



LMCMUN 2025



STUDY GUIDE



COMMITTEE

United Nations (Historic) General
Assembly – Disarmament and
International Security Committee

AGENDA

Assessing the Regional Security
Implications of Power Transitions
and Preventing the Militarization of
Revolutionary Movements in the
Middle East

FREEZE DATE

12th February, 1979



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Letter from the Chairpersons.....	1
2. Topic Area Summary.....	3
3. About the United Nations General Assembly.....	4
4. The Uniting for Peace Resolution.....	8
5. Revolutionary Movements and Power Transitions.....	13
6. The Iranian Revolution.....	21
7. Revolutionary Groups.....	30
8. The Lebanese Civil War.....	38
9. The Egyptian Revolution.....	40
10. The Iraqi Kurd War.....	43
11. The Yom Kippur War.....	47
12. Geopolitical History of the Middle East.....	51
13. Foreign Influence in the Middle East.....	56
14. Arms Trafficking in the Middle East.....	60
15. Current Scenarios of Revolt and Military Revolution.....	64
16. Timeline of Events.....	66
17. Questions for the Committee.....	70
18. Paperwork Guide.....	71
19. Recommendations by the Executive Board.....	77
20. Citations and Further Reading.....	78



LETTER FROM THE CHAIRPERSONS

Delegates,

It is our privilege to welcome you to the United Nations Historic General Assembly – Disarmament and International Security Committee, 1979, at the fourteenth edition of La Martiniere Calcutta Model United Nations.

Having engaged in the bittersweet activity known as MUN for over three years, we chairpersons know the stereotype associated with a General Assembly committee – boring and repetitive. It is thus our goal to abolish this stereotype through this committee. This year's UNHGA-DISEC promises to maintain a balance between conventional and crisis, culminating an experience we are sure would be unforgettable for most.

The agenda upon which this General Assembly shall deliberate is explosive – both literally and figuratively. The situation in the Middle East in the 1970s was marred by destruction and peril. This decade, which marked the transition from regality to legality in most of the Middle East, had an influence on world politics that continues to this day. These seismic shifts in geopolitics resulted in the illegal transfer of weaponry, which threatened the security of the region. The frustration of the people, which mainly stemmed due to the unwanted spreading of western influence among other factors, resulted in rebellions across the Arab world, shaking it to its core.

This agenda is unique as it does not center around a single country. At the time that this General Assembly meets, most of the nations of the Middle East are undergoing drastic changes. Be it the rebellion in Iran, the civil war in Lebanon or the complete reversal of the foreign policy of Egypt, this DISEC shall aim to solve the arms spillover that has occurred due to the 'winds of change' that blow over the Middle East.

The disruptive nature of the committee requires delegates to have a nuanced understanding of international law, mandate and in-depth knowledge of the clashing ideologies and influences that are shaping the region. As this is a double-delegate committee, we expect no compromises – whether it is paperwork, lobbying or speeches. To excel in this committee, we delegates must perform on all three fronts.



The situation in the Middle East is extremely tender and fragile, as it threatens to twist the existential fabric of the entire region and possibly the world. The coups and rebellions are just the beginning and what looms ahead may require this committee to transcend its mandate and take up an extremely important task – to prevent the sixth, and possibly final, extinction.

The rest, we leave to you delegates.

**Harshit Agarwal and Tanay Chaturvedi,
Chairpersons,
The United Nations (Historic) General Assembly – Disarmament
and International Security Committee,
La Martiniere Calcutta Model United Nations 2025.
unhgadisec@lmcmun2025.com**



TOPIC AREA SUMMARY

For generations, the Middle East has been a region of volatility and political unrest, becoming a hotspot for autocratic rulers and destructive wars which have taken a toll on the very political fabric that once held the Middle East together. Despite the best efforts of the international community to restore peace to this region, differences in ideologies and conflicting political interests have nullified any progress made.

Whether it be the rise of Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini to power and the fall from grace of Mohammed Reza Pahlavi in Iran, or the protests of religious minorities in Lebanon, which have led to one of the bloodiest civil wars in history – there is no shortage of chaos and instability. Then there is the fight for Kurdish identity as a direct result of marginalization of the Kurds in Iraq.

