



GWHMUN 2024



HCCC BACKGROUND GUIDE

Agenda: The Levant Crisis (Freeze
Date: January 19th, 1946)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- Letter from the Executive Board
- Introduction to the Committee
- Overview of the Balfour Declaration
- Key Participants and Stakeholders
- Terms and Provisions of the Balfour Declaration
- Factors Affecting Geopolitical Disharmony
- Tensions and Coalitions
- Crisis ROP/Documentation Guidelines
- Special Crisis Elements
- Sample Directives
- Sample Communique
- The Agenda: Background Information
- Events Following the King David Hotel Attack
- A Short Note on Conference Policy



LETTER FROM THE EXECUTIVE BOARD



Greetings, Delegates! We are beyond delighted to have you here at the 2024 Edition of Greenwood High Model United Nations (GWHMUN)! We, as your Executive Board, would like to welcome you to the Historical Continuous Crisis Committee (HCCC). MUN, by nature, is bound to put one's diplomacy, negotiation skills, critical thinking and analysis, and knowledge of geopolitical relations as a delegate, deliberator, and debater, to the ultimate test. From lively general discussions to crucial moderated caucuses that dive deep into each and every key element of your agenda, there is frankly, a lot on your plate. What will determine your level of skill, and eventually, your placement, will be how efficiently you face such challenges. Furthermore, our committee has a twist – crisis.

Considering that this committee's agenda is based on a historical precedent that existed before the formation of the United Nations, we understand that many of you could be unfamiliar with the legislation and structural dynamics of a committee such as this, let alone a crisis committee. However, we assure you that we will do our level best to ensure that this committee, regardless of your experience, is one worth remembering. This background guide briefs you on the primary facets of traditional crisis debate that will be necessary to leverage in committee sessions, so that your level of preparation is quintessential. We therefore strongly encourage you to go through this guide thoroughly in order to have the best level of understanding of committee proceedings, and moreover, to further your research.

You are expected to imagine as if you're planted into the committee's virtual time period – 1946 onwards. Unlike committees in the General Assembly, which follow set Rules of Procedure, in a crisis committee, you will be the writers of history, and you need not adhere to the historical timeline observed in real life, since the qualities, backgrounds, and spontaneous roles/perspectives of these portfolios will be imbibed in you. You will gather knowledge of the different kinds of documentation you can leverage in crisis committees to push your individual and joint agendas forward. Another unique characteristic of crisis committees is that you need not reach a general consensus. In essence, anything is possible, but the aftermath and outcomes of these events are decided by you and your portfolios. Hence, we advise you to gain extensive knowledge of the roles of your portfolios in the context of their countries' geopolitical relations, and what incentives they would have been trying to succeed in manifesting, in the previously mentioned time period.





As we guide you through this journey, we couldn't stress on this more: Activity is key. Clearly voicing out your perspectives without hesitation, contradiction, or pushing yourself into a corner amidst the chaos that crisis brings to the table, will be what gives you an upper hand over your fellow delegates. Do not fear the size and/or caliber of the committee. It is essential for you to learn how to use the crisis tools given to you to emerge as frontrunners of this agenda – from directives, crisis arcs, communiques, and press releases, to the content of these documentations and how it will determine the course of the committee. All in all, enjoy your time in committee, be creative and intuitive, and try to steer the HCCC in the direction you want it to, to your level best. Beyond this, we hope you take an invaluable learning experience away from this conference.

We wish you the best of luck for the upcoming conference, Delegates!

Sincerely,

Rishikesh Madhuvaury - Head Chairperson

Varun Vasudevan Iyer - Crisis Director

BS Chetan Swaroop Reddy - Vice Chairperson

Aarav Kejriwal - Vice Chairperson



Introduction to the Committee



BALFOUR DECLARATION:

Overview

The Balfour Declaration was an official public statement issued by the British Government in 1917 recommending and initiating the establishment of a "national home for the Jewish people" in Palestine. The Balfour Declaration served as a post-WWI precedent for the formation of Mandatory Palestine. Subsequently, the nation-state of Israel was formed in due course, by virtue of Britain's one-sided campaign for the Jews. However, given that in 1917, the Jewish population in Ottoman Palestine barely touched 10%, the Balfour Declaration is simultaneously rendered as responsible for the horrendous disputes and series of political and humanitarian conflicts spurred by the two Jews and the Arabs in the following years. The Russian Jewry at the time had refused a safe haven in Palestinian territory, as well as other previously deliberated regions such as Uganda and British Territories in India and the Asia-Pacific, due to its forecasted undermining of the rights of Jewish people in other countries such as those in Europe. Similar ambassadors of the Jewish faith, such as those from India also agreed with this belief unless they were granted Jerusalem due to religious claims.

The principal architects of the Declaration, Arthur Balfour and Chaim Weizmann, both of whom were Zionist ultra-nationalists, believed in a mutual rewarding political framework for the Jews under British Governance, which then led to the documentation and enforcement of the Balfour Declaration given Britain's tremendously strong grasp over the Levant as well as their upper hand in the war against the Ottomans.

