



BACKGROUND GUIDE

Disarmament & International Security Committee (DISEC)

November 2024



CONTENTS

- I. Letter from the Executive Board
- II. Introduction to Committee
- III. Rules of Procedure
- IV. Introduction to Agenda
- V. Major Parties
- VI. Humanitarian Situation
- VII. Question of Autonomy or Statehood
- VIII. Right to Self-Determinations of Kurds
- IX. Turkish Intervention
- X. Questions A Resolution Must Answer (QARMAs)



Letter from the Executive Board

Greetings Delegates,

We are delighted to welcome you to the Disarmament & International Security Committee (DISEC) at SNISMUN 2024, where we are committed to ensuring a smooth and efficient committee flow during the TWO days of the conference. As the executive board, we are excited to see you represent your respective nations and work together to develop resolutions and form a consensus addressing the conflict that we will be deliberating upon. As a delegate, you will be putting your negotiation prowess, diplomacy, critical thinking abilities, and knowledge of global affairs to the ultimate test alongside that.

In order to provide you with a solid grasp of the agenda and to help you get started on your conference research, we have put together this background guide. It is imperative that you do not use this background guide as your only source of information for the duration of the conference's research. It is advised that you use this background guide to gain a foundational understanding before expanding your knowledge on your own through independent study, which will be helpful during the conference.

The Executive Board will remain rigid in terms of the Rules of Procedure (RoP), and will also further refrain from interrupting the flow of debate, thus the responsibility of deciding and altering the flow of the committee is in your hands, the delegates. To do so, you will have to be thorough with the RoP, thus please read the RoP mentioned in the background guide adequately.

We encourage you to approach this conference not as a competition, but as a learning experience that will help you gain new connections, learn invaluable concepts, and further understand the world of international relations better. Lastly, if you have any queries, do not hesitate to contact the Executive Board.

Goodluck, and Godspeed.

Regards,
Alfred Thomas - Co-Chairperson
Mithun C - Co-Chairperson
Dhruv Bajaj - Vice Chairperson

Introduction to Committee

The Disarmament and International Security Committee (DISEC) is one of the six main committees of the United Nations General Assembly. Established in 1945 under the UN Charter, DISEC is tasked with addressing issues related to global security, disarmament, and the regulation of armaments. Its broad mandate covers a range of topics, from the prevention of armed conflicts to the control of weapons of mass destruction (WMDs).

Objectives

The main purpose of DISEC is to promote international peace and safety through disarmament and military regulations. The Committee strives to achieve this goal by addressing the following main objectives:

- **Disarmament:** DISEC is committed to reducing the global stockpile of weapons, in particular weapons of mass destruction (nuclear, chemical and biological). This includes efforts to promote nuclear non-proliferation, encourage states to accept disarmament treaties, and monitor the destruction of existing weapons of mass destruction.
- **Preventing Armed Conflict:** DISEC works to prevent the occurrence of conflict by addressing the root causes of war, such as territorial conflicts, competition for resources, and political instability. The Commission encourages diplomatic solutions and promotes confidence-building measures among nations.
- **International Security:** The Commission works to strengthen global security by addressing emerging threats such as terrorism, cyberwarfare, and the proliferation of small arms and light weapons. ISEC is fighting these issues and promoting international cooperation to strengthen the safety of all member countries.
- **Conventional weapons regulations:** DISEC focuses on conventional weapons regulations and management, such as light weapons, and mines. The Commission advocates for responsible use and trade of these weapons to minimize their impact on civilians and prevent their proliferation in conflict zones.
- **Support to Peacekeeping Operations:** DISEC does not directly manage UN peacekeeping operations, but plays a key role in developing the policies and frameworks that guide these missions. The Committee works closely with the Security Council and other UN bodies to ensure that peacekeeping operations are adequately equipped to maintain international peace and security.

