

GECMUN 6: CREATE!

HOSTAGE CRISIS COMMITTEE

THE 1979 HOSTAGE CRISIS IN IRAN
CHAIR REPORT

NICOLE TAN
KATIE PATEL
DHRUV LEEKHA

LETTER FRO THE CHAIRS

Hey everyone! My name is Nicole and I will be one of your chairs for the HCC. I attend Hong Kong International School (as do Dhruv and Katie) and I will be a junior. This will be my fifth year in MUN and GECMUN VI will be my thirteenth conference, third as a chair. Though the conference is only two days long, I hope that during this time, delegates will be able to come forth with creative, original solutions and, of course, be able to solve the issue at hand. I look forward to meeting you all in February!

Hey! I'm Katie, one of the chairs for the Historical Crisis Committee. I'm in tenth grade, and this is my twelfth conference. Though I've been in crisis committees as a delegate, I've never done so as a chair, so I'm excited to see one of my favorite types of committees from a new perspective. I also can't wait to see the debate and innovative solutions that will arise as the conference progresses. Good luck, and I can't wait to meet you all!

Hi! I'm Dhruv and I'm glad to say that I will be one of your chairs at GECMUN VI in the Hostage Crisis Committee (HCC). I will be in 10th grade at the time of the conference, and this will be my 5th year in Model United Nations, and my 17th conference, but will be one of my first conferences as a chair (which makes this conference even more exciting for me!). Though I have been in many different committees, I have never actually been in a crisis committee, so I'm thrilled to not only regulate debate, but to actively observe how this crisis plays out. I'm looking forward to all the delegations being able to meaningfully contribute to debate, through speeches, POIs, and directives. So until February 2020 rolls around, good luck in your preparation!

As always, please do not hesitate to contact any one of us if you should have any questions on the topic or details mentioned in this background guide. Happy prepping!

Sincerely,

Nicole Tan, Katie Patel, Dhruv Leekha

INTRODUCTION

The Hostage Crisis Committee is a fictional committee created by the chairs and is based off of the 1979 Iranian hostage crisis. Within the committee, delegations (both nations and organizations) will work together (or on their own accord, through private directives) to reach a solution and possibly negotiate with the perpetrators.

It is Saturday, February 10th, 1979. An unknown criminal organization, known only as the Cabal, has raided the World Economic Forum in Tehran, Iran. 93 prominent business and political leaders from ten countries have been taken hostage in the WEF building — namely, the United States, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, China, Japan, West Germany, France, Brazil, Canada, Italy, Egypt, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Argentina, Kenya, Australia, and Nigeria. As the crisis is broadcasted across news channels everywhere, chaos has ensued everywhere and government offices are being flooded with calls regarding the whereabouts of influential businessmen, foreign secretaries, and state administration heads. In the midst of this global panic, the United Nations has called for an emergency session to be convened among nations and international organizations to resolve the crisis as swiftly as possible. Secretary General Kurt Waldheim further released a statement announcing that “no nation will be leaving the room until a deal has been reached and all hostages are safely returned.”

In preparation for the meeting, you have received the following information in an intelligence report compiled by Interpol regarding the attack. Prior to the incident, intelligence agencies across the world have treated the Cabal as nothing more than a fairytale. However, Iranian intelligence is beginning to suspect that previous, unlinked crimes all lead back to the Cabal. On-site operatives have determined from preliminary evidence that the group is likely a terrorist organization originating from Iran, with the primary motive of ending American interference in Iranian politics. Religious motives are unclear, and whether the group is open to negotiation is unknown, as of now. Though it is uncertain as to why other foreign leaders were also taken hostage, it has been deduced from the little camera footage available, indecipherable online

correspondence, and a dead drop intercepted one week prior in Tehran that other nations were simply caught in the crossfire. Some analysis experts point to President Jimmy Carter's decision to admit Iran's deposed, pro-Western Shah into the United States for cancer treatment during the peak of the Iranian Revolution as the tipping point for the Cabal, but due to the group's anonymity, there is much information about the group that is yet to be unearthed.

It is crucial that delegates resolve the international crisis as quickly as possible, while still taking caution in order to maintain domestic and international stability, keeping ethics and the consequences of involvement in foreign affairs in mind, and of course, ensuring the hostages' safety.

