

Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations

Alexmun 2026, April 17, 18



Topics

Topic: The Role of Military and Surveillance Technology in the Escalation and Management of the India-Pakistan Conflict: Social Impacts and Challenges for Regional Peace.

President: Diego López Duarte

Moderator: Fernanda Mino Mora

Conference Officer: Sara Michelle Carrillo Navarro

Introduction to the chairs

As your chair, we are pleased to welcome you to the 10th edition of the United Nations Model of Bachillerato Alexander Bain, AlexMun 2026, that will be held on April 17 and 18. We are fortunate and glad to work with you on the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations where you will discuss issues of global importance, we encourage you to do your best to come up with innovative and viable solutions.

My name is Diego López Duarte, and I will be serving as your president during this United Nation Model of AlexMun 2026, in the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations. During these two days of debate, we will be addressing the topic of The Role of Military and Surveillance Technology in the Escalation and Management of the India-Pakistan Conflict: Social Impacts and Challenges for Regional Peace. diego.lopez@alex bain.edu.mx

My name is Fernanda Mino Mora, and I will be serving as your moderator during these two days of debate. My goal is to ensure that the sessions run smoothly and that all delegates will be able to express their country's position. I encourage you to participate respectfully, think critically, and enjoy the experience of diplomacy and teamwork. fernanda.mino@alex bain.edu.mx

My name is Sara Michelle Carrillo Navarro, and I will be serving as your Conference Officer during these two days of debate. I look forward to assisting the committee, ensuring that our sessions run smoothly, and supporting both chair and delegates throughout the sessions. sara.carrillo@alex bain.edu.mx

Delegates, please, in case there is any doubt, do not hesitate to approach any member of the chair or high command. Remember, we are here for you, and we will always be happy to help.

Introduction to the committee

- The Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations was established by General Assembly resolution 2006 (XIX) of 18 February 1965 to conduct a comprehensive review of all issues relating to peacekeeping. It reports to the General Assembly on its work through the Fourth Committee (Special Political and Decolonization) and comprises 155 Member States, mostly past or current contributors to peacekeeping operations.
- The Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations, also known as the C34, is a subsidiary body of the Fourth Committee of the United Nations General Assembly. A unique, multilateral body consisting of 157 Member States, the C34 brings together a wide range of peacekeeping stakeholders, including the Permanent Members of the Security Council, troop- and police-contributing countries, leading financial contributors to the Peacekeeping Budget, several host states and others. The C34 is mandated to carry out a comprehensive review of all issues relating to peacekeeping operations. In this role, it makes recommendations, by way of annual reports that are adopted by consensus, to peacekeeping stakeholders. In response, the Secretary-General publishes an annual report on the implementation of these recommendations, outlining the measures taken by the Secretariat.
- In its resolution 65/310, the General Assembly welcomed the report of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations (A/65/19); decided that the Special Committee, in accordance with its mandate, should continue its efforts to conduct a comprehensive review of the whole question of peacekeeping operations in all their aspects, examine the implementation of its previous proposals and consider any new proposals with a view to improving the capacity of the United Nations to fulfil its responsibilities in this area; and requested the Committee to submit a report on its work to the Assembly at its sixty-sixth session.

The Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations has several functions emphasizing the implementation of UN peacekeeping mandates.

1. The Special Committee on Peacekeeping is responsible for reaffirming the proposals and principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.
2. Peacekeeping operations are designed to support not replace national political efforts toward peace.
3. Acts as the most visible representation of the UN's commitment to global peace, security, and stability.
4. Deploys peacekeeping missions to prevent conflict, reduce violence, and protect civilians in areas affected by war or instability.
5. They facilitate and sustain viable political processes, ensuring that peace efforts are owned by the host country and the conflicting parties.
6. Peacekeeping missions empower national authorities to assume responsibility for maintaining peace and security.
7. They help host states build resilience to conflict, including by addressing root causes of violence.
8. Peacekeepers also stabilize volatile situations and create safe conditions for humanitarian assistance and rebuilding efforts.
9. Peacekeeping operations combine security, political, and developmental efforts to sustain peace.
10. This integrated approach ensures that peacekeeping supports broader peacebuilding and reconstruction objectives.
11. This cooperation has enabled over 55 peacekeeping operations to complete their mandates successfully.
12. The Committee is committed to becoming more agile, adapting to volatile and complex environments.
13. It promotes the use of modern technology and innovative approaches to improve efficiency, safety, and impact in the field.