Powers

As a committee of the UN General Assembly, DISEC has the mandate to discuss and make recommendations on issues related to disarmament and international security. However, it does not have the executive or enforcement powers vested in the UN Security Council. DISEC's main functions are:

- **Drafting resolutions:** DISEC is responsible for drafting and proposing resolutions that address specific disarmament and security issues. These resolutions are then submitted to the General Assembly for approval. Although these resolutions are not legally binding, they carry significant political weight and

can influence the actions of member states and other UN bodies.

- Facilitating diplomatic dialogue: DISEC serves as a forum for Member States to conduct diplomatic dialogue on disarmament and international security issues. The Commission promotes the search for consensus through debate and discussion and encourages cooperation among States.
- Promotion of international treaties: DISEC plays an important role in promoting international treaties related to disarmament and weapon management. Committee encourages member states to sign, ratify, and implement these treaties, such as the non -proliferation of nuclear weapons (TNP) and the Treaty of Weapon Trade (ATT).
- Support to other UN bodies: DISEC works with other UN bodies, such as the Security Council, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA), to advance disarmament and security objectives.

Subsidiary bodies of DISEC

To carry out its mission, DISEC works closely with several subsidiary bodies and specialized agencies within the UN system. Some of the major auxiliary organizations related to DISEC are as follows:

United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA):

UNODA provides substantial and organizational support to other UN organizations that are working on disarmament issues. We support the implementation of the Arms Control and promote dialogue on disarmament and non -diffusion.

Conference on Disarmament (CD):

The CD is a multilateral disarmament negotiating forum that operates independently but works closely with DISEC. It serves as a forum for negotiating major disarmament treaties, such as the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT).

United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR):

UNIDIR is an autonomous institute within the UN that conducts research on disarmament and international security issues. Provides analytical support to DISEC and other UN agencies.

Rules of Procedure

Rules of procedure refer to the formal conduct delegates are expected to maintain during the conference.

It is essential to adhere to the rules and maintain decorum for the smooth flow of the Committee.

For this conference, we will be adhering to the UNA-USA format of rules of procedure.

Begin formal session

How to raise it?

The delegate of "your allotted country" puts forward a motion to begin the formal session.

Setting the Agenda

How to raise it?

The delegate of "your allotted country" puts forward a motion to set the agenda as "Agenda of the committee"

Roll Call

How to raise it?

The delegate of "your allotted country" raises a motion to begin a roll call. When your allotted country is called upon during the roll call, you have two options either say "present and voting" or simply say "present". (Note: If a delegate says "present and voting", they cannot abstain from voting on the resolution at the end of committee.)

General Speaker's list

How to raise it?

The delegate of "your allotted country" puts forward a motion to set the agenda as "Agenda of the committee" Committee generally begins formal debate by starting the 'GSL' (General Speaker's list). It serves the purpose of allowing a delegate to express their stance on the agenda. A GSL is non-exhaustive.

Moderated Caucus

How to raise it?

The delegate of "your allotted country" raises a motion to suspend formal session/debate and move into a Moderated Caucus on "topic" for the time period of "x" minutes allotting "x" minute per speaker.

This motion can be raised when the committee wants to debate on a specific topic.

In case a delegate does not get recognized to speak, a delegate can send in your point through substantive chit.

Format of substantive chit:

Substantive chit

To: Executive board

From: Delegate of "your allocated country" *points*

Unmoderated Caucus

This motion is proposed when delegates wish to discuss the status of the committee among themselves and further evaluate their next actions.

How to raise it?

The delegate of "your allotted country" raises a motion to suspend formal debate and move into an unmoderated Caucus for the time period of "x" minutes.