KEY TERMS

Crisis Negotiation Team (CNT)

A multidisciplinary group of individuals that negotiate with a person or group involved in criminal activity with the goal of de-escalating the situation to avoid loss of life. Nations involved in the hostage crisis are likely to utilize this type of team to negotiate with the Cabal.

Diversion

A tactic that is either psychological or physical that draws the subject(s) away from the hostages. This would be used in an extraction situation to reduce the risk of harm to the victims, but delegates should be reminded that the number of Cabal members in proximity to the hostages is currently unknown, and that it is possible that not all subjects would be diverted.

Extraction vs. Negotiation

Extraction is a direct attempt to recover the hostages, but may prove riskier than other options. Negotiation, while less overtly dangerous to the hostages, can waste time while hostages are in danger. Additionally, angering the Cabal during negotiation could result in harm to the hostages. Delegates will have the choice between negotiation and extraction to recover the hostages, and should base their choices on the stance of their nation. Delegates could also consider pursuing both simultaneously, such as negotiating with an extraction strategy in the event that discussion is unsuccessful.

Forceful Extraction

A forceful extraction is done when the extraction team visibly enters the building in an attempt to recover the hostages. While this may require less time in planning and less knowledge about the layout of the building, forceful extractions typically result in higher casualties. Hostages may be killed by assailants during the rescue attempt, and innocents have been historically caught in the crossfire while these occur. Additionally, failure would likely result in the deaths of members of the extraction team, and the unsuccessful rescue would reflect badly on the countries involved.

Covert Extraction

An operation in which the extraction team enters the crisis site without detection in the aim of recovering the hostages before the assailants are aware of the team's presence. Though this type of extraction may be safer for the hostages by reducing the risk of aggravating the assailants by sending a team to attempt a rescue in more obvious ways, an understanding of the layout of the building is needed to attempt this type of extraction. While that information is being collected, likely through reconnaissance, the hostages are at risk and may have to wait longer than they would in a forceful extraction.

Sniper-Initiated Takedown

An extraction that is initiated by a sniper's planned or unplanned action. After the shot has been fired, that would serve as the signal for the rest of the extraction team to move in. Nations should be aware that snipers may take this action if the opportunity presents itself, even if it had not been planned. For example, if a target from the Cabal comes into the sniper's line of fire, and the sniper decides to take the shot, the extraction will begin. Thus nations should understand that this extraction may not take place at the exact time they'd planned and can thus change the outcome of the extraction.

Rewards-Based Negotiation

Rewards-based negotiation would be offering to fulfil a part or all of the Cabal's demands in exchange for the return of the hostages. Nations should keep in mind their policy on negotiation though, since some like the U.S. and the U.K. have a hard stance on not negotiating with terrorist groups. Additionally, delegates should remember that giving in to the Cabal's demands may set a precedent in the future that may encourage terrorist groups to take hostages.

Threat-Based Negotiation

Threat-based negotiation uses threats and punishments to convince the group to free the hostages. This requires some knowledge of the group, such as possible home bases of the organization or other information that could be used to harm them. This information would require more time to collect than that of rewards-based negotiation, which only requires the demands of the assailants. Furthermore, this strategy poses a higher risk to the hostages if the assailants become more hostile as a result of the threats.

Gag Order

A gag order is a legal order, typically made by a court or a government, to restrict certain information from being published to the public or made known to a third party. In the context of the hostage crisis, delegates may want to consider gag orders to help maintain domestic stability within their respective countries, and to minimize confusion and potential riots. However, the interpretation of such a move by the public should be taken into consideration as it may arouse fears of the formation of an increasingly authoritarian government.

Private Security Firms

Private security firms are companies that the families of hostages may reach out to for hostage negotiation. There may be updates regarding these companies and their progress that countries will be kept up to date on. Nations have the option to discourage the use of these firms, but they should consider the progress these companies have the potential to make. Many of these companies are from the U.S. and the U.K. and will work for citizens of other countries, but delegates should remember that they must operate within the laws of their home country and the country they're doing business in. For example, if the United States government bans private security firm involvement in the crisis, other countries can't use American firms anymore.

Proof of Life

Proof of life is evidence that the hostages are still alive, typically through photographic evidence where the victim is shown with some kind of verification of time, such as a current newspaper. Audio evidence such as phone calls may also be presented, but they can be faked through pre-recorded messages, so delegates should be wary of supposed calls from hostages. Delegates may want to account for proof of life during negotiations, especially as the motivations of the Cabal are largely unknown, meaning no hostage is guaranteed to be alive or safe.