Key Participants and Stakeholders

Zionist Jews played a crucial role in the negotiations surrounding the introduction of the concept of a Jewish Nation-State. A memorandum circulated to the British War Cabinet that supported the enlistment of Jews in WWI was the breeding ground for the establishment of a legislative committee determining the future of Ottoman Palestine. The primary stakeholders here were representatives of Great Britain, including British Prime Minister Asquith and his successor David Lloyd George, who was vocal about a primitive two-state solution in the British Empire in the Levant. However negotiations between Zionist Leadership and the Empire led to the formation of the Declaration's drafts. However, no Palestinian representative had any say in the approval of such negotiations, thereby making the declaration heavily prejudiced.





Terms and Provisions

November 2nd, 1917

Dear Lord Rothschild,

I have much pleasure in conveying to you, on behalf of His Majesty's Government, the following declaration of sympathy with Jewish Zionist aspirations which has been submitted to, and approved by, the Cabinet.

"His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country."

I should be grateful if you would bring this declaration to the knowledge of the Zionist Federation.

Yours sincerely,
Arthur James Balfour



Crisis ROP/Documentation Guidelines



FACTORS AFFECTING GEOPOLITICAL DISHARMONY IN THE LEVANT:

Tensions and Coalitions

Sunni-Shia divide: The longstanding religious division between Sunni and Shia Muslims, worsened by regional powers like Saudi Arabia (Sunni) and Iran (Shia), fuels conflicts in countries like Syria, Lebanon, and Iraq.

Christian-Muslim Relations: The Levant has been home to a significant Christian population. The balance between Christians and Muslims and their respective political influences were sources of tension for decades.

European Colonial Interests: European powers like Britain and France had long-standing interests in the region. A 1916 agreement between Britain and France planned the division of Ottoman territories into sectors of influence, leading to future conflicts.

Zionism: The late 19th and early 20th centuries saw the rise of Zionism, a movement advocating for the establishment of Jewish owned land in Palestine. This led to increasing Jewish immigration to Palestine, causing friction with the local Arab population.

Creation of New Borders: The arbitrary borders drawn by the Sykes-Picot Agreement and the subsequent mandates ignored ethnic, religious, and tribal boundaries. This sowed seeds of future territorial disputes and conflicts.

Great Arab Revolt: The Arab Revolt against the Ottoman Empire, supported by the British, was a significant event that shaped the post-war political landscape of the Levant.

Balfour Declaration (1917): The British government's support for the establishment of a "national home for the Jewish people" in Palestine intensified Jewish-Arab tensions and laid the groundwork for future conflicts.



❖

Crisis in the HCCC

The HCCC at GWHMUN 2024 will be following traditional crisis rules of procedure, with a higher emphasis placed on crisis direction over the course of the conference. The committee's freeze date, (June 19th, 1946) has been set such that major conflicts such as World War II, crises in the Global Zionist Movement, the Iranian Revolution and the formation of Transjordan are underway. Therefore, the portfolios representing their corresponding delegations must be prepared to develop the crisis provided under "Timeline of Events Following the King David Hotel Attack" in the advent of the Levant Crisis, whilst deliberating on both fundamental and nuanced aspects of the geopolitical dispute in itself. Delegates are expected to straddle between these two continually dynamic and spontaneous tasks to varying degrees dictated by the environment of the committee.

Provisional Speakers' Lists and Special Speakers' Lists

❖

A delegate may choose to raise a motion to enter a Provisional Speakers' List (PSL), wherein the Executive Board will select, through their discretion, a certain number of delegations to speak for or against the agenda (which is specifically the nature of this invasion) in an alternating sequence. Note that Day 1 will begin with a General Speakers' List to encourage maximum participation and inclusivity, while speakers' lists on the following days are left to the procedural voting outcomes of the delegates themselves. A motion to enter a Special Speakers' List (SSL) will be entertained to substitute classic moderated caucuses, when delegates wish to discuss specifically the nature of the crisis at hand, in relation to the committee's crisis updates.

Special Crisis Elements

The extent of legal implications on the state of war in this committee leads to the certainty of introducing additional, yet valuable crisis elements, including but not limited to: Emergency Special Summits, trials, and presidential statements (involving any and all types of leadership positions via EB discretion). Depending on the volatility and progression of the War following committee deliberation on the formation of Mandatory Palestine, Zionist territorial aggression and the attack on King David Hotel, delegates may be expected to write committee directives (bloc-wide or unanimous), peace treaties or settlements, international licensing agreements, trade charters, arms embargoes and any other types of documentation that in large part, resolve major existential issues in committee through their specializations, in a dynamic manner. In order to further their political agendas in the HCCC, delegates will be expected to write individual directives, communiques, and press releases of any kind. Directives are objective crisis notes that provide detailed, intuitive, and thoroughly strategized operations and plans that achieve a particular goal in committee. Communiques serve the same purpose, except in letter format, directed to a specific persona/portfolio that is absent in committee. If committee progresses such that delegates will compile a Draft Resolution succeeding the Treaty of Versailles as a legal premise for future conflicts, then the crisis at that particular time will need to be addressed through an annexure, which is an extension of the legal document that addresses specific issues outside of the rigid domains of the Draft Resolution itself. The EB will brief delegates on crisis documentation in live committee sessions, but for reference, delegates may refer to the sample crisis documentations below.