Points

1. Point of Parliamentary Enquiry
This point is raised by a delegate to clarify anything regarding the rules of procedure or to know the status of the committee (For example: to know which delegate is speaking next/ if the EB is accepting more speakers)
How to raise it?
The delegate of "your allocated country" raises a point of a parliamentary inquiry.
2. Point of Personal Privilege
This point is raised by a delegate to address a personal issue. (For example: to ask another delegate to repeat a point they made in their speech/to be excused from the committee)
How to raise it?
The delegate of "your allocated country" raises a point of personal privilege
3. Point of Order
This point can be raised by a delegate to point out logical or factual inaccuracies in the speeches of other delegates.
How to raise it?
The delegate of "your allocated country" raises a point of order, Factual inaccuracy/ Logical Fallacy (either one).
4. Point of Information
This is raised when a delegate wants to ask questions about another delegate's speech. How to raise it?
The delegate of "your allocated country" raises a point of information
If you asked a question and are still not satisfied with the answer, you can raise a follow-up question right after the delegate answers.
How to raise it?
The delegate of "your allocated country" wants to raise a follow-up question
(Note: This point can be denied if the Chairperson feels so).

If a delegate wants to ask a question through chat, you can use this format:

POINT OF INFORMATION

TO: Delegate of "country you want to question"

VIA: Executive Board

FROM: Delegate of "your allotted country" * *state the question**

Resolution

It contains all the solutions that the committee wants to introduce in the form of a formal document that will be discussed and put to vote in front of the committee. If passed, this acts as a set of suggestions and recommendations to those who agree with it on the issue at hand.

Sponsors are those who have majorly written the resolution, whose countries must agree with every clause, and who would be answering the questions based on the resolution. The number of sponsors is usually kept between 2 and 4, this will be informed to the committee on the day of the conference.

Signatories are those who would like to see the resolution discussed in front of the committee. A signatory does not necessarily agree with the resolution, just wants to see it be debated. A delegate can be a signatory to more than one resolution. Resolutions must have at least 1/3rd of the committee's strength as signatories to be able to present them to the committee.

An amendment to a resolution is in the form of an edit, addition, or deletion to the resolution that has been presented to the committee. This is usually sent to the chairs after the resolution has been discussed and through a motion, the committee is in an amendment session. If more than 1/3rd the number of a resolution's total number of operative clauses are accepted as amendments, the resolution will be scrapped. When an amendment is presented to the chairs, the sponsors of the resolution will be given the option to either accept it as friendly or unfriendly. A friendly amendment is automatically accepted, and the content that was aimed to be changed, added or deleted as such. An unfriendly amendment means that the committee will vote, to decide whether or not the change shall be made. This is done through a simple majority vote.

1. (To introduce Resolution) the delegate of "your allotted country" would like to raise a motion to introduce *RESOLUTION NAME*
2. (Amendments) the delegate of "your allotted country" would like to raise a motion to Move into the amendment session for *RESOLUTION NAME*
3. (To vote on the resolution) the delegate of "your allotted country" would like to raise a motion to table the *RESOLUTION NAME* for the voting procedure.

Resolution Format

(Name of resolution)

Sponsors:

Signatories:

Topic: XYZ

Committee name,

(Preambulatory Clauses)

1. Every preambulatory clause ends with a comma (,) (Operative clauses)
2. Every Operative clause ends with a semicolon (;)
3. Every sub-clause to a resolution should end with a comma (,) till and unless it is the last sub-clause to the main clause, it shall end with a semicolon (;)
4. Every main clause before starting with a sub-clause should have a colon (:) 4. Full stop at the end of the resolution.

Voting

Voting is of 2 types, procedural and substantive. Procedural voting requires a simple majority, which is set at 50%+1 of committee strength. For example, if a committee has 100 people, the simple majority is set at 51 votes. Procedural Voting is used in cases such as voting upon motions. Substantive voting requires a 2/3rds majority. This is primarily used in voting upon a resolution. For example, if a committee has 100 members, the majority will be set at 67 votes.

Press Conference

The questions may range from matters of foreign policy, the agenda itself or controversial actions by the respective nations of the delegates, with the intended purpose being to test the depth of the research and knowledge of the delegates.

Introduction to the Agenda

The Kurds are an ethnic group with a unique language, culture and history, and one of the world's largest stateless nations. Living primarily in an area known as Kurdistan, which includes parts of Turkey, Iraq, Iran and Syria, the Kurds have long sought greater political autonomy and recognition of their rights. The political situation of the Kurds in the Middle East is deeply complex, shaped by historical grievances, regional geopolitics, and the struggle for self-determination.

