
HIXSMUN 2024

1-3rd February 2024

munsecretariat@hixs.org

mun@hixs.org

The Dehradun Conference

Freeze Date: *1st August, 1940*

Deliberating on the Future of the Indian Subcontinent

Letter from the Secretariat



Dear Delegates,

We are delighted to extend a warm welcome to the inaugural edition of HIXSMUN, where we explore a theme deeply rooted in the universal essence of uncertainty and peril.

Throughout history, humanity has faced moments of great peril, often standing at the precipice of existential threats. From nuclear standoffs to ecological crises, the countdown to midnight on the metaphorical doomsday clock has served as a stark reminder of our shared vulnerability. Today, the threats may have evolved, encompassing global pandemics, artificial intelligence dilemmas, and climate emergencies, but the sense of urgency and the need for decisive action remain constant.

The theme for HIXSMUN, "A Minute to Midnight," pays homage to this iconic symbol of humanity's vulnerability. However, it also signifies hope and resilience, reminding us that we have the power to turn back the clock, to reset our course, and to confront the challenges that loom on the horizon.

At HIXSMUN, we invite delegates to embody this spirit of hope and resilience as they would navigate the crises of the past, confront those of the present, and anticipate those of the future. We challenge you to come together as global leaders, crisis solvers, and visionaries to move the doomsday clock away from midnight.

To facilitate this endeavor, HIXSMUN combines the best elements of MUNs from around the world, offering a unique and immersive experience. Delegates will have the opportunity to rewrite history, steer nations through moments of turmoil, and shape a future where humanity prevails.

Join us in this collective effort to reset the clock, to rewrite the narrative, and to redefine the potential of Model United Nations. We look forward to welcoming you on the 1st of February 2024, as we embark on a journey to rediscover the power of diplomacy and determination.

Sincerely,

The Secretariat | HIXSMUN24

Letter from the Executive Board



High Ranking Members of the British Cabinet, Leaders of the Indian Political Parties and Your Highnesses of Princely States,

We warmly welcome you to this Joint Meeting hereinafter referred to as The Dehradun Conference. It is an honor and a privilege for us to serve as the Executive Board for the committee. This meeting will be presided over by The Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Winston Churchill, with the gracious assistance of the Deputy Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Clement Attlee. Members of the committee are called to order on August 1, 1940, for the discussion of an important agenda.

His Majesty's Government of the United Kingdom has decided to make further provision for reforms in the Government of India. It will be the responsibility of this committee to come up with a proposal regarding the same.

This guide will give you a preface to the discussions we wish to see in the committee. You are expected to go through the guide in detail and conduct extensive research on the several topics and subtopics that have been outlined. You are required to adhere to the freeze date of August 1, 1940, for all discussions on the first day, subject to change at the discretion of the Executive Board on the following day. We will have an eagle's eye for substantive research and logical innovation so as to maximize scope for productive participation. While rhetorical arguments may be made in brief to support facts and figures, the Executive Board will look more favorably upon practical, applicable, and relevant exchange of information. The principal objective is to learn from the agenda and its discussion in the committee. The Rules of Procedure will be fairly relaxed and will in no way curb or hinder debate. Notwithstanding however, orderly conduct is expected from every member of the committee and members are required to adhere to their political/religious stances at all times. All forms of participation – verbal as well as written – will be aggregated towards the assessment of individual performances. We encourage mature, elaborate, and interesting debate throughout the two days of the conference. At the end of the day, the idea is to have an energetic, earnest, and memorable committee experience for all of us to learn from.

Members of the Executive Board or the Secretariat can be contacted for substantial and procedural queries. We look forward to hosting you and hope to see your best at HIXSMUN 2024.

Sincerely,
The Executive Board
Vansh Tevatia | Chair & Ishika Midha | Vice-Chair

Update 1.0

Respected members of the committee,

After the historic Government of India Act, 1935 was passed by the British Parliament as the longest Act in the history of the United Kingdom, elections were successfully held in the winter of 1936-37 to the Provincial Legislative Assemblies in eleven provinces - Madras, Central Provinces, Bihar, Orissa, the United Provinces, the Bombay Presidency, Assam, the North-West Frontier Province, Bengal, Punjab and Sind in accordance to the Provisions of the Act.

It was much to the disappointment of His Majesty's Government that the Indian National Congress was not supportive of Lord Linlithgow, The Viceroy of India's declaration on September 3, 1939 of India to be at war with Germany alongside Britain. Subsequently, Ministries formed by the Indian National Congress tendered their resignation on October 22, 1939.