Sample Directive 1

Operation Taiwan

By : United States of America, Republic of China (Taiwan)

Signed: India, Japan, United Kingdom, Indonesia

To: The EB

Joint Covert Military Operation Directive

OBJECTIVE: To Neutralize the Chinese presence in Taiwan to further prospects of a reverse invasion and liberation of the Taiwanese mainland claimed by Chinese aggressors, through a series of coordinated actions by the QUAD-SCC and Allied Powers

Procedure :

I. The USA marine corps, Japan's Amphibious Rapid Deployment Brigade and Taiwanese forces collaborate to push the Chinese out of Taiwan, by incorporating the:

- Creation of beachheads (temporary line of defense, generally on land-sea boundaries, until further reinforcements come)
- Use of LCAC (Landing Craft Air Cushion) for transport of weapons, defense systems, reinforcements, personnel like Marine Air/Ground Task Force
- Indirect participation of Japan in the above strategies as well, similar to 2013 Senkaku Islands drills
- Marine Semi-guerrilla warfare, moving Chinese troops towards the Northern Coast, until a full-fledged retreat to the Chinese shore occurs

II. Airforce: The Japanese and American Air Forces shall station air troops in Taiwan. This is to prevent the Chinese from entering Taiwan and also threaten the opposition's entry into China.





III. The USA will send a carrier strike group headed by the USS Gerald R. Ford, carrying 10 F35 Lightning II along with & 4 B-52 Bombers from the 2nd Bomb Wing of the US Air Force. Using radar imagery from technology onboard the Gerald R. Ford, along with satellite imagery, the US Navy will ascertain locations for the Chinese bases in the Paracel islands. Following this, all B52 bombers on the Gerald R. Ford will take off for the Paracels & will bomb all Chinese military installations. 7 F35 Lightning IIs present onboard will provide them with reconnaissance backup & can help the Bombers complete their missions, as per the accord of the commanding officer of the Gerald R. Ford.

IV. The British Navy's strike group, led by HMS Queen Elizabeth, shall move Northeast of the Paracel islands, following the operation undertaken by the Japanese and American air forces and the Taiwan front of the blockade at Truro Shoal. This shall be transformed as a base for future crises thus increasing the allied forces' presence northwards in the South China- Sea, essentially driving Chinese presence slowly out of the region in that hemisphere altogether. All formerly deployed Southeast Asian battalions will assist this strike group.

- The Hsiung Feng II (HF-2) anti-ship missiles which lock onto the target developed by the technology of the TMCS will be supplied to the aforementioned troops, developed by Taiwan to stall the Chinese fleets off the Taiwanese shore.

V. The Indian Navy will make its way through the Malacca Strait to the Naval Base Heracleo Alano in the Philippines on the 2nd of January 2022 at 5AM IST. 5 Indian frigates will be on way to the mentioned naval base. INS Shivalik, INS Tarkash, INS Trikand, INS Beas and INS Betwa will carry SA-N-12 surface-to-air missiles through 3S-90 missile launchers working in partnership with the stationed frigates.

VI. The Japanese, American, and British Navy along with their Airforce that have yet to be utilized by the completion of the pushback, will be stationed at the Eastern Taiwanese cities of: Dawu, Taimali, the Dulan Forest and Coastline, Chenggong, Changbin, Fengbin, Lanyu AND Hualien. The Indian Navy shall be hosted in the Spratly archipelago claimed by Taiwan with support from the American blockade that has indefinitely suspended Chinese naval operations and trade, in case the invasion provokes/emboldens Chinese forces to divert the alliance's attention back to the South China Sea for a flank invasion of Taiwan.





Sample Directive 2

Operation Adlerauge

Joint Covert Directive

Author: Nikita Khrushchev

Sponsor: Lavrentiy Beria

OBJECTIVE: Establishing a significant intelligence network in Germany, German-occupied Poland and suspected Nazi spies in satellite states

Executive Summary:

Plan of Action:

The following intelligence operation will be divided into two phases -

- > Phase 1 - Procuring and Sending NKVD Agents to various Satellite states and to parts of Poland and Germany
- > Phase 2 - Intelligence Gathering operations carried out by NKVD Agents in these states and German embassies

Phase 1

This phase involves contacting and dispersing various NKVD agents to satellite states. This will be carried out as follows -

