harvest

HIS MUN 2025
BACKGROUND GUIDE
AIPPM

HISMUN'25

Letter from the Executive Board

Greetings delegates,
It is an honor for us to be serving as the executive board at Harvest International School Model United Nations 2025. This agenda was selected as it has a very unique complex and it is a pressing national issue, one that tests the very balance between security, democracy, and social justice. In order to make your understanding of the topic easier, we have created this background guide for your reference, as a way to gain knowledge on core concepts related to the agenda. Below, you will find a brief on the actual agenda, and some research topics to help you get started with your research. Kindly note that this guide may not be cited as a source for information if asked, i.e. each delegate is expected to research beyond just this document. We look forward to intense and factually accurate debates that not only simulate political realism but also reflect leadership.

VR Tharun - Head Chairperson
Krithik Shanker - Vice Chairperson
Dikshil A - Moderator

Rules of Procedure (ROP)

Roll Call

At the start of every session, the Chairpersons will take attendance to record which members are present. This will be used to confirm participants and to calculate simple and special majorities. During Roll Call, when your name or portfolio is called, you may respond with one of the following:

Present – You are present in the committee but will not vote on procedural matters.

Absent – Used only if a delegate is not present in the committee when roll is called. Delegates may change their status from Present to Present and Voting (or vice versa) by informing the Executive Board before the next voting session begins.

Opening Statements (GSL)

Each member will have 90 seconds to deliver an opening statement explaining their party or portfolio's stance on the agenda. If no other motion is passed, the committee may return to opening statements later.

Question Hour

During Question Hour, members may question others on topics not directly related to the main agenda. Delegates will be informed in advance if a question has been addressed to them. The Executive Board will review all submitted questions before the session begins. The Board will mark questions the following way:-

- **Starred Questions:** Must be answered orally and allow follow-up (supplementary) questions.
- **Unstarred Questions**: Can be answered in writing or orally. Supplementary questions are not allowed unless permitted by the Executive Board. Each delegate may submit up to three questions in total.

Discussion Sessions (Moderated Caucuses)

A Discussion Session is a formal debate on a specific topic. The committee will decide on the topic, total duration, and time per speaker.
After each speech, delegates may engage through:

Points of Information (POIs): Questions about the topic or the content of the speaker's speech. Not to ask for repetition.

Points of Order: Used to highlight a factual mistake or logical error in another delegate's speech. The delegate must quote the exact part of the speech being challenged.
Types:-

- **Factual Inaccuracy** - When someone gives information that is wrong or untrue. Example: Saying that there are 13 months in a year.
- **Logical Fallacy** - When someone's argument does not make sense or is based on faulty reasoning.Example: Saying that if one student failed the exam, then the exam must be unfair.

Coordination Sessions (Unmoderated Caucuses)

An informal debate session where delegates can freely interact, negotiate, and form alliances without a set topic or speaking order. The total time will be decided by the committee.

Motions

Delegates may raise motions to begin any of the above sessions. The Executive Board will conduct a voice vote to decide. Those in favor say "Aye." Those against it say "Nay."

Types of Motions

Motion to Suspend the Meeting: Temporarily halts the session for a specified period.
Motion to Adjourn the Meeting: Ends the session permanently until the next scheduled meeting.
Motion to Move into a Moderated Caucus: Proposes a discussion session with a fixed topic, time, and speaking duration per delegate.
Motion to Move into an Unmoderated Caucus: Proposes a coordination session for informal debate, negotiation, or drafting documents.
Motion to Open or Close the Speaker's List: Used to start or end formal speeches by delegates in a debate.
Motion to Table a Draft Resolution or Bill: Places a draft before the committee for discussion or debate.
Motion to Divide the Question: Allows the committee to vote on separate parts of a draft resolution or bill individually.
Motion to Appeal the Chair's Decision: A procedural motion challenging a ruling made by the Executive Board.

Order of Disruption

Motion to Suspend the Meeting
Motion to Adjourn the Meeting
Motion to Move into a Moderated Caucus
Motion to Move into an Unmoderated Caucus
Motion to Open the Speaker's List
Motion to Close the Speaker's List
Motion to Table a Draft Resolution or Bill
Motion to Divide the Question
Motion to Appeal the Chair's Decision
Point of Order
Point of Information
Point of Personal Privilege

Documentation

Press Releases: Short updates from news agencies within the committee to inform members of ongoing developments. They may be sent during any formal session except during Question Hour, or while Tabling Bills.

Draft Resolutions / Draft Bills: The AIPPM functions like a legislature; therefore, the final outcome of debate will be a Bill or Resolution. To submit a draft to the dais, it must have at least one-third of the committee as signatories and up to two sponsors.

- Sponsors present the draft and answer questions regarding its content.
- Signatories support discussion of the draft but may not agree with all its contents. A delegate may sign multiple drafts, but a sponsor cannot be a signatory to any bill, including their own.