The Muslim League however promised its support, calling on Muslims to help the British Empire by honourable co-operation at this critical and difficult juncture. Subsequently, The British Government is now well pleased by the improved accommodating attitude of the Indian National Congress and its offer to cooperate.

Keeping all these developments in mind, after consultation from His Majesty King of the United Kingdom and the British Dominions George VI, the Parliament of the United Kingdom has decided to make further provision for reforms in the Government of India. You are called upon to be part of this committee to come up with a proposal regarding the same.

Regards,

Winston Churchill (Prime Minister)

Background

The Evolution of Indian Nationalism: A Comprehensive Analysis (1919-1940)

In modern Indian history, the span from 1919 to 1940 unfolds with great political reform, where the dynamics between British colonial governance and the ever increasing demand for self-determination played out in a complex political situation. This era bore witness to a series of legislative changes, mass mobilizations, and geopolitical transitions, collectively shaping the trajectory towards the eventual dismantling of British imperial rule on the Indian subcontinent.

The Government of India Act, 1919: A Constitutional Overhaul

The aftermath of World War I ushered in a new era in British India, marked by political upheaval, socio-economic changes, and a fervent desire for self-governance. The Government of India Act, 1919, colloquially known as the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms, stands as a landmark in the annals of constitutional development in the subcontinent. This comprehensive legislation sought to address the growing discontent and demands for political representation, laying the groundwork for subsequent movements and constitutional reforms.

Historical Context:

To appreciate the significance of the Government of India Act, 1919, it is crucial to contextualize it within the broader historical framework. The conclusion of World War I in 1918 had profound implications globally, and India, as a vital part of the British Empire, experienced the ripple effects of the geopolitical transformations.

The war had exacerbated social and economic disparities in India, leading to widespread unrest and a surge in nationalist sentiments. The infamous Jallianwala Bagh massacre in 1919, where British

troops fired upon a peaceful gathering in Amritsar, further fueled anti-British sentiments, laying the groundwork for a reevaluation of the governance structure in India.

Objectives of the Act:

The Government of India Act, 1919, was conceived with dual objectives: to address the political aspirations of Indians and to bolster the British war effort by garnering support from the Indian populace. Edwin Montagu, the Secretary of State for India, and Lord Chelmsford, the Viceroy of India, undertook the challenging task of crafting a constitutional framework that would balance these imperatives.

Dyarchy: A Novel Governance Model:

At the heart of the constitutional overhaul was the introduction of the Dyarchy system in the provinces. This innovative model sought to distribute powers between elected Indian representatives and British officials, thereby providing a semblance of self-governance. The subjects were categorized into 'transferred' and 'reserved,' with elected Indian ministers controlling the former and the British maintaining authority over the latter.

This division aimed to integrate Indian participation in governance while retaining imperial control over critical aspects such as defense, foreign affairs, and finance. The Dyarchy experiment was both a recognition of Indian political aspirations and a cautious attempt to maintain the status quo of British supremacy.

Expansion of Legislative Councils:

The Act also sought to widen political participation by expanding the scope of legislative councils. Separate electorates were maintained for Muslims and other minorities, reflecting the British policy of communal representation. While the Act extended the franchise to a larger section of the Indian

population, the electoral system still fell short of universal suffrage, maintaining exclusions based on property qualifications.

Provincial and Central Legislative Councils:

The reforms extended beyond the provinces to the central government, introducing legislative councils at both levels. The central legislature, albeit advisory in nature, included elected representatives from the provinces and nominated members. This marked a departure from the earlier system, providing a platform for Indians to voice their concerns and contribute to the legislative process.

Socio-Economic Reforms:

Beyond political reforms, the Act acknowledged the need for socio-economic changes. It included provisions for the appointment of a Public Service Commission, paving the way for a more professional and merit-based civil service. Additionally, the Act acknowledged the importance of local self-government, devolving certain powers to municipalities and districts.

Initial Responses and Criticisms:

The Government of India Act, 1919, received mixed responses from various quarters. While some hailed it as a step towards constitutional development and political representation, others critiqued it as a half-hearted measure that fell short of true self-governance. Mahatma Gandhi, for instance, expressed his disappointment, viewing the reforms as inadequate in addressing the fundamental issues of British exploitation and discrimination.