- Lavrentiy Beria, head of the NKVD, and Nikolai Khrushchev, political commissar and Lt. General, will hold a meeting with several of the most high-ranking officers in the force, in a covert NKVD safehouse located 40 Kilometers South of Moscow, where he will brief them on the nature of the operation, and their individual involvement in it
- As longstanding officers in the secret force, they will be used to maintaining complete secrecy in their movements
- These officers have several sub-officers working under them who are highly trained
- After the briefing, the highly trained officers will act as follows
- Each officer will contact 5 sub-officers who are most trustable and competent enough to carry out operations where they are under extreme pressure and are surrounded by enemy spies





- Each squadron, complete with one “head” officer and his 5 subordinates will be allocated one satellite state by Mr Beria
- Three separate squadrons will be sent to Germany and two will be sent to German-occupied Poland
- With their target state known, the squadron will move to their respective satellite states, through clandestinely issued cars that are already under the possession of the NKVD
- For those travelling to Germany/German-occupied Poland, this will be done by driving to Poland and being smuggled across the border by NKVD agents present in Soviet-occupied Poland
- Simultaneously, contact will be issued with existing NKVD agents that are present either in Germany or in German embassies around the world
- After being transported to these satellite states, the spies will communicate with Moscow using encrypted radio transmissions that will have the following properties -
- Noise will be added to a voice signal to prevent enemies from listening to the conversations
- Noise will be added by playing a record of noise in sync with the voice signal
- When the voice signal reached the receiver can subtract the noise signal out, leaving the original voice signal
- The receiver needs to have exactly the same noise signal and the noise records were only made in pairs; one for the transmitter and one for the receiver
- Only two copies of records will make it impossible for the wrong receiver to decrypt the signal
- These signals will be given to the respective squadrons before the commencement of the operation
- Each squadron will use a different noise signal in order to communicate with Moscow
- Only the head of the squadron will be able to communicate
- In the event that the leader dies, the next in line (previously decided) will assume this responsibility
- This system will be wholly similar to the one used by the USA during WW2 called SIGSALY
- The radio transmissions will be done using already established secure lines in previously conducted NKVD and Soviet intelligence operations
- Even if the transmissions are found, the enemy will not be able to decipher it as they do not have the correct noise signal

Phase 2

This phase concerns the carrying out of a misinformation campaign by the NKVD agents present in the area

The misinformation campaign will be divided into two main approaches -

Approach 1

- This approach concerns the previously outlined spy network that will be present in the satellite states
- They will be instructed to act as follows





- A database of suspected Nazi spies will already be known to the USSR through their previous intelligence operations
- 40% of the squadrons will be tasked with coming in contact with these suspected Nazi spies
- For example, this could be through studying the frequent movements of the spies, working as a bartender at a bar they frequent, or becoming a janitor at an organization that they work at
- Constant communication will be made between the agents and Moscow using the methods described above
- As these agents are highly skilled, they shall come to a conclusion with two days of the operation on what approach to pursue
- They will have false identities created for them by the NKVD, which will include documentation, backstory, resumes etc.
- Through this, they will be able to secure contact with said individual
- After establishing contact, these agents will be instructed with attempting to communicate with said suspected individuals, mostly informally
- Significant questions will only be asked when the suspect has become drunk
- These questions will only be pursued once the workers have established significant contact with said individuals
- Any important information will be relayed to squadron leaders through word-of-mouth through dead drop locations that are under previous Soviet surveillance that are decided upon beforehand
- The remaining 60% of satellite squadrons will be tasked with seeking additional information about further Nazi movements by working as bartenders in suspected Nazi regions
- Through this, the NKVD will acquire additional knowledge about further Nazi spies
- These individuals will then be communicated with using the methods established above

Approach 2

- This approach concerns the gathering of Nazi movements by NKVD agents in German-occupied Poland and Nazi Germany
- These NKVD agents will pose as janitors in Nazi government offices
- They will have been issued German documentation etc. by the NKVD department beforehand, so they should have no problem with getting a job
- They will all be of Indo-European descent, from Ukrainian SSRs and such, in order to conform to Nazi racial ideologies
- Through securing a job at Nazi offices in Germany/German-occupied Poland, these agents will learn the possible movements of Nazi forces with regard to the Eastern front





- Simultaneously, information by previously sent spies in German embassies will also be communicated, using the methods described previously, in order for the Soviet Union to gather more whole information on the nature of the German border presence
- Any information regarding this will be communicated directly to Moscow by the squadron leader, conforming to all the methods stated previously
- Many of the other details, such as leadership and how they communicate internally will remain the same for both approaches
- All these agents will have backstories that consist of them defecting/fleeing the Soviet Union in favor of Germany, due to their affiliation and admiration for the supreme race theory

Expectations:

- The USSR will gain a whole understanding of the Nazi border movements in order to construct an ambush

Signatures:

Nikita Khrushchev

Lavrentiy Beria





Sample Communique

From: Van Tien Dung, Chief of General Staff of the People's Army of Vietnam
To: Vo Nguyen Giap, Commander in Chief, People's Army of Vietnam

Respected General,

Though our invasion through the Viet Cong was successfully initiated, a colonial revolt from the US has held us back, unable to seize Quang Tri. Civilians continue to evacuate through the Mu Gia pass, and Guerrilla training is halted and postponed.