Reconnaissance

The profiling of the crisis site, which will likely be done by members of nations' intelligence agencies. Delegates can use satellite imagery and blueprints for a larger overview, but for in-detail information on the crisis sites, delegates should send in agents, but this may result in discovery, risking negotiations and possibly the safety of the hostages. Delegates' results from the reconnaissance will be sent to them in private notes from the chair, and they can choose to release the intelligence they've received or keep it private. However, there is a risk the information will be leaked regardless, so withholding findings may damage alliances formed with other nations.

Risk Assessment

The evaluation of risks to military personnel and the public prior to beginning extraction efforts. Delegates should be aware that if they choose to storm the building, heavy loss of military personnel should be expected, which would've been noted in a risk assessment.

Window of Opportunity

The optimal time for an extraction operation. This may be when subjects guarding the hostages are fewer in number or more likely to be caught off guard. The window of opportunity will likely be included in findings from in-person reconnaissance, as the observer will be noting guard activities and possible weak points in the Cabal's defenses.

World Economic Forum (WEF)

The World Economic Forum is an organization that brings business, political, and other leaders of society together annually to scrutinize the world's political economy. While the meeting is typically held in Geneva, Switzerland, it is being held in Tehran, Iran, in 1979. Delegates should take into consideration the types of members of society that are being taken hostage using the context of the WEF, and the larger implications that may have on the country as a whole.

TIMELINE OF EVENTS

1953: CIA-organized military coup in Iran

President Eisenhower ordered a military coup that overthrew Iran's democratically elected Prime Minister Mohammed Mossadegh. This action came after mounting pressure from Britain to form a joint operation, who was unhappy that Iran nationalized its oil industry. The US continues to vehemently deny its involvement in the coup.

1953 to 1979: US puppet government in Iran

Following the coup, the US-installed Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi as the leader of Iran, effectively ending the years of democracy in the country. What followed was 25 years of CIA-supported tyrannical rule that resulted in the deaths of thousands of dissidents who dared to speak up against the US puppet government. A clear example of foreign involvement and backing the Shah was the Shah's decision to denationalize Iran's oil industry, with 60% of it going towards American firms.

1978: World Economic Forum announces the decision to hold 1979 WEF in Iran

Amidst international tensions, the WEF announced its decision to hold the next WEF in Iran. This was largely seen as a move to diffusing growing animosity on an international scale, but specifically between the US and Iran. Several world leaders spoke out against the decision with concerns of safety and feasibility, but the WEF remained steadfast in their decision.

February 8-10, 1979: 9th World Economic Forum

The 9th World Economic Forum saw world leaders and hundreds of executives from business firms arriving in Tehran on February 8th. Throughout the duration of the closed-door conference, an increasing number of Iranians gathered on the streets to protest global interference by foreign nations. The protests, although mainly peaceful, saw handfuls of Iranians grow violent. Although the forum was meant to last for a duration of five days, it was cut short.

February 10th, 1979: Cabal raids the World Economic Forum, taking 93 hostages

Around noon, armed figures dressed in black broke into the main conference hall. According to news sources, after some confusion, the armed men, now identified as the Cabal, began binding and blindfolding the forum attendees. 93 officials, leaders, and representatives from ten different countries were reported missing amidst the chaotic aftermath of the raid. Shots were exchanged, with many members of security detail being flown back to their respective countries for immediate treatment. The Iranian police have set a parameter around the building, and they are yet to find a way in. Though foreign security detail has expressed their worries over the competence of Iranian forces, Iranian officials have insisted on using their own forces as the area is under their jurisdiction. However, it is expected that foreign nations will insist on their own involvement and/or attempt to fly in troops as the day progresses.