For any clarification about document format or submission rules, delegates may consult the Executive Board during committee sessions.

About AIPPM

All India Political Parties' Meet (AIPPM) is a simulation of a high-level political forum where delegates represent political leaders and parties instead of countries.
It focuses on national issues, political debate, and policymaking based on each party's ideology and alliances.

AIPPM is a semi-crisis committee, which means that while it follows normal debate rules, the Executive Board can introduce sudden developments or updates during the session. Delegates must think quickly and respond to these situations as real politicians would.

AIPPM does not have a fixed mandate. The flow of debate, type of documentation, and any crisis updates are completely at the discretion of the Executive Board, and their decisions are final.

About the Agenda

Deliberating upon Left-wing Extremism and National Integration using relevant Internal Security Framework (UAPA, PMLA) with special emphasis on the Red Corridor region

History of Left-Wing Extremism :-

Left-Wing Extremism (LWE), commonly referred to as Naxalism or Maoist insurgency, originated in the Naxalbari uprising of 1967 in West Bengal. The movement began as a peasant revolt led by radical communists protesting against landlessness, exploitation by landlords, and feudal oppression. The initial revolt was largely localized in areas with high socio-economic deprivation.
During the 1970s and 1980s, the movement spread to Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Odisha, and Jharkhand, with multiple regional groups emerging to champion agrarian reform and tribal rights. These groups were often organized around the ideology of armed revolution inspired by Mao Zedong, emphasizing guerrilla warfare and mobilization of marginalized populations.
In 2004, several of these regional factions merged to form the Communist Party of India (Maoist), creating a unified organizational structure and strategy. This consolidation allowed the movement to expand its influence across the so-called Red Corridor, a swath of central and eastern India encompassing districts in Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, Odisha, Maharashtra, Telangana, and Andhra Pradesh.They fund their operations mainly through illegal means like extortions, illegal mining and running parallel economies. The insurgents began targeting government infrastructure, security forces, and economic projects, while simultaneously establishing shadow governance structures in some rural areas.

Current Scenario:-

The present situation has seen a great reduction in violence as compared to what we have had in the past ten years which is a result of the Government's security and development measures. According to the Ministry of Home Affairs (2024) we see that the number of active Maoist cadres is at 5000 to 6000 with the most affected areas being 27 districts in six states. While progress has been made the insurgency still plays on what may be termed as structural issues which include lack of access to education, health care, infrastructure and job. The Government's Security Development approach is that of a combined law enforcement and welfare program which puts forth housing, education, health care and job opportunities in the affected districts. Although we have seen progress the fact that there are still police and security attacks along with infrastructure attacks shows that we require very targeted policy responses.

Legal Frameworks:-

In the debate between security and civil liberties a number of constitutional elements come into play.
Article 19(1)(a) which provides for freedom of speech and expression must be put in scale with measures to suppress extremist propaganda. Article 21 which protects the right to life and personal liberty plays out in the conduct of security operations and in the treatment of surrendered insurgents. Articles 244 and the Fifth Schedule which present special administrative and governance structures for tribal areas that make up the main part of the Red Corridor also see action along with Article 46 which is on the promotion of the educational and economic interests of Scheduled Tribes and their protection from exploitation.

Legal frameworks are at the core of what we do to counter LWE. The Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act (UAPA) which was put into law in 1967 allows the government to identify persons and groups as terrorists which in turn gives investigative agencies more powers for arrest, detention and prosecution. The Prevention of Money-Laundering Act (PMLA) of 2002 goes after the finance backers of insurgency and it puts assets related to illegal activities up for seizure and attachment. The National Investigation Agency (NIA) Act, 2008 empowers the NIA to investigate and prosecute offenses that threaten India's national security. The Forest Rights Act (FRA) of 2006 which recognizes the rights of tribal and forest based communities to their land and resources reduces the incidence of insurgency. Also we have in the Indian Penal Code (IPC) and Criminal Procedure Code (CrPC) which provide the legal back up to go after violent act,extortion,arson and attacks on security forces.

Left-Wing Extremism (LWE) in the Indian States:-

- **Chhattisgarh** - Surrender and Rehabilitation Program Between 2018-2022, the state government of Chhattisgarh was able to successfully facilitate the surrender of more than 1,200 Maoist cadres from across districts such as Sukma, Dantewada, and Bijapur. The scheme offered vocational training, education, and government and private sector employment to surrendered cadres. Financial aid, housing, and medical benefits were provided to surrendered cadres' families to ensure their social reintegration. It was complemented with intelligence-driven security operations, which decreased violent incidents by about 40% in the targeted districts over a span of four years. Community engagement in the local areas through Gram Sabhas ensured that former cadres were integrated back into society, and there was less chance of re-recruitment.