The roots of the Kurdish issue can be traced back to the aftermath of World War I and the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire. Although the 1920 Treaty of Sèvres initially envisaged the creation of a Kurdish state, this promise was never kept. Instead, the 1923 Treaty of Lausanne established the modern borders of Turkey, Iraq and Syria, splitting the Kurdish population between these new nation-states. Since then, the Kurds have faced a degree of repression and alienation in these countries, leading to long-term violent struggles for recognition and autonomy.

In Turkey, the Kurdish issue was one of the most controversial issues in the modern history of this country. The Turkish government has long pursued policies aimed at assimilation of the Kurds, including banning the Kurdish language and culture. The rise of the Kurdish militant group Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK) in the 1980s marked the beginning of an armed rebellion against the Turkish state. The conflict, which continues to date, has won tens of thousands of lives and remains the main source of instability in the region.

In Iraq, the Kurds have reached a wide degree of autonomy, in particular in the region of Kurdistan in Iraq (KRI). The creation of a no-fly zone by the United States and its allies after the 1991 Gulf War allowed the Kurds to establish their own regional government. This autonomy was further strengthened after the 2003 US invasion of Iraq. However, tensions remain between the Kurdistan Regional Government (KRG) and the Iraqi central government over issues such as oil revenues, territorial disputes and the status of disputed territories such as Kirkuk.

In Syria, civil war erupted in 2011, providing an opportunity for the Kurds to assert control over an area in northeastern Syria known as Rojava. The Kurdish-led Syrian Democratic Forces (SDF) have played a decisive role in the fight against ISIS, garnering international acclaim in the process, but the future of Kurdish autonomy in Syria remains uncertain, especially given Turkey's military intervention and complex alliance network in the Syrian conflict. The Kurdish political situation in the Middle East is therefore characterized by a struggle for autonomy and recognition in a region rife with political turmoil and shifting alliances. Each Kurdish-inhabited country has a different approach to the Kurdish issue, resulting in persistent and multifaceted problems that have important implications for regional stability and international relations.

Major Parties

1. Turkey

Turkey has a large Kurdish population, mainly in the southeast. The Turkish government has historically suppressed Kurdish cultural and political expression, viewing Kurdish nationalism as a threat to national unity. The Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK), a Kurdish militant group, has waged an armed insurgency against the Turkish state since the 1980s, seeking greater autonomy or independence. Turkey considers the PKK a terrorist organization and is conducting military operations against Kurdish forces both on its own territory and in neighboring Iraq and Syria.

2. Iraq

In Iraq, the Kurds have established a great deal of autonomy in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq (KRI). The Kurdistan Regional Government (KRG) governs the region and has its own parliament and army (Peshmerga). Relations between the KRG and the Iraqi central government in Baghdad have been tense, particularly over issues such as the sharing of oil revenues and the status of disputed territories like Kirkuk. The Kurds played a crucial role in the fight against ISIS, but their independence aspirations, highlighted in a 2017 referendum, faced strong opposition from Baghdad.

3. Syria

Kurds in Syria, mostly settled in the northeast region known as Rojava, are seeking autonomy amid the country's escalating civil war. The Kurdish-led Syrian Democratic Forces (SDF) are a key US ally in the fight against ISIS, but Turkey views the Syrian Kurdish forces as an extension of the PKK, and Rojava's autonomous government is not recognised by the Syrian government, threatening its interests with Turkish military intervention.

4. Iran

Iran has a large Kurdish population, mainly in the western provinces. The Iranian government, concerned that Kurdish nationalism could inspire separatism within its borders, has cracked down on Kurdish political movements. Iranian Kurdish groups such as the Party for the Free Life of Kurdistan (PJAK) have staged small-scale rebellions against the Iranian state, leading to periodic government crackdowns.