MAJOR MEMBER STATE STANCES

The United States of America

The United States of America has an interest in ensuring the safe return of the many high-profile American hostages that were taken at the World Economic Forum (WEF). However, beyond that, they have a vested interest in maintaining distance from the Iranian government and any coalition it may form, due to the nature of the relationship between the U.S. and the Islamic Republic of Iran following the 1979 Iranian revolution and its overthrow of the American backed Shah. A vital fact to keep in mind regarding the United States is their well-known policy of refusing to negotiate with terrorists, which will have serious implications during the hostage crisis. That being said, delegates can attempt to find creative solutions around this issue, such as using private sector proxies to unofficially negotiate on behalf of the American government or avoiding negotiation entirely. [Total hostage count: 22]

The International Criminal Police Organization

The International Criminal Police Organization, better known as INTERPOL, is an international organisation that dedicates itself to connecting transnationally, police organisations around the world. While it is not a part of the United Nations, it is a permanent observer at the U.N. (however, this relationship only began in the 90s, after the time of the historical crisis of this committee). The primary use of INTERPOL in this committee will most likely not be through direct "boots on the ground" methods, such as INTERPOL's incident response teams, seeing as INTERPOL would require Iran to request such a team, not any other member state. The primary way in which they may come into play in this situation is through border security operations, such as Operation Red Lotus but on a smaller scale (operation Red Lotus was an INTERPOL operation conducted in Southeast Asia which enhanced border security to apprehend internationally wanted criminals, especially those with INTERPOL red notices* on them), to ensure that none of the hostage-takers leaves Iran in order to avoid capture.

*An INTERPOL red notice is issued by an INTERPOL member state or an organisation that is governing over a criminal case at the behest of the international community which informs the world's police organisations that the individual with a red notice on them is wanted for crimes and extradition to the notice issuing member state.

International Monetary Fund

The International Monetary Fund (IMF) is one of the two financial bodies of the United Nations, the other being the World Bank. While the World Bank focuses on more long-term projects, the IMF specialises in providing immediate aid to countries that suddenly find themselves in an economic crisis. A well-known case would be that of Greece in the late 2000s, in which Greece received substantial loans and debt relief during their economic crisis. Due to the unprecedented scale of this hostage crisis in the modern era, the IMF has little to no experience in such situations. However, due to the nature of the IMF as a short-term lender, countries who are looking to try and negotiate with the Cabal in regards to possible ransoms in exchange for hostages, but do not want to work with a coalition or can foresee difficulty in procuring the necessary funds due to reasons such as: an economy that cannot handle the financial burden of the government paying ransom fees; limited executive power or limited discretionary funds that would make it difficult to obtain the ransom fee efficiently; may consider utilising the IMF. One crucial fact to keep in mind is that the United States, as the world's largest economy, yields strong influence along the IMF, which could lead to difficulties for member states to get assistance from the IMF if their plan is disliked by the United States. Delegations that meet these descriptions, or can envision a different use for the IMF during committee, should be ready to collaborate with the delegation of the IMF.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Iran's relationship with the USSR at this time was hostile, with the Iranian Supreme Leader dubbing the Soviet Union Lesser Satan (with the U.S. being Greater Satan). Due to the Soviet Union state atheism, occupation of Afghanistan, and the Iranian government's poor treatment of the Iranian Tudeh Party (Iran's Communist Party), the relationship between the two states was fairly strained. Moreover, seeing as the USSR played a key role in the Allied invasion of Iran during WWII, and therefore were also key in the installation of Mohammed Reza Pahlavi as the Shah of Iran (who was subsequently overthrown in the 1979 Iranian Revolution). The USSR's intention in committee would most likely be to safely rescue their hostages, while not betraying their foreign policy as it relates to the ongoing Cold War with America and its rocky relationship with Iran. [Total hostage count: 7]

The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The relations between the United Kingdom and Iran at the time of the Islamic Revolution were extremely hostile. The U.K. officially severed diplomatic ties with Iran in the aftermath of the 1979 revolution. The United Kingdom, alongside the USSR, occupied Iran during World War II, and also tensions between the two countries have been ongoing since the conclusion of World War II. Due to disputes over oil in the late 40s, the United Kingdom incited a conspiracy with the U.S. to campaign against Iran. This hostility eventually culminated in the 1953 Iranian coup (sponsored by the American Central Intelligence Agency), which strengthened power for the Shah mentioned above, Mohammad Reza Pahlavi, who was favourable towards the West. Seeing as the United Kingdom and the Islamic Republic of Iran had no official diplomatic connections, negotiations will be more difficult to engage in for these two specific nations, either having to go through coalition members or private sector entities. The United Kingdom's goal in the debate will be to secure the safe return of their hostages without getting themselves put on Iran's list of the Western 'Satans', so as to get closer to form a petroleum trade agreement with Iran, seeing as the previous agreement had become void after the revolution when Iran nationalised its petroleum industry. [Total hostage count: 7]