Peacekeeping missions have saved countless lives in active conflict zones by preventing large-scale violence, protecting vulnerable populations, and enabling humanitarian aid delivery.

Examples include protection efforts in South Sudan, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and Central African Republic, where peacekeepers have created safe zones for displaced persons and civilians under threat.

The UN has successfully brokered or supported peace agreements that ended long-standing conflicts.

Notable examples:

- Namibia: Supervised independence elections and withdrawal of foreign forces.

- Cambodia: Oversaw elections and national reconciliation after decades of civil war.

- Liberia and Sierra Leone: Supported peace deals and helped rebuild post-war governance institutions.

- El Salvador and Mozambique: Helped implement peace accords and reintegrate former combatants.

Many missions have successfully implemented DDR initiatives, collecting weapons from ex-combatants, supporting their reintegration into civilian life, and reducing the likelihood of renewed conflict.

This has been particularly effective in West Africa. Peacekeeping operations have organized or monitored credible national elections to establish legitimate governments.

Limitations

Despite its pivotal role in reviewing and improving peacekeeping operations, the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations (C-34) faces several structural and operational limitations that obstruct its overall effectiveness.

1. One of the main constraints is that the C-34 has no mandatory authority, it can only issue recommendations and policy suggestions that depend on the voluntary cooperation and political will of Member States and the United Nations Secretariat. As noted by the Center for Civilians in Conflict, the committee's reports "have no mandatory authority," which limits their direct impact on UN decision making processes.
2. Another significant limitation lies in the Committee's consensus based decision making process. While consensus encourages unity and inclusivity among Member States, it often results in slower progress and weak agreements. The United Nations itself recognizes that all recommendations of the C-34 are adopted by consensus, a process that, although democratic, can make it difficult to introduce bold reforms or address urgent operational deficiencies in peacekeeping missions.
3. The C-34's capacity is also restricted by resource and logistical constraints within the UN peacekeeping system. Limited funding, shortages in trained personnel, and delays in troop and police contributions from Member States continue to pose challenges to implementing reforms. These financial and operational constraints, highlighted by research on UN peacekeeping, have long been recognized as key obstacles to improving the performance of peace operations.
4. Finally, the Committee must navigate complex geopolitical realities that further constrain its influence. In regions with deep rooted conflicts or competing national interests, such as South Asia, the implementation of peacekeeping reforms or new surveillance technologies is particularly sensitive. As the Norwegian Mission to the UN has noted, the large number of recommendations proposed each year by the C-34 reflects an ongoing struggle to balance reform with the political realities of the international system.
5. While the C-34 remains a vital platform for reviewing and strengthening UN peacekeeping, its influence is constrained by its

advisory nature, consensus requirements, financial limitations, and the geopolitical sensitivities that shape the global peacekeeping landscape.

Actions and objectives:

While the Committee does not create missions, it issues annual consensus based recommendations that influence how peacekeeping operations function globally. Through this advisory role, the C-34 indirectly impacts missions like the United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP), established in 1949 to monitor the ceasefire along the Line of Control in Jammu and Kashmir.

Pakistan has actively supported this modernization approach and has repeatedly urged the UN, including at C-34 sessions, to expand the use of surveillance technologies such as drones, satellite imaging, and real time situational monitoring tools in peacekeeping operations. In 2025, Pakistan's ambassador to the UN publicly called for integrating these technologies into UN missions to strengthen ceasefire monitoring and ensure transparency along sensitive borders such as the LoC. Pakistan has also advocated for strengthening UNMOGIP through increased resources, clearer reporting mechanisms, and an enhanced technological capacity. This aligns with the country's broader diplomatic objective of maintaining an international presence in Kashmir and increasing impartial observation of ceasefire violations.