As my Commander in Chief, I urge you once again, to fully resort to an invasion from the PAVN without smaller, poorly coordinated infantry attacks:

- Prepare for the mobilization of ten light infantry divisions (19800), twenty ranger battalions (81st Group), four armored cavalry groups (2200), along with airborne 32nd and 85th battalion regiments.
- Deploy VPAF (Air Force) Mig-17 fighter jets from bases in Shenzhen and Hainan Island (est. 1963), through a press release to the CCP Ministry of Defense, via any Secretary member to the VPA Sub-Bureau of Intelligence.

An already built tunnel network from the PAVN embassy in Phuoc Long to Saigon (20.25) miles constituting the "Iron Triangle" in the Cu Chi District (est. 1965) will house the regiments and divisions for however long they need to be sustained, with ample food, water, and fundamental essentials.

Time the arrival of airborne fleets, such that they fly through Laos, directly Southbound to the Mekong Delta, after which a rendezvous operation should be in order. En route to Saigon, conduct raids on the Bien Hoa and Tan Son Nhut minor US bases to damage artillery reserves, using the II-28 twin engine bombers at the PAVN's disposal.

3 hours afterwards, launch a skirmish across guarded Saigon outskirts, near Xuan Loc. The strength of the US Army doesn't match the quantity of PAVN troops at this juncture.

Civilian casualties are substantially unlikely, as the PAVN is a trained military, unlike the Viet Cong. The invasion will continue directly until we lay siege to Saigon.

In all truth and sincerity,

Van Tien Dung

Please keep in mind that neither of these samples are specific to the agenda. They serve as a collective guide for one to understand formatting, procedure, and the requirement for detail in each type of documentation that is sent to the Executive Board. It does NOT serve as a template for extracting content that is in any way whatsoever related to this committee's agenda.

Furthermore, kindly note that a session on Crisis Rules of Procedure, key elements of a Crisis Committee, and other notable aspects to be considered during the conference, may be held on the day of committee before formal session, in order to clear selective doubts and confusion regarding nuances in ROP. Crisis documentation, specifically directives, communiques, and press releases, will also be revisited in this session.

NO PRE-WRITTEN CRISIS DOCUMENTATION WILL BE CONSIDERED.



The Agenda: Background Information



Timeline of Events Following the King David Hotel Attack: Crisis Update 1

(Floor for directives to be opened during first committee session - Freeze Date: 26th January, 1946)

2nd November, 1917 - On 2nd November 1917, Britain illustrated clear support for the notion of “Establishment of a national home for the Jewish people in Palestine”, through the form of a letter given by The British Foreign Secretary Arthur Balfour to Lionel Walter Rotschild, A leader of the Anglo-Jewish community. This letter, later went on to be deemed as a declaration, this further demonstrated a major policy shift by the British government to publicly support the Zionist aim of establishing a Jewish homeland in Palestine.

9th December, 1917 - Soon, after the declaration was released, The British army captured key cities including Gaza, and Jaffa, furthermore, Jerusalem was surrendered to the British on 9th December 1917. Further accentuating their strong actions to implement their intentions in the region shown through the Balfour declarations. Therefore, the Ottomans lost control of the entire Levant region to British forces. The Treaty of Sèvres partitions the Ottoman Empire, including mandates for Britain (Palestine, Transjordan) and France (Syria, Lebanon)

22 July 1922 - The League of Nations further granted Britain a, now, official mandate over Palestine that incorporated the principles of the Balfour Declaration in the mandate. Which, simply, formalized and recognized Britain's de facto control over Palestine. Arab nationalists opposed the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine. Some 75,000 Jews emigrated to Palestine between 1922 and 1926, thus rising from 9% to 27% at the end by the year 1935.

19th April, 1936 - Opposed to this, in April 1936 a civil disobedience campaign against the Zionists began. The British responded by sending almost 20,000 troops to Palestine, and the Jewish paramilitary organization Haganah aided British efforts to put down the insurrection. At its peak in 1938, the insurrection had up to 10,000 Arab fighters.

23rd May, 1939 - In response to the recent Arab Revolt, a policy paper, known as “The White Paper” was issued by Britain to defend the civil and religious rights of all Palestinians, regardless of race or religion, and, while facilitating Jewish immigration and settlement, ensuring that the rights and positions of other parts of the population are not affected. 75,000 Jews would be permitted entry into the nation over the following five years; beyond that, Jewish immigration would be contingent upon Arab "acquiescence." Only specific portions of Palestine would be open to land transfers to Jews, and within ten years, the possibility of an independent Palestinian state would be explored. Regardless, The Arabs were against this policy paper mainly due to their mistrust of the British government and their opposition to a clause in the paper that would have extended the mandate past the 10-year mark.





Crisis Timeline

January 20th, 1946

Ernest Bevin, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in the United Kingdom delivers the following address.