Legacy and Impact:

The Act's legacy lies not only in its immediate impact but also in its role as a precursor to subsequent constitutional developments. The Dyarchy system, despite its limitations and criticisms, set a

precedent for future experiments in governance. The expanded legislative councils sowed the seeds for increased political participation, paving the way for subsequent demands for complete independence.

The Act's socio-economic provisions, particularly those related to civil services and local self-government, left a lasting impact on administrative structures. The institutional changes introduced by the Act, while imperfect, represented a departure from the rigidity of colonial governance and laid the groundwork for future constitutional discussions.

The Non-Cooperation Movement (1920-1922): A Unified Voice of Dissent

In the aftermath of World War I, India found itself at the crossroads of political awakening and anti-colonial fervor. The oppressive Rowlatt Act of 1919, coupled with the tragic Jallianwala Bagh massacre, became catalysts for a groundswell of discontent that would soon coalesce into one of the most significant chapters in the struggle for Indian independence — the Non-Cooperation Movement of 1920-1922.

Precursors to Dissent:

The Rowlatt Act, passed by the British colonial administration in 1919, bestowed draconian powers upon the government to suppress political dissent. Its implementation, coupled with the high-handed response to peaceful protests, particularly the Jallianwala Bagh massacre in Amritsar, deeply wounded the sentiments of Indians. The seeds of dissent had been sown, and the stage was set for a transformative movement.

Gandhi's Call for Non-Cooperation:

At the helm of this transformative movement stood Mahatma Gandhi, who had already emerged as a prominent leader in the Indian National Congress. Drawing inspiration from the philosophy of non-violence and civil disobedience, Gandhi issued a clarion call for non-cooperation with the

British authorities. This marked a departure from the prevalent political strategy, emphasizing non-violent resistance as a potent force for change.

Boycott of Institutions:

The Non-Cooperation Movement sought to hit the British where it hurt the most — by boycotting institutions that were seen as instruments of colonial control. Indians were urged to abstain from government offices, courts, schools, and other symbols of British authority. This massive withdrawal of participation was designed to cripple the colonial administration and demonstrate the collective will of the people.

Symbolic Acts of Defiance:

The movement gained momentum through symbolic acts of defiance. The most iconic among these was the burning of foreign-made clothes as a rejection of colonial economic exploitation. Indians began to discard British goods and adopted Swadeshi, emphasizing the use of locally-made products. The spinning wheel, a simple yet powerful symbol of self-sufficiency, became the emblem of the movement.

Unity Across Communities:

One of the distinctive features of the Non-Cooperation Movement was its ability to transcend regional, religious, and linguistic differences. Hindus and Muslims, urbanites and villagers, came together under the banner of a common cause. This unity, often elusive in the diverse Indian socio-political landscape, posed a formidable challenge to the colonial authorities.

Impact on Education:

The movement had a profound impact on the educational landscape. Students played a crucial role by boycotting government schools and colleges, leading to the establishment of alternative

educational institutions rooted in Indian cultural values. This marked a significant shift in the perception of education as a tool for colonial indoctrination.

The Chauri Chaura Incident:

The Non-Cooperation Movement, while largely non-violent, witnessed a tragic turning point in 1922 at Chauri Chaura. A peaceful protest against oppressive taxes escalated into violence, resulting in the death of several police officers. In response, Gandhi, deeply perturbed by the deviance from non-violence, called off the movement, demonstrating his unwavering commitment to the principle of ahimsa.

Evaluation and Legacy:

The Non-Cooperation Movement, despite its premature end, left an indelible mark on the Indian psyche. It demonstrated the potency of non-violent resistance as a tool for political change. The movement also compelled the British to reckon with the growing power of a united Indian populace and reevaluate their strategies for colonial control.

In retrospect, the Non-Cooperation Movement laid the groundwork for future struggles against colonialism. It infused a sense of pride and self-reliance in the Indian masses, fostering a spirit of unity that would become instrumental in subsequent movements. Gandhi's experiment with non-violence during this period set the stage for his larger philosophy of Satyagraha, which would become a guiding principle in the quest for Indian independence.

The Civil Disobedience Movement (1930-34): The Salt March & London Conferences

As the 1930s dawned, India stood at a crucial juncture in its struggle for independence. The Civil Disobedience Movement, initiated by Mahatma Gandhi in 1930, emerged as a seminal chapter in the quest for self-determination. This movement, characterized by acts of non-violent resistance and civil

disobedience, unfolded against the backdrop of economic hardships, political discontent, and the growing desire for complete independence from British colonial rule.