India's actions and objectives differ significantly. While India is one of the world's largest troop contributors to UN peacekeeping and regularly supports reforms focused on training, mandate clarity, and operational effectiveness, it does not support expanding UN involvement in Kashmir. India maintains that UNMOGIP's mandate is obsolete following the 1972 Simla Agreement, which established the Line of Control as a bilateral issue. As a result, India does not call for enhanced surveillance technology within UNMOGIP and instead favors bilateral mechanisms for monitoring ceasefire violations. India's position in peacekeeping discussions, such as within the C-34, is framed around sovereignty, operational efficiency, and ensuring that UN missions respect host-state consent and remain aligned with field realities.

The actions of the C-34, Pakistan, and India demonstrate a complex interplay between technological modernization, political objectives, and competing narratives regarding the role of international observers in the India–Pakistan conflict. While the Committee seeks to improve peacekeeping effectiveness through technology and mandate clarity, Pakistan promotes expanded UN monitoring supported by surveillance tools, and India prioritizes sovereignty based approaches that limit external involvement in Kashmir.

Topic Overview

Topic: The Role of Military and Surveillance Technology in the Escalation and Management of the India-Pakistan Conflict: Social Impacts and Challenges for Regional Peace.

In the second decade of the 21st century, security challenges and conflicts remain central issues to the study of international relations. This assumption retains its unique importance with reference to the multi-faceted security problems and challenges in Indo-Pakistani relations. The unresolved, protracted conflict between these two states has its roots in colonial times and in 1947, when the British divided their empire into two dominions: India and Pakistan, on the basis of the 'two nation theory.' This theory argued that Muslims and Hindus, the largest religious communities in the subcontinent, are two distinct nations unable to live together. This was the indirect result of the divide *et impera* principle based on the manipulative exploitation of religious differences between these communities, which was strengthened and widely used during British rule in India. This was followed by an unprecedented rise in inter-communal violence and brutal massacres, affecting Hindu, Muslim and Sikh people. The extreme violence peaked during the time of the Partition and has traumatized many families in India and Pakistan. This, along with the first escalation of the conflict in the 1948 Kashmir war, had a tremendous impact on shaping the national consciousness, a virulent exclusive ideology based on mutual acrimony and distrust, fostered by military and political leaders of both India and Pakistan.

It laid the groundwork for decades of hostilities between the two states and strengthened the military component, especially in Pakistan. However, nowadays the military role and argument of strength is also bolstered by the Hindu nationalist policy of BJP-ruled India.

Over decades, the persistent conflict, the arms race along with its nuclear aspect, have shaped the security structure in South Asia. The escalation-prone relations between India and Pakistan have left their pernicious mark on the prospect of mutual harmony and the likelihood of political and economic cooperation in the whole region remains significantly hindered. Until now all the attempts aimed at seeking a satisfactory resolution of the contentious issues have turned out to be ineffective. Whereas the conflict remains a crucial

element of contemporary regional security challenges, its dynamics serve as a useful case study in post World War II conflict research and analysis. The realities of the India-Pakistan rivalry may undoubtedly serve as a thought-provoking point of reference in the theoretical debate on international security on local, regional and supra-regional levels.