“Fellow Citizens, today, as the Foreign Secretary of His Majesty's Government, I address you with a solemn declaration of our principles regarding the situation in Palestine. The recent disturbances have underscored the critical need for a measured and balanced approach to immigration policy. It is our unwavering belief that uncontrolled Jewish immigration threatens the delicate equilibrium of Arab-Jewish relations in Palestine. We stand firm in our commitment to uphold the principles laid out in the 1939 White Paper, which seeks to establish Palestine as a homeland for both Arab and Jewish communities, ensuring the political and economic rights of all inhabitants. Our policy aims to safeguard regional stability, preserve British influence, and respect the legitimate aspirations of Arab nations. Let it be known that our actions are driven by a deep-seated commitment to justice, peace, and the security of all peoples in this pivotal region. Thank you.”

January 21st, 1946

Amidst escalating tensions, British mandate authorities launch "Operation Sentinel," a sweeping crackdown on illegal Jewish immigration into Palestine. Strengthened naval forces deploy advanced radar and surveillance along the Mediterranean coast, intensifying patrols and coastal radar stations to enforce a stringent blockade. Coastal towns and ports, including Haifa and Jaffa, are placed under heavy surveillance, with increased scrutiny on key entry points for refugee ships. Simultaneously, British intelligence agencies initiate widespread operations across Europe, disrupting Jewish refugee networks and expanding internment camps in Palestine to quell mounting unrest and assert control over immigration.

January 27th, 1946

Under the cover of darkness, Irgun fighters execute Operation Iron Sword, a daring assault on British naval presence in Jaffa and Haifa ports. Using specialized diving techniques, operatives successfully attach limpet mines to three British guard boats, strategically selected to disrupt British efforts to enforce maritime blockades aimed at restricting Jewish immigration to Palestine. The explosions rock the ports, causing widespread damage and temporarily disabling the vessels, amplifying tensions between Jewish paramilitary groups and British authorities.

January 30th, 1946

Radio Damascus reports a provocative statement from Syrian President Shukri al-Quwatli, in which he refers to the Druze community as "a dangerous minority." This comment sparks outrage among the Druze population, prompting an immediate demand for a public retraction from prominent Druze leader Sultan al-Atrash. Al-Atrash issues a stern warning that if the retraction is not forthcoming, the Druze would indeed become "dangerous" and that a force of 4,000 Druze warriors would "occupy the city of Damascus."





January 31st, 1946

In a meticulously coordinated operation known as Defensive Shield, Haganah operatives strike multiple railway targets across Mandate Palestine. Palmach units, equipped with sappers and explosives, orchestrate simultaneous attacks at midnight, targeting 153 railway points, including critical junctions and bridges. The synchronized sabotage disrupts British logistical networks and impedes military movements, highlighting Jewish resistance to British immigration restrictions. Concurrently, the Palyam marine unit conducts underwater missions, sinking three additional British guard boats in coordinated assaults at Haifa and Jaffa ports, further challenging British maritime control.

February 1st, 1946

In a covert and controversial move, the British Secret Intelligence Service (MI6) executes "Operation Embarrass" in Italian ports, targeting ships destined for Jewish refugees bound for Palestine. Undercover operatives, posing as dockworkers and fishermen, clandestinely attach limpet mines to vessels scheduled for departure. However, a tragic mishap during the operation leads to the premature detonation of one ship with 40 Jewish refugees onboard. The devastating incident sparks immediate Jewish media attention and ignites widespread outrage across Palestine and beyond. David Ben-Gurion, leader of the Jewish Agency, issues a stern condemnation, declaring, "This heinous act against innocent refugees demands justice." The incident escalates tensions and deepens animosity between Jewish resistance groups and British mandate authorities.

February 3rd, 1946

Independent reports suggest that, in response to escalating tensions, Syrian Social Nationalist Party leader Antoun Saadeh and Najjadeh Chief Adnan al-Hakim have met with French officials in a clandestine meeting in Beirut. Leaked documents hint at a promise of support to the French administration in exchange for backing the revocation of Lebanese independence. Political analysts assume this agreement aims to counteract growing pan-Syrian nationalism and pan-Arabism, ensuring French control over their Middle-Eastern territories. Sources indicate that French officials are considering leveraging their military presence in the region to enforce this agreement, despite significant opposition from various Lebanese factions.

February 4th, 1946

In a decisive move against British control, Haganah forces execute Operation Discord, targeting eleven key bridges linking Mandatory Palestine to neighboring Arab states. Under the cover of darkness, Irgun units deploy across multiple locations, successfully detonating explosives at vital bridge points. The synchronized attacks sever crucial transportation links used by British military convoys, significantly hindering British logistical capabilities and prompting fears of heightened conflict. A fierce firefight erupts at one bridge, resulting in casualties on both sides and underscoring the escalating violence in the region.