The People's Republic of China

Although there are only brief details that can be found regarding the China-Iran relationship after the revolution, their ties were overwhelmingly positive. China immediately recognised Iran after the Islamic Revolution, perhaps due to its tensions with the previous regime under Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi. Their disdain for both the U.S. and the USSR strengthened their relationship, leading to trade flourishing under the new rule of Iran, largely in regards to Chinese petroleum imports. If China were to join a coalition, it would most likely be that of Iran — however, that could raise serious problems since it would escalate tensions between China and the West that could result in sanctions. Accordingly, China's goal in the committee will be to secure their hostages while essentially maintaining distance from most coalitions. [Total hostage count: 6]

The State of Japan

While it is clear that Japanese-American relations were not their strongest at this time, especially with ongoing diplomatic spats between the two nations partially as a result of the Vietnam War, the two nations still had a very close and positive bond. However, Japan was actively engaged in petroleum trade with Iran before the crisis, which would incentivise the Japanese delegation to avoid over-angering Iran. If Japan were to join a coalition, it would almost certainly be with the United States, though they may try to keep a low profile to avoid the suspension of petroleum trade. [Total hostage count: 6]

The Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany)

Largely due to the Marshall Plan, West Germany was highly favourable towards the United States, with America holding a large military presence within the nation. Therefore, it would be likely that the West German delegation would join the American coalition. The strategy for West Germany will likely be to stick as close as possible to America to retrieve their hostages. However, with a booming economy, it would not be beyond West Germany to operate based on private directives unbeknownst to the United States if an opportunity were to arise, especially at this time in history when America was refusing to send enriched uranium to Germany in light of the nuclear deal made between them and Brazil, thus harming the close relationship between America and West Germany. [Total hostage count: 5]

The French Republic

At this time, France was favourable towards the idea of a Europe that had minimal American influence. Due to this fact, a coalition with the United States and France would be very tense, but France could work well with a nation such as West Germany who shares similar values, is European, and has strong economic relations with France. France's goal in committee will be to retrieve their hostages while not betraying their vision for a Europe independent from America. France also has a history of negotiating with subjects during hostage crises, so negotiation would likely be a strong tactic. [Total hostage count: 5]

The Federative Republic of Brazil

As mentioned in previous descriptions, Brazil and West Germany had just formed a nuclear agreement which closed relations between Brazil and Germany, but greatly distanced America from Brazil. The American government even strong-armed a private bank and a government bank to stop engaging in financial activities with Brazil. Brazil and Iran have had a historically strong relationship, predominantly in the form of trade, but also diplomatically. Due to this relationship, Brazil is in a rather tough spot diplomatically. Brazil would avoid actions that would be strongly against Iran, one of their key economic partners, but they cannot bring the wrath of the international community on them. Therefore, throughout the debate, the Brazilian delegation will be walking on a fine line between the West and Iran. Another key fact regarding Brazil is that as one of the largest economies of that time, they have the capability to undertake private directives, which could come in useful as far as avoiding participating in coalitions. However, with the looming risk of leaks, there is a risk of delegations finding out about any private directives, which could seriously diplomatically endanger delegations like Brazil. [Total hostage count: 3]

Canada

Some delegates may be familiar with Canada's involvement in the hostage crisis through the movie "Argo". This film was largely true in terms of Canadian aid to America in rescuing their hostages. Even though the opportunity for this sort of rescue attempt on behalf of Canada would not necessarily arise, it speaks volumes about how willing Canada would be to assist the United States in their endeavours. Moreover, Canada was a uniquely privileged country during the Iranian revolution, having its diplomatic outposts remain fairly untouched. The Carter presidency had significantly stronger relations with America than in the Nixon era, so close cooperation between these two nations would only be natural in order to ensure the safe return of American and Canadian hostages. Canada, due to its close relations with America, was naturally against Iran and effectively ceased diplomatic activities with Iran immediately after the Islamic Revolution. Canada's goal in committee will very simply be to ensure that they can safely bring home their hostages. [Total hostage count: 4]

