokepoint”. Over the years, Iran has repeatedly threatened to block it.

Not every maritime interaction between Iran and the U.S. has been adversarial. In October 2017, for example, naval officials from Iran and the U.S. reportedly liaised to facilitate the rescue of Iranian fishermen by the USS Howard.

Current situation

UN Secretary-General Antonio Guterres late Friday called for an independent investigation into apparent attacks on tankers transiting through the Persian Gulf, Strait of Hormuz and Gulf of Oman. "We believe it is very important to avoid, at all costs, a major confrontation in the Gulf," said Guterres in New York. "At the present moment, we don't see a mechanism of dialogue possible to be in place." The US and UK have accused Tehran (capital of Iran) of attacking tankers transiting through the waterways that separate the Arabian Peninsula and Iran, allegations which Iranian officials have denied.

If the Islamic Republic of Iran uses their grip on the Middle East to initiate more aggressive acts on oil tankers in the strait then a US military interference will be unavoidable and due to both countries' history with one another, consequences will be deadly.

Questions to Consider

1. What could the Middle Eastern and NATO powers do in order to release the tension in the region?

2. Does your country believe that the US-Iran war inevitable? If so what could be the consequences of this war?



TOPIC B: DISARMAMENT OF THE JAMMU AND KASHMIR REGION

Topic Overview

After three brutal wars in the Jammu and Kashmir region between two world powers of Pakistan and India which both possess nuclear warheads, tension has been at all high levels with both sides threatening war to each other and endangering innocent lives within the region who do not want to be part of this conflict. If both countries went on a nuclear war the world would be greatly affected by nuclear fallout and unprecedented loss of life. How can both countries come up with a peaceful agreement? Should a policy of disarmament of the region arise? How to stop the nuclear war threats?

Introduction

Since 1947, India and Pakistan have been locked in conflict over Kashmir, a majority-Muslim region in the northernmost part of India.

The mountainous, 86,000-square-mile territory was once a princely state. Now, it is claimed by both India and Pakistan. The roots of the conflict lie in the countries' shared colonial past. From the 17th to the 20th century, Britain ruled most of the Indian subcontinent, first indirectly through the British East India Company, then directly through the British crown. Over time, Britain's power over its colony weakened, and a growing nationalist movement threatened the crown's slipping rule.

Background/History

As long as the territory's existence was guaranteed by the United Kingdom, the weaknesses in its structure and along its peripheries were not of great consequence, but they became apparent after the British withdrawal from South Asia in 1947. By the terms agreed to by India and Pakistan for the partition of the Indian subcontinent, the rulers of princely states were given the right to opt for either Pakistan or India or—with certain reservations—to remain independent. Hari Singh, the maharaja (Indian prince) of Kashmir, initially believed that by delaying his decision he could maintain the independence of Kashmir, but, caught up in a train of events that included a revolution among his Muslim subjects along the western borders of the state and the intervention of Pashtun tribesmen, he signed an Instrument of Accession to the Indian union in October 1947. This was the signal for intervention both by Pakistan, which considered the state to be a natural extension of Pakistan, and by India, which intended to confirm the act of accession. Localized warfare continued during 1948 and ended, through the intercession of the United Nations, in a cease-fire that took effect in January 1949. In July of that year, India and Pakistan defined a cease-fire line—the line of control—that divided the administration of the territory. Regarded at the time as a temporary expedient, the partition along that line still exists.

Current Situation

14 February suicide car bombing claimed by the Pakistan-based militant group Jaish-e-Mohammed killed more than 45 security personnel in Indian-administered Kashmir's Pulwama district, some 30 km from the state capital Srinagar. The attack, which targeted a convoy of the paramilitary Central Reserve Police Force (CRPC), was the deadliest terror incident in Jammu and Kashmir (J&K) for over three decades. Vowing revenge and accusing Pakistan of complicity, Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi's Bhartiya Janata Party (BJP) government has warned Islamabad (capital of Pakistan) that support for jihadist proxies will no longer be tolerated. Threatening to isolate Pakistan diplomatically, Modi has called on the international community to take united, concrete action against terrorism and those who spread it. New Delhi has recalled its high commissioner (ambassador) from Islamabad and withdrawn Pakistan's Most Favored Nation trading status. Islamabad also withdrew its top diplomat from New Delhi, accusing India of making allegations without investigations and denying any role in the attack.

This can threaten the world peace since India and Pakistan are both testing each other's tolerance day by day and a single mistake can lead to a nuclear war between two countries with possession of hundreds of nuclear missiles.

Questions to Consider

1. Does your country believe the region of Jammu and Kashmir better off without influence of Pakistan and India? Should the region become its own governing nation?
2. How can the world powers prevent a nuclear war between Indian and Pakistan? Can terms that satisfy both countries be agreed upon?