5. United States of America

The United States has played a complex role in the Kurdish conflict. He supported Iraq and Syria's Kurdish army, especially in the battle with the Islamic state. Nevertheless, the US support was often practical and not basic, so we balanced the support of Kurd's allies and maintained the relationship with NATO's major members, Turkey. The withdrawal of U.S. troops from parts of Syria in 2019, allowing

Turkish forces to advance into Kurdish-controlled areas, was widely seen as a betrayal by Kurdish forces.

6. Russia

Russia is also a key player in supporting the Assad regime, particularly in Syria. Russia's position on the Kurds is somewhat ambiguous as it balances its alliance with the Syrian government with the Kurdish aspirations for autonomy. While Russia has at times acted as an intermediary between Kurdish forces and the Syrian government, its primary objective remains the re-establishment of Syrian state control over the entire territory.

Humanitarian Situation

Presently, control of the Kurdish space is divided amongst five main political-military groups: the Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK), followed by the influential ruling duopoly formed by two factions within Iraqi Kurdistan, i.e., PUK and KDP in addition to PKK affiliated organizations such as PYD/YPG; complemented with more minor non-state influenced actors permeated into northern Iraq (Like Iran-based guerrilla operations) Such as Iranian-armed small parties like Komala Party of Iranian Kurdistan and Kurdistan Democratic Party of Iran (KDP-I). It groups those who pursue different interests and the most contradictory affiliations with regional and international powers. The state of humanitarian affairs in the Middle East is similarly mixed, although this has more to do with Kurdish fighters under arms. Millions of Kurds are uprooted from their homes as a consequence of wars. These proliferating conflicts, particularly in northern Iraq where the Iraqi government battles ISIS, continue to force tens of thousands of Kurdish refugees and IDPs from their homes. The large-scale displacements that have persisted to affect Kurdish communities are reported as a critical humanitarian priority, with implied needs for shelter, food and medical assistance. The peak of the humanitarian crisis occurred as ISIS surged to prominence (2014-17) in Iraqi Kurdistan. Hundreds of thousands were displaced by the violence in a brutal campaign spearheaded by that group as it expanded its territorial footprint. Almost down-and-out following irreparable damage caused last year however ushered in a few continuous hurdles for the region. Many IDPs are still in Internally Displaced Persons camps or informal settlements and economic conditions remain precarious with oil prices volatile and political disputes between the KRG authorities in Baghdad ongoing. And these are the very real challenges to local populations around access to services and quality of life.

The consequences of the Syrian Civil War, which began in 2011 in Rojava or Syrian Kurdistan reached a humanitarian catastrophe. This led to large displacements and extensive damage to infrastructure due to the conflict. The focus on the near starving refugee situation was really brought into light with ISIS' siege of Kobane in 2014-2015. This has even included last October's Operation Peace Spring which saw Turkish military actions that have directly contributed to additional displacement and a major disruption in the provision of life-saving services. Kurdish officials in Rojava are doing what they can, but the chronic instability is wearing on both their people and themselves.

The south-eastern part of Turkey, or the Kurdish portions controlled by the Turks i.e. Kurdistan has been an ominous humanitarian situation since as far back as the 1980s due to friction between Turkish state and moreover PKK (Kurdish workers) parties. Some periods of this conflict have been marked by intense violence and displacement and frictions. Crucially, further clashes in the Kurdish-inhabited towns of London have been added for 2015-16 to bring along massive forced displacement and city infrastructure tampering. Repression and conflict-related violence have persisted, leaving the Kurdish peoples in chronic poverty with access to services at their worst.

Since the Iranian Revolution in 1979, Iran has not developed politically and economically under a repressive government. Dozens of Kurdish political activists and civil society groups have faced crackdowns, arrests and

multiple cases of human rights abuses. In turn, lack of investment in infrastructure and social services has aggravated poverty across the area leading to economic underdevelopment. These various instances of ongoing oppression and economic deprivation have severely impeded the ability of Kurdistan as a nation to fight for its rights and move forward towards a better future.