Italy

While post-WWII relations between Italy and America were strong, Italy's foreign policy during the 1970s was weak and at times neglected due to domestic turmoil. With different political factions all vying for power, some through violent means, Italy will have some problems deciding which nations to work within the council. However, even private directives will be difficult for the Italian delegation, considering the fragile and controversial centrist coalition that Italy had recently formed in the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate of the Republic. Thus, getting approval for any private directives in Parliament may prove to be challenging. Though private directives will not literally be passed through a country's government, delegates should keep issues such as political repercussions and the feasibility of acquiring funds in mind. Italy's main challenge in committee will be to safely bring their hostages home, while not destroying the fragile equilibrium reached domestically in the Italian government. [Total hostage count: 3]

Egypt

Egyptian-American relations at the time of the Iranian Revolution were quite positive. With the United States forcing France and Britain to withdraw their troops from Egypt during the Suez Crisis, Egypt grew more favourable towards America. Moreover, Egypt's recognition of Israel and fruitful negotiations over the Sinai Peninsula and other matters at Camp David, arbitrated by the United States, further strengthened relations between the two countries. Moreover, Iranian Egyptian relations had gone cold due to Egypt's previous President's (Gamal Abdel Nasser) support for Pan-Arabism as opposed to Iran's vision of Pan-Islamism. Relations further soured when Egypt was suspended from the Arab League over refusing to toe the line of other Middle Eastern states when it came to the Israeli issue. With this being considered, Egypt will likely avoid joining the Iranian coalition and may participate in the American coalition to retrieve their hostages and build strong relations with the United States. [Total hostage count: 5]

Saudi Arabia

While at times strained, the Saudi-American relationship was considerably strong. The critical tie between Saudi Arabia and the U.S. was their mutual hatred for communism. This force drove a strong friendship between the two nations, which took the form of the U.S. supplying Saudi Arabia with military jets and mutual investment in each others' infrastructure.

Moreover, Saudi Arabia, as the prime Sunni nation in the Middle East, was immediately against the new Iranian government, as an Islamic Shi'ite theocracy. For this reason, it is more than likely that if Saudi Arabia joined a coalition, it would be the American coalition. However, as in the case with West Germany, Saudi Arabia has the fiscal and military capacity to engage in private directives to manoeuvre their way out of their solution, to not look like America's inferior puppet. [Total hostage count: 4]

Iraq

The critical issue that was governing the relationship between Iraq and the United States of America was Kurdish autonomy in Iraq. It was a complicated situation with America backing the Kurds' efforts to gain autonomy in Iraq and then supposedly betraying the Kurds. However, this "betrayal" was not in favour of the Iraqi government. America and Iraq had already suspended diplomatic ties more than a decade before over the 1967 Israel War. However, Iraq also had terrible relations with Iran at this time due to the Islamic Revolution's effects. Thus, Iraq will have a hard time in committee finding whom to partner with and may have to rely solely on private directives to rescue their hostages. [Total hostage count: 2]

Kenya

While Kenya and the United States did not have close ties at this time, the Cold War and Kenya's general apathy towards the Communist ideals of the USSR made them a dependable ally of the US. Kenya imported large, extensive amounts of Iranian oil, so in light of this, Kenya will try to keep a low profile in committee while also relying on American support to retrieve their hostages. [Total hostage count: 3]

Argentina

Argentinian-American relations were problematic at this time. Due to the human rights violations of the rightist Argentine regime, American human rights groups forced Congress' hand in suspending arms trade between themselves and Argentina. However, until the suspension of aid, the US had been a steadfast supporter of the exploits of the Argentine Junta government, especially Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, who assisted the Junta in accomplishing all that it wanted to before America ended its aid. Thus, it would not be surprising to see Argentina joining the American coalition, mainly since minimal accounts exist of an active trade or diplomatic relationship between Argentina and Iran. [Total hostage count: 4]

Australia

Australia and America shared a close relationship at this time in history. Their military alliance was particularly notable, with a formal treaty known as ANZUS between the two nations, which helped ensure Australia (and New Zealand's) security with American protection, and also reassured America that Australia would be willing to assist the U.S. in warfare. As far as Iranian Australian relations go, there is not too much there. While Australia notably did not close its embassy in Iran at the time of the Islamic Revolution, they were still, of course, not supporters of the new regime. They did support the interim government of Iranian Prime Minister Mehdi Bazargan; however, he was a moderate figure who did not support terrorism. Thus Australia felt comfortable supporting him. In light of all this, Australia will almost certainly join the American coalition due to their close diplomatic and military relationship. [Total hostage count: 4]