- **Jharkhand** - Technology Integration and Community Policing Drone monitoring, GIS mapping, and live intelligence systems were used by the Jharkhand Police to track LWE activity in areas such as Latehar, Palamu, and Gumla.Community participation aided in locating potential threats and insurgent hideouts, making operations more efficient. Technology utilization resulted in a 50% decrease in security forces' attacks from 2019 to 2023. The state government integrated security with development initiatives such as road connectivity, electrification, public school infrastructure in affected regions, and development of minor cadres through education scholarships and skill development initiatives to decrease youth exposure to LWE recruitment.

- **Odisha** - Forest Rights Implementation and Land Redistribution Odisha's government made accelerated implementation of the Forest Rights Act (FRA), 2006, a priority for providing legal land titles to more than 15,000 tribal families evicted by industrial and mining projects.Secure land tenure decreased grievances and support for LWE groups among people, particularly from districts such as Koraput, Malkangiri, and Rayagada. Subsidiary welfare measures included housing assistance, healthcare programs, and microfinance access for tribal families. It worked with civil society groups to track land disputes and aid grievance redressal in a timely manner, building the state-local community trust. The intervention produced quantifiable reductions in insurgent recruitment and extortion, proving that socio-economic grievances must be addressed simultaneously with security operations.

- **Maharashtra** - Counter-Insurgency and Integrated Development in Gadchiroli The district of Gadchiroli, among the worst hit in Maharashtra, had a multi-faceted approach with police operations complemented by developmental activities. These included road connectivity, the construction of schools and hospitals, and youth employment schemes in the tribal regions. Rehabilitation of surrendered cadres consisted of vocational training, placement services, and integration with the community.Collaborative actions among state police, central paramilitary forces, and local administration strengthened intelligence gathering and response times. Violent events between 2017 and 2022 in Gadchiroli reduced by around 35%, which shows the success of integrating development with focused security.

- **Andhra Pradesh and Telangana –** Greyhounds Anti-Maoist Operations The Greyhounds force, which was elite, was deployed in Andhra Pradesh and Telangana border districts to carry out specialized anti-insurgency operations. Operations were ideologically oriented and aimed at neutralizing the active Maoist cadres with a minimum of civilian casualties. The government, at the same time, implemented livelihood programs, education programs, and housing schemes among the tribal population to dissuade recruitment. Community liaison programs facilitated citizen involvement in reporting and resolving conflicts, enhancing people's trust in the state. Its success created notable decreases in ambushes, extortion, and attacks against infrastructure, and it became a prototype for other Red Corridor states. AIPPM disputes can revolve around the integration of security with development to ensure sustainable results, in accordance with constitutional and human rights guarantees. Delegates could discuss new rehabilitation plans for surrendered cadres, technology and community policing-based approaches to curbing extremism, and ways of disrupting insurgent funding networks.

Judicial Precedence :-

- Supreme Court – “PMLA & ED Powers Case” (July 2022) The Court upheld NIA’s powers to investigate cross-state offenses, attach property, and prosecute terrorism-linked financial crimes. This strengthens the state’s ability to target LWE funding networks, which often finance arms, supplies, and insurgent recruitment in Red Corridor districts.

- Supreme Court – “Karnataka Al-Hind ISIS Module Case” (August 2025) The Court granted bail to Saleem Khan, highlighting that mere membership in a WhatsApp group does not constitute a prima facie offense under UAPA. This ruling underscores the importance of evidence in prosecuting extremist activity, including those related to LWE.
- Supreme Court – “Udaipur Homebuyers Case” (October 2025) The Court returned assets wrongly attached under Prevention of Money Laundering act (PMLA). For LWE, this highlights the necessity of distinguishing between criminal financing of insurgency and legitimate civilian property, ensuring tribal and rural communities are not unfairly penalized during enforcement operations.
- Supreme Court – “PMLA Provisions Validity Case” (July 2022) The Court upheld Sections 5, 17, 45, and 50 of Prevention of Money Laundering act (PMLA), validating the ability of agencies to trace and attach funds linked to extremist activities. In the Red Corridor, such powers are crucial to dismantle financial networks sustaining Maoist operations.

QARMAS
(Questions That A Resolution Must Answer)

- What legal and policy measures should be strengthened or introduced to combat extremist activities while respecting constitutional rights?
- How can the Indian Penal Code (IPC) provisions related to sedition, conspiracy, murder, and terrorism be applied effectively to LWE while preventing arbitrary prosecution?
- How can socio-economic development be leveraged to reduce recruitment into LWE groups?
- How will funding networks and financial support for LWE groups be detected, disrupted, and prosecuted?
- What mechanisms will ensure that operations against LWE do not violate human rights or alienate tribal populations?

Research Provisions

Official Government Documents
Reliable News Publications
Indian Constitution
High Court/Supreme Court Rulings
Commision Reports (Ex- Law Commitiee Findings)
Any other relevant source
Wikipedia will not be accepted as a source of information