Question of Autonomy or Statehood

The Kurds are an ethnically distinct group, sharing a language and culture but divided among these states. After WWI, the Treaty of Sèvres provided a framework for an independent Kurdistan however this never came to pass due naturally not only in response to nascent regional power dynamics at the moment but also with regard to re-ignition nationalist movements within their surrounding locales. The Kurdish question is arguably one of the most protracted on the planet and certainly inarguably within the Middle East. At its core, it captures the Kurdish sense of national self-determination — an aspiration that has met with different levels of challenge and sometimes outright repression at certain moments from the four states in which they are resident: Turkey, Iran, Iraq and Syria. The Kurdish issue at large has changed historically every decade, in a way that was only partially different from the last nesting of autonomy:

- Iraq: Kurdistan region in Iraq has its own government, military and currency making it highly autonomous. The region regularly grapples with tense relations with Baghdad — the independence referendum of September 2017 and its consequences are a case in point.
- Turkey: Kurds have long fought with the ruling Turkish class over cultural and political rights; a dispute that has catalyzed conflict between Kurdish insurgents and forces loyal to Ankara since PKK was founded in 1978. Compromises have been reached, but whether the Kurdish population will be granted its ultimate goal of either full autonomy or independence in an autonomous region seems unlikely.
- Iran & Syria: In Iran and Syria, Kurdish established people have suffered comparative injuries but to differing degrees of suppression/resistance.

Some of the factors that affect Kurdish autonomy or statehood are:

- Strategic interests: The fact that the region is considered as a geostrategically crucial one means that it is an appalling issue regarding major political powers, thus worsening Kurdish question.
- The influence of economic factors: The likely financial sustainability of a Kurdish state is an important factor for the Peshmerga's allies.
- Divisions amongst Kurdish factions: The Kurdish factions are also a big problem and let them be the breeding ground between one another.
- International law — the self-determination ideal is written into international legal statutes, but in reality its application can be messy and open to political interpretation.

Summing up, the decision of self-rule or as simply Kurdistan is an intricate one for a region with grand-scale interests. Autonomy recognized by Baghdad will not be an option that guarantees Kurdish self-determination as a right because the fact is, after all these developments and over two decades of de-facto independent political survival in Kurdistan (at least), Kurds have yet to achieve anything close to full self-rule. Given the relatively high degree of de facto independence achieved by KRG authorities, however, full statehood presents a particularly difficult path that will require careful balances between internal dynamics and outside forces. Even though the Kurdish struggle reflects some of the wider issues concerning self-rule and statehood in a region characterized by ethnicity.

Right to Self-Determinations of Kurds

As a part of the goal, which is one of the key tenets in international law and human rights for people to assert their individual or collective identity as nations within an autonomous unitary state on basis such as ethnicity, culture. Namely, self-determination has a profound impact on these people residing in Iraq, Turkey, Iran and Syria, such as the Kurdish. This principle declares that all peoples have the right to self-determination, and by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and pursue their economic, social and cultural development. For Kurds, that means everything from varying degrees of autonomy to outright independence, depending on where you are.

The Kurdistan Regional government in Iraq has developed a high degree of self-rule, with its own administrative bodies and military forces along with control of extensive oil reserves. However, tensions with the central Iraqi government continue to fester over revenue sharing and territorial claims. The KRG's quest for independence, underscored by the 2017 referendum has drawn sharp criticism from Baghdad and further complicated regional politics.

As for Syria, the Kurds have created their own self-governing semi autonomous region in the north — Rojava. Their governance model is rooted in democratic principles and pluralism, yet their objectives are met with a series of obstacles given the complexity generated by war dynamics and regional geopolitics. The group's struggle for wider recognition and autonomy is further complicated by their dealings with the Syrian government, along with Turkey's own fears over Kurdish militias.

Turkey has repressed the Kurds, who are seeking autonomy and civil rights in an independent (or quasi-independent) state. The persistent violence is the result of fighting between Turkish government forces, and separatists in the country's population PKK. The Turkish state's repressive policies toward Kurdish political aspirations and cultural identity have created serious human rights problems, some of which are internationally known.