Ongoing turmoil in the Middle East caused by wars like the Yom Kippur War of 1973 and the Iraqi-Kurd Wars of 1961 and 1974 have wreaked havoc on the lives of innocent civilians and has created humanitarian crises, the likes of which man has never witnessed. This is further aggravated by various economic crises like the Iranian Oil Crisis caused by the overthrow of the Shah and Egypt's dire economic straits as result of Arab League sanctions after the Camp David Accords. The constant proliferation of arms, ammunition and explosives to non-State actors by external powers and actors and the rise of revolutionary groups such as the Fedayeen-e-Khalq and Mojahedin-e-Khalq is only adding fuel to the Middle Eastern fire. The Middle East is in shambles.

That begs the question – what can be done to provide relief to the millions of people who must face the hardships of the time with hope that peace will return and their safety will be assured? What can be done to effectively cut off the illicit arms trade routes that have indirectly led to the unnecessary deaths of so many? That is the objective of this General Assembly – to restore sanctity. Be sure that the journey will be one with several bumps along the way – will this committee come together and persevere, or fail to settle the disharmony within the Middle East?



ABOUT THE UNITED NATIONS

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The United Nations General Assembly is the main policy-making and representative body of the United Nations (UN). It is an equal representation of 151 Member States (as of 1979), and each member has the equal opportunity of voting and presenting their opinions. This body was established in 1945 under the UN Charter, and it plays an important role in international diplomacy and maintaining international peace and security.

- The United Nations General Assembly's main role is to provide a platform for international discussions and cooperation. The functions of the GA are outlined in Chapter IV of the UN Charter, and some of these, which shall be relevant to the committee, are as follows:
- The UNGA has been consistent in addressing international issues, which include peace and security, international law, humanitarian efforts, and sustainable development.
- While it is true that the resolutions of the UNGA are not legally binding, they do carry political weightage and contribute in shaping global policies. These resolutions have the potential to influence international law, set diplomatic examples, and lay the base for international treaties and regulations that could be highly useful to solve problems that plague our world.
- The UNGA coordinates with the various UN Agencies, like the UNESCO, WHO, and UNHCR (looks into matters of refuge), in order to make sure that the objectives of these agencies are in accordance with the priorities of the international community at large.
- The Decisions taken in the UNGA are taken through a majority vote, and important matters (like that of security and financial concerns) require a two-thirds majority.



Mandate of the UNGA

The UNGA works under Chapter IV of the UN Charter, which gives the committee the power to make recommendations on situations concerned with disarmament, security threats, and prevention of conflicts. The same chapter also gives the outline of the responsibilities and limitations of the General Assembly. Chapter IV of the UN Charter can be found [here](#). The main aspects of the UNGA as defined by this Chapter are as follows:

Limitations of the UNGA

- The resolutions passed by the General Assembly are purely recommendary in nature, i.e., they are not legally binding on any of the member States. However, a UNGA resolution does represent the geopolitical stance of the member States, and also sets certain international norms and guidelines.
- While the Security Council is exercising in respect of any dispute or situation the functions assigned to it in the present Charter, the General Assembly shall not make any recommendation with regard to that dispute or situation unless the Security Council so requests.
- The UNGA DISEC cannot impose sanctions or undertake any military action.

Responsibilities of UNGA

- Promotion of international cooperation in the political field and encouraging the progressive development of international law and its codification.
- Promotion of international cooperation in the economic, social, cultural, educational, and health fields, and assisting in the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.
- The General Assembly shall receive and consider annual and special reports from the Security Council; these reports shall include an account of the measures that the Security Council has decided upon or taken to maintain international peace and security.
- The General Assembly shall receive and consider reports from the other organs of the United Nations.



Powers of the UNGA

- It may consider the general principles of co-operation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments, and may make recommendations with regard to such principles to the Members or to the Security Council or to both.
- It may discuss any questions relating to the maintenance of international peace and security brought before it by any Member of the United Nations, or by the Security Council. Any such question on which action is necessary shall be referred to the Security Council by the General Assembly either before or after discussion.
- It may call the attention of the Security Council to situations which are likely to endanger international peace and security.
- It may recommend measures for the peaceful adjustment of any situation, regardless of origin, which it deems likely to impair the general welfare or friendly relations among nations, including situations resulting from a violation of the provisions of the UN Charter setting forth the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations.



Functions of the UNGA-DISEC

1. Arms Control and Disarmament

DISEC aims to promote disarmament across all member States and halt the illicit trafficking of arms. This initiative includes the following points:

- Reduction in the number of nuclear weapon stockpiles and support the observance of treaties like the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).
- Regulation of conventional arms, which includes small arms, light weapons, and heavy military machines like artillery or any military equipment.
- Proliferation of chemical and biological weapons that can be a great threat to international peace and security.