The India-Pakistan conflict today is increasingly shaped by the rapid advancement and deployment of military and surveillance technologies that have transformed both escalation dynamics and crisis management. Drones, satellite imagery, and advanced radar systems are now integral to monitoring the Line of Control, enabling both nations to maintain real-time awareness of troop movements and potential threats, but they also heighten the risk of accidental confrontations and misinterpretations. The proliferation of unmanned aerial vehicles for reconnaissance and, in some cases, armed operations has shortened decision-making timelines, leaving little room for diplomatic intervention before tensions escalate. India has heavily invested in indigenous defense technologies, anti-drone systems, and digital surveillance networks, particularly in Jammu and Kashmir, while Pakistan continues to strengthen its capabilities through Chinese and Turkish partnerships, adding sophisticated drones and electronic warfare systems to its arsenal. These developments have increased the potential for asymmetric warfare, cyberattacks, and information manipulation, making the conflict more complex and unpredictable. On the social front, civilians living near border areas face the direct impact of this militarization, including displacement, property damage, and psychological stress from constant surveillance and shelling. In Kashmir, widespread use of facial recognition technology, internet shutdowns, and digital monitoring has raised serious concerns about privacy, human rights, and freedom of expression. Cross-border humanitarian ties, such as the Kartarpur Corridor for Sikh pilgrims, have been repeatedly suspended due to security concerns, further reducing opportunities for people-to-people dialogue and mutual understanding. The constant drone incursions used for smuggling weapons and drugs across the Punjab and Rajasthan borders also fuel local insecurity and criminal activity. Overall, while these technologies aim to enhance security and deterrence, they have also deepened mistrust, curtailed civil freedoms, and placed border populations under perpetual tension. Without modernized confidence-building measures to regulate drone operations, cyber activities, and surveillance protocols, the region risks entering a cycle where technological competition replaces diplomacy, making sustainable

peace even more difficult to achieve.

Historic context of topic

The India–Pakistan conflict has its roots in the partition of British India in 1947, when the subcontinent was divided into two states, a largely Hindu majority India and a Muslim majority Pakistan. The princely state of Jammu and Kashmir, with a Muslim majority but ruled by a Hindu monarch, became the central flashpoint. Soon after partition, tribal militias from Pakistan invaded Kashmir, prompting the monarch to accede to India in exchange for military support, a move that triggered the first Indo-Pakistani war in 1947 to 1948. A UN mediated ceasefire in 1949 created the Line of Control (LoC), but the underlying territorial dispute remained unresolved.

Over the following decades, the Kashmir issue continued to fuel periodic wars and military skirmishes, notably in 1965, 1971, and in 1999 during the Kargil War. The Kargil conflict was especially significant, Pakistani forces infiltrated positions on the Indian side of the LoC during the winter of 1998 to 1999, occupying high altitude posts. In response, India launched a full scale military operation (Operation Vijay) and eventually reclaimed the peaks after intense fighting.

A major turning point in the conflict's trajectory was the nuclearization of South Asia. In May 1998, India conducted nuclear tests, followed within weeks by Pakistan, ending decades of nuclear ambiguity and triggering a full fledged arms race.

This nuclear development fundamentally changed the security dynamics, conventional military actions now carried the risk of nuclear escalation.

Since then, the India–Pakistan rivalry has been shaped by military posturing, deterrence, and repeated cycles of escalation. Confidence-building measures (CBMs), such as agreements on prior notification of military exercises, have been intermittently negotiated, but tensions over Kashmir persist.

The presence of nuclear weapons has arguably imposed a form of some sort of caution into

conventional warfare, but the risk of miscalculation remains high.

In parallel, surveillance and military technology have become more central to how both sides manage and escalate conflict. The rugged terrain of Kashmir, high altitude battlefields (like Siachen), and the need for intelligence have pushed both countries to develop advanced surveillance capabilities, integrate air power, and deploy modern military assets. Over time, the conflict has evolved from primarily territorial arguments to a high stakes contest involving technological sophistication, information warfare, and arms modernization.

Suggested Tools for Further Research, Documents of Significance, and Guiding Questions

Guide questions:

- How has the development of nuclear and military technologies affected the stability of South Asia?
- What role has surveillance played in either preventing or escalating tension between India and Pakistan?
- What are the social consequences of constant surveillance and militarization on border communities?
- What are the historical roots of the India-Pakistan conflict regarding territorial disputes?
- What are the social and economic consequences of military spending and surveillance expansion in both India and Pakistan?