February 6th, 1946

This discovery raises alarm within French colonial authorities, who suspect the meeting is convened to discuss potential uprisings against the colonial administration. SDECE investigators, who were tasked with investigating a clandestine meeting between Phalange Party President Pierre Gemayel and Maronite Patriarch Anthony Peter Arida at the Monastery of Our Lady of Yanouh in Bkerke, have hit a roadblock, being unable to recover any minutes or substantial evidence. Nonetheless, French officials, wary of a potential conspiracy, have issued arrest warrants for several Phalangist leaders, including Gemayel. In response to the arrest warrants, Pierre Gemayel has retreated to his home village of Bikfaya, a known Phalangist stronghold. French police attempting to apprehend him faced fierce resistance from local Maronites, who pelted police vans with rocks and formed human barricades, forcing the authorities to retreat. This standoff has significantly heightened tensions between the French and the Phalangist community.

February 7th, 1946

Reports suggested that Gemayel had convened an urgent meeting of the Phalange Militants' Bureau in Bikfaya. Sources indicated that Gemayel was forming a War Council to coordinate resistance efforts. Allegedly, active recruitment drives for Phalangist, Christian, and Maronite militants were underway, signaling an imminent escalation of hostilities. The French authorities appeared to be on high alert, anticipating further unrest and potential armed conflict.





Country/Portfolio Introductions

TRANSJORDAN

Stakeholders: The British Crown, Emir Abdullah I

In 1921, following the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, the British established the Emirate of Transjordan under the leadership of Emir Abdullah I, the son of Sharif Hussein of Mecca. The creation of Transjordan was part of the British strategy to maintain control over the region and protect their interests, particularly in neighboring Palestine and Iraq. Abdullah was installed as a ruler to placate Hashemite ambitions after his family's support in the Arab Revolt against the Ottomans during World War I. Abdullah sought to expand his rule and harbored ambitions for a Greater Syria, which sometimes brought him into conflict with other Arab leaders and British policies.

The British provided financial and military support to stabilize Abdullah's rule and ensure Transjordan served as a buffer state against potential threats. This arrangement allowed Abdullah to maintain a degree of autonomy while ensuring loyalty to the British Crown. The emirate's creation helped stabilize the region but also set the stage for future geopolitical dynamics, including Transjordan's eventual evolution

ISRAEL AND THE JEWISH AGENCY

The British Mandate for Palestine, established after World War I, placed Britain in control of the region with the task of implementing the Balfour Declaration of 1917, which supported the establishment of a "national home for the Jewish people." The Jewish Agency, led by figures like David Ben-Gurion, became the main representative body for the Jewish community, advocating for increased Jewish immigration and land purchases. This influx of Jewish immigrants, particularly during the 1930s due to rising anti-Semitism in Europe, led to significant tensions with the Arab population, who feared displacement and loss of political power.

The Arab Revolt of 1936-1939 was a major uprising against British rule and Jewish immigration, marked by widespread violence and strikes. The British response included military intervention and the establishment of commissions, such as the Peel Commission (1937), which proposed partitioning Palestine into separate Jewish and Arab states. The White Paper of 1939 aimed to limit Jewish immigration and land purchases to appease Arab concerns but was rejected by the Jewish community. These tensions and conflicting policies highlighted the deepening divide between Jews and Arabs, setting the stage for the eventual partition of Palestine and the creation of Israel in 1948.





THE CROWN

Stakeholders: The British Crown, Local Arab Leaders

The British Crown faced significant challenges in maintaining control over its Middle Eastern mandates following the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire. In Palestine, the early 1920s saw increasing tensions between Jewish immigrants and the Arab population, culminating in incidents like the 1920 Nebi Musa riots, where violence broke out during a religious festival. The British response included implementing martial law and increasing military presence to restore order. In Iraq, the 1920 Iraqi Revolt posed a major challenge to British authority. The revolt was driven by a diverse coalition of Shia and Sunni Arabs, as well as Kurds, who opposed British colonial rule and sought greater autonomy. The British used a combination of military force and political concessions, such as the Treaty of 1922, which granted Iraq limited self-governance while retaining British control over foreign and military affairs. These incidents highlighted the difficulties the British faced in balancing their strategic interests with local nationalist aspirations. The use of military suppression and political negotiation became a recurring strategy in the British approach to managing unrest in their mandates, illustrating the complexities of colonial administration in the Levant and surrounding regions.

BRITISH IRAQ

Stakeholders: The British Crown, Iraqi Monarchy, Kurdish Population

After World War I, the British established the Kingdom of Iraq under a League of Nations mandate, installing King Faisal I, a Hashemite, as the monarch in 1921. Faisal was chosen for his leadership during the Arab Revolt and his potential to unify the diverse Iraqi population. However, Iraq's creation by merging three former Ottoman provinces—Mosul, Baghdad, and Basra—led to significant ethnic and sectarian tensions among Arabs, Kurds, and other minorities. The 1920 Iraqi Revolt was a widespread uprising against British rule, driven by various groups including Arab nationalists and Shia clerics who opposed foreign domination and demanded independence. The British response was harsh, involving aerial bombardments and ground assaults to suppress the revolt. In response to ongoing unrest, the British negotiated the Anglo-Iraqi Treaty of 1922, which granted Iraq a degree of self-governance while maintaining British control over key areas such as defense and foreign policy. Additionally, the Kurdish population in northern Iraq sought greater autonomy, leading to multiple uprisings, such as those led by Sheikh Mahmud Barzanji from 1919 to 1924. The British used both military force and political promises to quell Kurdish demands, but the issue of Kurdish autonomy remained unresolved.