Background and Precursors:

The simmering discontent after the culmination of the Non-Cooperation Movement in 1922 lingered in the Indian political milieu. The demand for complete independence, or Purna Swaraj, gained traction, and the Indian National Congress sought more potent means to convey the urgency of the nationalist cause.

The Salt March (March-April 1930):

The catalyst for the Civil Disobedience Movement was the oppressive British salt monopoly, which levied heavy taxes on this essential commodity. In an audacious act of defiance, Mahatma Gandhi embarked on the historic Salt March from Sabarmati Ashram to the coastal town of Dandi, covering a distance of approximately 240 miles.

The march, undertaken by a diverse group of marchers, symbolized a protest against the unjust salt laws. Gandhi and his followers reached Dandi on April 6, 1930, where he famously breached the salt laws by producing salt from the Arabian Sea. This symbolic act reverberated across the nation, capturing the imagination of the masses and inspiring similar acts of civil disobedience.

Widespread Acts of Civil Disobedience:

The Salt March served as a catalyst for a wave of civil disobedience campaigns across India. Indians, led by Gandhi's principles of non-violence and non-cooperation, started boycotting British goods, refusing to pay taxes, and violating salt laws. The campaign garnered widespread support, uniting people from various backgrounds and regions under the common banner of defiance against colonial oppression.

Repression and Imprisonment:

The British response to the Civil Disobedience Movement was marked by repression. Thousands of Indians, including Gandhi, were arrested for participating in acts of civil disobedience. However, the arrests did little to quell the spirit of resistance. The movement demonstrated the resilience and determination of the Indian populace in their quest for freedom.

The First Round Table Conference (1930-1931):

While the Civil Disobedience Movement was at its peak in India, parallel diplomatic efforts were underway in London. The British government, realizing the gravity of the situation, convened the First Round Table Conference in 1930-1931 to discuss constitutional reforms and address Indian political demands.

However, the conference proved to be inconclusive. The British government and Indian leaders were at an impasse over issues such as the communal award, representation, and the scope of self-governance. The failure of the conference exposed the deep-seated mistrust and differences between the two sides.

The Second Round Table Conference (1931):

Undeterred by the lack of progress, the British government called for a second round of discussions in 1931. This time, Mahatma Gandhi was invited to represent Indian interests. The discussions, however, remained deadlocked as fundamental differences persisted, particularly on the issues of communal representation and the safeguarding of minority rights.

The Gandhi-Irwin Pact (1931):

Amidst the impasse, negotiations between Mahatma Gandhi and the Viceroy of India, Lord Irwin, led to the signing of the Gandhi-Irwin Pact in 1931. The pact marked a truce between the Indian National Congress and the British government. In exchange for the suspension of the Civil

Disobedience Movement, the British agreed to release political prisoners and allowed Indians to participate in the Second Round Table Conference.

The Second Round Table Conference (1931-1932):

The participation of Indian representatives, including B.R. Ambedkar, in the Second Round Table Conference did not yield substantial results. Disagreements persisted over the structure of the constitution, representation of minorities, and the safeguarding of communal interests.

Conclusion of the Civil Disobedience Movement:

Despite the diplomatic efforts and temporary truces, the Civil Disobedience Movement gradually waned by 1934. The movement, while not achieving all its objectives, had significant consequences. It brought attention to the unjust colonial practices, showcased the unity of the Indian people, and laid the groundwork for future constitutional discussions.

The Government of India Act, 1935: Facade of Autonomy

In the backdrop of simmering political discontent and the persistent demand for increased Indian participation in governance, the Government of India Act of 1935 was enacted by the British Parliament. Promising constitutional reforms, this legislative endeavor sought to address some of the longstanding issues within the colonial governance structure. However, beneath the veneer of devolution lay a complex framework that, while presenting a facade of autonomy, retained significant vestiges of imperial control.

Constitutional Provisions:

1. Federal Structure:

The Act envisioned a federal structure for British India, comprising provinces and princely states. While the federal structure aimed to provide a semblance of self-governance, real power was concentrated in the hands of the British authorities.

2. Diarchy in Provinces:

Building upon the model introduced in the Government of India Act, 1919, the 1935 Act retained the diarchical system in the provinces. Certain powers were transferred to elected Indian representatives, while others remained under the direct control of the British-appointed Governor and officials. This division of powers perpetuated a hierarchical governance structure.