Documents of Significance:

The documents of significance in the India-Pakistan conflict reveal the evolution of a territorial dispute into a technologically complex and politically entrenched rivalry that continues to shape South Asian security and society. The Instrument of Accession of 1947 was the initial document that brought Jammu and Kashmir into the Indian Union and immediately provoked Pakistan's opposition, sparking the first war between the two new nations. This was followed by the United Nations Security Council Resolutions of 1948 and 1949, which established a ceasefire and called for a plebiscite to determine the future of Kashmir, setting an international precedent that still influences diplomatic debates today. The Tashkent Agreement of 1966, brokered after the 1965 war, represented an early attempt to stabilize relations through negotiation but failed to provide lasting peace. In 1972, the Simla Agreement transformed the ceasefire line into the Line of Control and enshrined the principle

of bilateralism, ensuring that India and Pakistan would address their differences without third-party mediation. The Lahore Declaration of 1999 was a milestone in acknowledging nuclear responsibility and committing to dialogue, but it was quickly undermined by the Kargil conflict that same year, highlighting the fragility of trust. Later, the Ceasefire Agreement of 2003 provided temporary relief along the border, reducing casualties and tension until repeated violations eroded its effectiveness. As military technology advanced, newer documents such as India's Defense Cyber Doctrine and Pakistan's Full Spectrum Deterrence strategy reflected the shift toward digital warfare, surveillance, and drone-based defense systems. Reports from the United Nations on human rights in Kashmir and national legislation concerning cybersecurity, data privacy, and anti-terror laws further expanded the documentation of how security imperatives increasingly intersect with civil liberties. Together, these documents trace a historical and political arc that connects traditional territorial disputes with modern security challenges, demonstrating how legal instruments, peace accords, and strategic doctrines collectively define the nature of conflict and the limited but ongoing search for stability between India and Pakistan.

Bibliography

1. Al Jazeera. (2025 Mayo 9). India–Pakistan tensions: A brief history of conflict.
<https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2025/5/9/india-pakistan-tensions-a-brief-history-of-conflict>
2. Agnieszka Kuszewska. (n.d.). India-Pakistan conflict: Escalation and de-escalation: The dynamics of contemporary security challenges. ResearchGate.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344100052_India-Pakistan_Conflict_Escalation_and_De-Escalation_the_Dynamics_of_Contemporary_Security_Challenges
3. Andrew Perreira. (n.d.). India-Pakistan conflict. Encyclopaedia Britannica. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/India-Pakistan-conflict>
4. Cambridge University Press. Militarization. Cambridge English Dictionary.
<https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/militarization>
5. Carranza M. E. (1999). An Impossible Game: Stable Nuclear Deterrence After the Indian and Pakistani Tests. The Nonproliferation Review.
<https://www.nonproliferation.org/wp-content/uploads/npr/carran63.pdf>
6. Center for Civilians in Conflict. Jorgensen J. y Giffen A. (2021 Mayo 10). New report by the UN Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations (C-34) advances and limits the protection of civilians.
<https://civiliansinconflict.org/blog/2021-c34-report/>
7. Dawn News. (2025 Julio 30). Pakistan calls for boosting UN peacekeeping missions’ role to resolve disputes like Kashmir.
<https://www.dawn.com/news/1927589>
8. Encyclopaedia Britannica. (n.d.). Kargil War. <https://www.britannica.com/event/Kargil-War>