MANDATORY PALESTINE

Stakeholders: The British Crown, Jewish Population, Arab Population

The 1929 Hebron massacre, where Arab rioters killed numerous Jews, exemplified the deepening conflict between Jewish and Arab communities under British mandate. British attempts to mediate often failed, exacerbating tensions.





KURDISH IRAQ

Stakeholders: The British Crown, Kurdish Leaders

Following the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, the Kurdish population in the newly formed state of Iraq sought greater autonomy or independence. Kurdish leaders like Sheikh Mahmud Barzanji resisted the central authority imposed by the British and the Iraqi monarchy. Barzanji declared himself the ruler of an independent Kurdish kingdom in 1922, directly challenging British and Iraqi control. His leadership saw several uprisings against the British, aiming to establish Kurdish self-rule. The British response to these uprisings involved significant military campaigns, including aerial bombardments and ground assaults. Despite initial successes, Kurdish resistance was eventually suppressed through force and political negotiations. The British made several promises regarding Kurdish autonomy to placate the unrest, but these were largely unfulfilled, leading to continued dissatisfaction and sporadic uprisings. The suppression of Kurdish revolts and the failure to grant meaningful autonomy to the Kurdish regions set the stage for long-term tensions between the Kurdish population and the central government in Baghdad, contributing to the ongoing struggle for Kurdish rights and recognition within Iraq.

SYRIA

Stakeholders: The French Mandate Authority, Syrian Nationalists

The Great Syrian Revolt (1925-1927) against French colonial rule was led by Druze, Sunni, and Alawite factions. Despite initial successes, the revolt was brutally suppressed by the French, solidifying resentment and nationalist fervor.

LEBANON

Stakeholders: The French Mandate Authority, Lebanese Sectarian Groups

The 1926 establishment of the Lebanese Republic under the French mandate attempted to balance Christian and Muslim political power. The confessional system aimed to prevent sectarian conflict but laid the groundwork for future strife.

TURKEY

Stakeholders: Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, Allied Powers

The Treaty of Lausanne (1923) recognized the sovereignty of the Republic of Turkey under Atatürk, following the War of Independence against Allied occupation. This treaty defined modern Turkey's borders and ended the Ottoman Empire.





IRAN

Stakeholders: Reza Shah Pahlavi, British and Russian Interests

Reza Shah's 1921 coup, supported by the British, marked the beginning of modernization and centralization efforts in Iran. His policies aimed at reducing foreign influence but often clashed with traditional power structures.

BRITISH AFGHANISTAN AND CENTRAL ASIA

Stakeholders: The British Crown, Afghan Tribal Leaders, Soviet Union

The Third Anglo-Afghan War (1919) resulted in the Treaty of Rawalpindi, granting Afghanistan full independence from British influence. This solidified Afghanistan's status as a buffer state between British India and Soviet Central Asia.



A Short Note on Conference Policy



We request the delegates of the HCCC to abide by the following specificities in regulations in order to maintain suitable conduct over the course of the conference:

- No internet access will be allowed in formal session. Delegates must have one document stored as an offline workspace, wherein they can continuously write their directives. For each directive window, they are expected to send their documentation as a PDF to the Chairperson's email (to be disclosed in session), and delete any previous directives on that document in time for the next window. Internet access will be provided by the Executive Board via hotspot during unmoderated caucuses. All other documents containing portfolio research must be stored on the delegates' devices as offline copies.
- Delegates are expected to adhere to the standard norm of MUNs, and attend in formal attire, as well as undergo all security checks.
- Crosstalk will be entertained in committee sessions depending on the nature of the POI being raised. If the line of questioning eventually becomes fruitless, then the crosstalk shall elapse.
- The Executive Board reserves the right to downmark any delegate for sightings of misbehavior, inappropriate language and/or abuse directed towards other delegates or of conference equipment such as vandalism of school property, and will not inform delegates of such marking procedures unless it is absolutely necessary.
- The Executive Board will be allowing all forms of crisis documentation, but will open and close the windows for submission of directives at their discretion, with a notice to the delegates. POIs via chat are meant to be handwritten (notebooks will be provided in the delegate handbooks).

Further Links for Research:

<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/13531049008575960#:~:text=At%20the%20Zionist%20Congress%20in,the%20end%20of%20an%20era.>

<https://www.theguardian.com/books/2009/jun/28/balfour-and-weizmann-geoffrey-lewis#:~:text=The%20story%20of%20the%20Balfour,and%20the%20ardent%20Jewish%20nationalist.>

<https://history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/creation-israel#:~:text=In%20May%201946%2C%20Truman%20announced,creation%20of%20a%20Jewish%20state.>