Nigeria

Nigeria experienced a volatile political climate from the 1970s onwards. For this reason, it was extremely difficult for Nigeria to establish any strong diplomatic relationships with any nations. Additionally, this instability meant its economy could not flourish, despite the size of the nation and its population. The Nigerian government at this time had started in 1976, following a coup that led to General Olusegun Obasanjo becoming the Nigerian Head of State. There were no clear relations between Nigeria and America, or between Nigeria and Iran. Nigeria may have difficulty finding partners in committee, however, due to President Olusegun Obasanjo's commitment to returning to a civilian led government, they may be able to join the American coalition to get their hostages retrieved. [Total hostage count: 3]

Iran

Last but certainly not least is Iran. Delegates may have some misconceptions regarding the Iranian government at the time of the hostage situation. It is important to remember that the situation has been caused by a terrorist organisation known

as the "Cabal" that is not (necessarily) sponsored by the Iranian government or some extreme factions within the military etc.. It is also vital to recall that at this time, Iran is neither an Islamic theocracy, nor is led by a Supreme Leader*. It was a civilian interim government that was in power at the time of this crisis, led by interim Prime Minister Shapour Bakhtiar, who was appointed by the Shah amidst the protests, a couple of weeks before the hostage crisis. Bahtikar, specifically, was appointed to appease the protesters, seeing as Bahtikar was a critic of the Shah, yet was still fairly moderate. During his short spell as the head of Iranian government, he did as much as he could to support human rights, to satisfy the protesters. He dissolved the Shah's infamous secret police that was despised by the general populous; he released all political prisoners; and he made plans to hold elections in three months after his appointment to help stabilize the government. In committee, despite these liberal moves by Shapour Bakhtiar, Iran will still most likely not assist the other nations in retrieving their hostages, seeing as the government in February was appointed by Ruhollah Khomeini, who would almost certainly not support freeing hostages. Throughout committee session, Iran will have to hold its own by not surrendering to the demands of the West, while also walking a fine line between the will of liberal Prime Minister Bakhtiar, and conservative Ruhollah Khomeini, and ensure the safety of Iran against other nations.

*Seeing as this is a historical crisis committee, delegates would not be aware that this is what would happen in the future

SUGGESTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

As a nation or organizations' representative, it is the delegations' responsibility to cooperate and negotiate with both allies and enemies to safely return their respective hostages. Due to the fact that this is a crisis committee and information will be incrementally introduced into the committee, our main suggestions for your preparation would be to familiarize yourself with your country stance and have a few plausible ideas in mind regarding the issue. Please keep in mind that the crisis is set in 1979, so keep methods and military technology appropriate to that time period. The date when the crisis meeting is held is January 28, 1979, and committee length will be the equivalent of a week in the crisis. Note that some of the newfound information will only be given to the parties involved (eg. a CIA report may only be shown to the delegate of the United States), and that delegates have the option of revealing the information to the rest of the committee or to keep it classified, but the prevention of leaks cannot be guaranteed. Both public and private directives can be introduced, but when introducing private directives, make sure not to isolate yourself from the rest of the committee and keep the big picture in mind. More information on directives can be found below and in the Crisis Committee R.O.P.

As this is a crisis committee, will allow personal pronouns, but keep in mind that you are representing a larger entity. Furthermore, it may seem tempting to form an all-encompassing bloc and to be willing to sacrifice all resources for the greater cause, but do not forget your country stances, natural alliances, and the political climate at this time. Although you may be in a committee dedicated to solely solving a crisis, your responsibilities as a delegate do not differ from those in a normal committee. Lastly, please be creative, but keep it realistic as well.

Some things and questions to consider when coming up with solutions:

- Possible censorship of the media and public
- Negotiation with the Cabal
- Prevention of further crises
- Bloc alliances
- Political status quo / climate (previous grudges)
- Prioritization of one country over the greater good, should the case arise
- Taking individual, private actions (eg. only freeing one country's hostages, privately negotiating with the Cabal)
- Who, if anyone, is backing the Cabal?
- How much should other countries have to sacrifice for something that seems to be between the United States and the Cabal?
- How much trust / credibility can be given to alleged reports, considering past agency scandals?
- Should Iran be able to hold the most weight and responsibility in this issue?
- Should an alternative method of voting be proposed in this situation?

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Delegates will generally be following UNA-USA procedure, with specificities added specifically for crisis committees. This R.O.P. can be found on the GECMUN website or through [this direct link](#).