3. Bicameral Legislature:

The Act introduced a bicameral legislature at the federal level, consisting of an Assembly and a Council. While this ostensibly expanded the scope for legislative representation, the Council was dominated by officials rather than elected representatives, diluting the democratic principles the Act purported to uphold.

Provisions for Princely States:

The Act made provisions for the inclusion of princely states in the federal structure, allowing them to accede to the federation at their discretion. However, the autonomy granted to these states was limited, as the paramountcy of the British Crown over the princely states remained intact. The so-called autonomy was, therefore, more illusory than substantive.

Reservation of Powers:

Despite the introduction of a federal structure, the Act retained significant powers under the purview of the Governor-General and the British government. Key areas such as defense, external affairs, and the Governor-General's discretionary powers remained firmly under imperial control. This reservation of powers undermined the purported move towards self-governance.

Provincial Autonomy and Its Limits:

While the Act envisaged elected governments in the provinces, it imposed significant constraints on their autonomy. The Governors retained veto powers, and in the event of a breakdown of law and order, the Governor could dismiss an elected ministry, effectively undermining the democratic will of the people.

Communal Representation and Separate Electorates:

The Act perpetuated the divisive policy of communal representation by retaining separate electorates for different religious communities. This not only fueled communal tensions but also contradicted the principles of secular governance.

The Provincial Autonomy Experiment:

The introduction of provincial autonomy, despite its limitations, did witness certain socio-economic reforms. Elected ministries initiated changes in areas such as education, health, and public works. However, the overarching control retained by the British authorities acted as a check on the extent of these reforms.

Implementation Challenges and Opposition:

The Government of India Act, 1935, faced significant challenges in its implementation. The complex provisions, coupled with inherent ambiguities, led to administrative difficulties. Moreover, Indian

leaders, including those within the Congress, viewed the Act with skepticism, considering it inadequate in meeting the aspirations for complete self-governance.

Limited Impact and Unfulfilled Promises:

The Act, while presented as a move towards autonomy, ultimately fell short of its promises. The continued presence of British officials in key administrative positions, the reservation of vital powers, and the perpetuation of divisive policies thwarted genuine progress towards self-determination.

Provincial Elections of 1937: A Glimpse of Autonomy

The enactment of the Government of India Act in 1935 set the stage for a significant development in Indian political history—the Provincial Elections of 1937. These elections marked a pivotal moment as they provided a glimpse into the potential autonomy promised by the constitutional reforms.

Under the provisions of the Act, the provinces were granted a degree of self-governance, with elected Indian representatives assuming key roles in provincial legislatures. This marked a noteworthy departure from previous governance models, and the elections were eagerly anticipated as a step towards increased Indian participation in the administration.

Resonance of the Congress Sweep:

The Indian National Congress, led by stalwarts such as Jawaharlal Nehru and Subhas Chandra Bose, emerged as a formidable force in the elections. The Congress secured significant victories, forming governments in several provinces, including the United Provinces, Bihar, and the Central Provinces.

Congress Ministries and the Dawn of Autonomy:

The installation of Congress-led ministries reflected the people's aspirations for self-rule and played a crucial role in shaping the provincial administration. The Congress, known for its commitment to inclusive governance, initiated socio-economic reforms, and policy changes aimed at addressing the needs of the masses.

British Indian Troops in World War II: A Catalyst for Dissent

However, the autonomy promised by the Government of India Act was soon overshadowed by geopolitical exigencies. The outbreak of World War II in 1939 significantly altered the global landscape, and India found itself drawn into the conflict without prior consultation with Indian leaders.

Congress Resignation in Protest:

In a decisive move, the British government, without seeking the counsel of Indian leaders, committed Indian troops to fight in the war. This unilateral decision became a flashpoint of contention, especially for the Indian National Congress, which had ministries in power in various provinces.

Frustrated by the lack of consultation and a perceived violation of Indian autonomy, the Congress ministries tendered their resignations in protest. The Quit India Movement, which unfolded in 1942, marked a culmination of this discontent, as Indians demanded an end to British rule and the establishment of a sovereign nation.

Conclusion: The Unfolding Turmoil

The period from the Government of India Act in 1935 to the resignation of Congress ministries in 1939 reflects the paradox of autonomy and discontent. The Provincial Elections of 1937 symbolized a potential path towards self-governance, but the British decision to involve Indian troops in World War II without consultation proved to be a breaking point. This pivotal juncture set the stage for intensified agitation and resistance, foreshadowing the turbulent years that lay ahead in the struggle for Indian independence.