Iranian Kurds as well face a large number of obstacles. Much of it is because the Iranian government has long been repressing Kurdish political movements while maintaining marginal acknowledgment to some extent for his minority's cultural rights. Under the shadow of political instability and tough resistance, Kurdish groups in Iran have been vying for more autonomy as well as increased political representation.

Although the right to self-determination is universally acknowledged, its practical realization in international reality is often difficult. The principle supports the notion of self-determination, but it does not mean secession or full independence will result. The way the world has chosen to respond to Kurdish aspirations represents a compromise between respecting cultural rights and preserving regional integrity. Kurdish cultural and political rights are supported by many countries and international organizations, but the full independence of Kurdish areas would result in disputes with Turkey as well as other regional adjoining nations such Iraq, Iran or Syria.

In sum, Kurdish self-determination is not a simple or static question but rather one shaped by historical wrongs

as much as regional politics and international machinations. The push for more autonomy (in this case independence) remains an iconic reality of the political canvas across the Middle East and as such is redefined in terms of what could happen if Kurds had freedom.

Turkish Intervention

Over the past years Turkey has stepped up its military incursions in the KRI, mainly targeting Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK), a designated terrorist organization by the U.S., and EU. Turkey is carrying out these operations based upon its strategic objectives to provide neutralization of the PKK's hereunder and the maintenance residency stability, namely that security measures are intended to positively provide regional state national federal policy pacifiers. The situation regarding Turkish interference in Kurdistan is fundamentally founded on historical-political processes that date back hundreds of years. A large group of Kurds today predominate in Turkey, Iraq and Iran, based on the boundaries delineated by France and Great Britain at the end of WW I. This quest has been especially visible in Turkish Kurdistan, where the Kurdish populace is experiencing its own tensions as they constantly call for more rights and self-determination. This tussle entered the modern phase and started to pick up steam towards the end of the 20th century.

Much of the conflict has revolved around the Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK), which was founded in 1978. The PKK began as a Marxist-Leninist movement but radicalized and turned to violence after the arrest of its leader Abdullah Ocalan, who now endorses mainly Kurdish rights and autonomy. The Turkish government has always seen the PKK as a terrorist organization. This image has defined responses to the PKK, resulting in operations back as far as the early 1980s and up until our present decade. Its operations are designed specifically to weaken the PKK and have been very contentious in Turkish-Kurdish relations.

The military incursions of Turkey have also reached beyond its borders, primarily in Iraq and Syria. The following year, Turkey carried out its first large-scale cross-border raid into northern Iraq against the PKK in 1995. The intervention continued into the 2010s with key operations including Operation Olive Branch in 2018, and a large-scale operation called Operation Peace Spring that started in October of 2019 focusing more on Kurdish groups in northern Syria. The Kurdish groups tied to the PKK are represented in a coalition called Syrian Democratic Forces (SDF) that have been allies of U.S. forces against ISIS superlative This plays into a very complex dynamic between Turkey, the U.S. and other regional actors.

The humanitarian consequences of these military operations have been dire. Several thousands of civilians have further been displaced, infrastructures demolished and massive human casualties recorded. Since the 1980s, ongoing violence has caused immense suffering not only among Kurdish people but also across other affected communities.

Turkey's interventions have yielded many mixed international responses. A few of the countries, especially those allied to Turkey or working in campaigns against terror have vouched for what Turkey was doing. In the context of 2019 Operation Peace Spring, some Western allies questioned the way in which Turkey was moving forward with negative humanitarian effects. This division serves to exemplify the larger Kurdish cultural battle for autonomy in relation to both regional power politics with Turkey, Iraq and Syria as well as engagement within international society.

QARMA (Questions A Resolution Must Answer)

1. How can cooperation be increased between international security frameworks and Kurdish forces to combat NSAs in the region?
2. Which solution will be viable for the Kurdish population - Autonomy or statehood?
3. To which degree do the Kurdish population have a right to self determination?
4. How will the deteriorating humanitarian situation of the Kurdish population be addressed?
5. How will the conflict between Turkish and Kurdish forces be resolved?

**GOOD LUCK TO ALL
DELEGATES!**