There will be one key amendment made to this R.O.P. specifically for this committee which shall be as follows: Any committee members have the right to send a note to a chair issuing a veto threat on any public directive which directly concerns the delegate and that the delegate believes would never be approved by their organisation (in the case that the delegation is representing an organisation), or would violate their nation's sovereignty (if the delegation is representing a nation), since all directives passed in committee are binding if passed. The note to the chair should include how exactly the delegate sees themselves as being involved, and why they would consider the solution mentioned to be unrealistic. For example, if there was a public directive that instructed INTERPOL to send an incident response team to the WEF, the delegate of INTERPOL could send a note to the chair stating that this is a veto threat because the public directive is ordering them to send in an incident response team (how INTERPOL is involved) and that this is unrealistic because firstly, INTERPOL can't send a team into the WEF without the consent of Iran, and secondly, that it violates article 3 of the INTERPOL constitution (why this is unrealistic). If the chair approves of this note, then they will permit the delegation in question to deliver a concise veto ultimatum to the committee, essentially restating what was said in the note to the chairs.

In light of this, delegations representing organisations are permitted to answer "present and voting" during roll call, if they feel that they may veto a directive during session. Besides in this specific instance of a veto, delegations of organisations will not be allowed to vote on any public directives; however, they will be permitted to write and submit public directives (but not vote on these directives).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Central Intelligence Agency. (1979, December 14). Iran, Relations with the USSR. Retrieved August 12, 2019, from <https://www.cia.gov/library/readingroom/docs/CIA-RDP81B00401R000600020002-5.pdf>
- [CNBC International]. (2017, October 12). What's the difference between the IMF and the World Bank? | CNBC Explains [Video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IN3qrFA4jXc>
- Crisis Negotiation Team. (2017, September). Retrieved August 12, 2019, from https://www.fema.gov/media-library-data/1517003039470-0c27db64a20eaf338b660602b0959743/NIMS_508_b_CrisisNegotiationTeam.PDF
- Feldman, L. (1978). Canada and the United States in the 1970s: Rift and Reconciliation. *The World Today*, 34(12), 484-492. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40395029>
- Grabianowski, E. (2007, July 13). How Interpol Works. Retrieved August 12, 2019, from <https://people.howstuffworks.com/interpol.htm>
- The International Criminal Police Organization. (n.d.). Retrieved August 12, 2019, from <https://www.interpol.int/en>
- INTERPOL and the United Nations. (n.d.). Retrieved August 12, 2019, from <https://www.interpol.int/en/Our-partners/International-organization-partners/INTERPOL-and-the-United-Nations>
- INTERPOL response teams. (n.d.). Retrieved August 12, 2019, from <https://www.interpol.int/en/How-we-work/INTERPOL-response-teams>

- Iran Hostage Crisis. (2010, June 01). Retrieved August 12, 2019, from <https://www.history.com/topics/middle-east/iran-hostage-crisis>
- Iran hostage crisis. (2019, January 31). Retrieved August 12, 2019, from <https://www.britannica.com/event/Iran-hostage-crisis>
- Kagan, J. (2019, June 13). World Economic Forum (WEF). Retrieved August 12, 2019, from <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/w/world-economic-forum.asp>
- Kinzer, S. (2008). All the Shah's Men: An American Coup and the Roots of Middle East Terror. Retrieved August 12, 2019, from https://books.google.com.hk/books/about/All_the_Shah_s_Men.html?id=Wv4B6C-WTG8C&printsec=frontcover&source=kp_read_button&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false
- Patel, Katie, et al. "Hostage Crisis Interview." 21 July 2019.
- Tactical Response and Operations Standard for Law Enforcement Agencies. (2018, April). Retrieved August 12, 2019, from <http://ntoa.org/pdf/swatstandards.pdf>
- U.S./Iran Timeline: 1953-2007. (n.d.). Retrieved August 12, 2019, from <http://stpeteforpeace.org/factsheets/us.iran.timeline.html>
- Wright, R. B. (2010). The Iran Primer: Power, Politics, and U.S. Policy. Retrieved August 12, 2019, from https://books.google.com.hk/books?id=MDgwI59s_hUC&lpq=PA186&ots=xy7W1akXVv&pg=PA186&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false

Designed by Minsung Son, Louis Lee