9. Fiveable Inc. Communal violence – Honors World History.
<https://fiveable.me/key-terms/hs-honors-world-history/communal-violence>
10. Fiveable Inc. Military influence in politics – Latin America 1791 to Present.
<https://fiveable.me/key-terms/latin-america-1791-present/military-influence-in-politics>
11. Fiveable Inc. Nuclear arms race – AP World History: Modern.
<https://fiveable.me/key-terms/ap-world/nuclear-arms-race>
12. Ghazala Jalil. (2017 Abril). Nuclear Arms Race in South Asia: Pakistan's Quest for Security. ResearchGate.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/364282377_Nuclear_Arms_Race_in_South_Asia_Pakistan%27s_Quest_for_Security
13. Government of Jammu and Kashmir. Instrument of Accession of Jammu and Kashmir Batti, I. A. (2025). The Indo-Pakistani Conflict: Nuclear Deterrence and Strategic Stability in South Asia. IJCRT.
<https://ijcrt.org/papers/IJCRT2506096.pdf>
14. Hashmi M. J. y Khan S. M. (2024?). Emerging Network-Centric Warfare Capabilities of Indian Military: Challenges for Pakistan's Security. Margalla Papers.
<https://margallapapers.ndu.edu.pk/site/issue/download/15/70>
15. International Security. Faculty of History University of Cambridge.
<https://www.hist.cam.ac.uk/international-security>
16. Javed N. y Altaf Z. (2024). India–Pakistan Development of Drones: Implications for Strategic Stability. ISSI Strategic Studies.
https://issi.org.pk/wp-content/uploads/2025/06/3_Nimra_Javed_and_Zohaib_Altaf_S_S_No_2_2024.pdf
17. Nadège Sheeha. (2008). United Nations peacekeeping: Limitations and prospects.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/23697557_United_Nations_peacekeeping_Limitations_and_prospects
18. Permanent Mission of India to the United Nations. (n.d.). India and United Nations Peacekeeping and Peacebuilding.
<https://www.pminewyork.gov.in/pdf/menu/49151pkeeping.pdf>

19. Permanent Mission of Norway to the United Nations. (2025 Febrero 18). Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations (C34).
<https://www.norway.no/en/missions/un/statements/general-assembly-plenary/2025/special-committee-on-peacekeeping-operations-c34/>
20. Permanent Mission to the United Nations in New York, Government of Norway. (2025 Febrero 18). Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations (C34).
<https://www.norway.no/en/missions/un/statements/general-assembly-plenary/2025/special-committee-on-peacekeeping-operations-c34/>
21. ResearchGate. India-Pakistan conflict escalation and de-escalation: The dynamics of contemporary security challenges.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344100052_India-Pakistan_Conflict_Escalation_and_De-Escalation_the_Dynamics_of_Contemporary_Security_Challenges
22. ScienceDirect. Regional security.
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/earth-and-planetary-sciences/regional-security>
23. Shah A. (2023). Deterrence under Surveillance: Indian Space-based ISR Capabilities and Pakistan's Nuclear Deterrence. Strategic Vision Institute.
<https://thesvi.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/Deterrence-under-surveillance-indian-space-based-isr-capabilities-and-pakistans-nuclear-deterrence-7-26.pdf>
24. Sofía Sebastián y Aditi Gorur. (2018 Marzo). U.N. Peacekeeping and Host-State Consent: How Missions Navigate Relationships with Governments.
<https://www.stimson.org/wp-content/files/file-attachments/UN-PeacekeepingAndHostStateConsent.pdf>
25. The Express Tribune. (2025 Abril 09). Pakistan urges tech boost in UN peacekeeping.
<https://tribune.com.pk/story/2538747/pakistan-urges-tech-boost-in-un-peacekeeping>
26. The Express Tribune. (2025 Febrero 23). Pakistan calls

for strengthening UNMOGIP.

<https://tribune.com.pk/story/2530335/pakistan-calls-for-strengthening-unmogip>

27. United Nations. (n.d.). Background – United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP).

<https://unmogip.unmissions.org/background>

28. United Nations. (n.d.). Recommendations of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations (C34). United Nations Peacekeeping.

<https://peacekeeping.un.org/en/recommendations-of-special-committee-peacekeeping-operations-c34>

29. United Nations. (n.d.). United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP).

<https://peacekeeping.un.org/en/mission/unmogip>

30. United Nations. United Nations Web TV.

<https://webtv.un.org/en/asset/k1h/k1h8beplub>

31. United Nations. Report of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations (C-34) (A/78/19). <https://docs.un.org/en/A/78/19>

32. University of Tehran. (2023). De-escalating the India-Pakistan Conflict in the Shadow of Nuclear Weapons: A 27-Year History.

https://wsps.ut.ac.ir/article_102442_140b38b82f57b7b8cd717d451976785d.pdf