2. Promotion of Multilateral Diplomacy

The UNGA DISEC allows all UN member States to be part of discussions on peace and security.

3. Coordination with other Bodies of the UN

While DISEC itself is not able to take direct action as its resolutions aren't legally binding, it works with the Security Council, while also collaborating with the UN Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA) and other UN agencies in order to implement security measures and carry out its responsibilities.

4. Preventing and Managing Armed Conflicts

Addressing regional conflicts and power struggles, and this includes those that are caused by revolutionary movements, political instability, economic issues, and military coups.



THE UNITING FOR PEACE RESOLUTION

Deadlock in the United Nations Security Council

A deadlock in the UNSC occurs when one or more of the five permanent members (China, France, Russia, United Kingdom and United States of America) use their veto power even if at least 9 of the 15 members (i.e. majority) support a resolution. This negative vote or veto creates a situation where the national or political interests of the P5 nations obstruct the United Nations Security Council from taking necessary actions with regards to the crisis being discussed. Because of this veto, the UNSC fails to pass a resolution, and thus is unable to take any action. This makes the global resolution of conflicts and humanitarian crises, and peacekeeping efforts come to a halt. Such a State in the United Nations Security Council is referred to as a “deadlock.”

The deadlock often originates due to long standing differences in the political perspectives of the States. For example, during the discussion of crises like those in Ukraine, Gaza, and North Korea, the P5 nations have used their vetoes to protect their own interests or the interests of their allies. Russia and China, for instance, have repeatedly blocked actions that could pressure their allies, while the US has vetoed resolutions which went against Israel.

Thus, the veto power given to the P5 nations occasionally prevents the UNSC from taking necessary measures to enforce international peace and security. This leads to the invoking of the “Uniting for Peace” resolution.



The Uniting for Peace Resolution

The Uniting for Peace Resolution or the Acheson Plan, as it was once popularly called, was adopted by the UN General Assembly on November 3, 1950, as the UN General Assembly Resolution 377A(V).

It is commonly conceded that its procedures were designed to help surmount an apparently major obstacle to the operation of the UN – the Soviet veto or its alleged abuse, and the concomitant stagnation of the Security Council. Its particulars were the product, at least in part, of both the accidents and the demands of the Korean War. The United Nations Security Council could and did adopt resolutions of substance pertaining to Korea up until the time (August 1, 1950) the Soviet delegate returned, after which it adopted no other resolution; moreover, there was a UN commission already stationed in Korea which could and did report to the United Nations Security Council immediately upon the outbreak of hostilities in the month of June, 1950.

The resolution belonged to a longer evolutionary history, too. The general shift in emphasis away from the United Nations Security Council was manifested even before the Korean War by the creation of an "Interim Committee" of the General Assembly in 1947. The Uniting for Peace Resolution was more or less a reflection of the immediate environment of the Korean crisis, but it was also part of the main stream of basic institutional change, to which it contributed at the same time.

The intent and design of the original Charter was that disputes endangering international peace and security should be taken care of by action of the Security Council through the method, if finally necessary, of dispatching UN military forces against the offending State or States. The Security Council, however, had for the most part, proven incompetent in this respect; and there were no UN military forces at all. The Uniting for Peace Resolution would rectify this situation by providing for the following four changes in organization and procedure:

1. The authority to transfer a peace and security issue to the General Assembly if the Security Council was blocked by veto.
2. The capacity to call emergency sessions of the Assembly, if necessary, for this purpose.



3. A recommendation that Member States maintain special UN-designated units in their respective national armed forces.
4. The creation of –
 - A Peace Observation Commission
 - A Panel of Military Expert
 - A Collective Measures Committee

Thus, the central problems of maintaining international peace and security would be solved – by advance warning through the Peace Observation Commission; by expeditious shifting of the dispute from the stymied Council to the vetoless Assembly; by use, if necessary, of voluntarily and unilaterally earmarked forces; and by further long-range planning through the Collective Measures Committee.

United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) resolution 377 A (V), the "Uniting for Peace" resolution is a resolution which comes into action in cases where the United Nations Security Council has failed to act due to a lack of unanimity among the five permanent members or the P5 (United States of America, Russian Federation, United Kingdom, People's Republic of China and Republic of France). *The resolution states that The United Nations General Assembly shall take a matter into consideration if The United Nations Security Council fails to act, owing to the negative vote of a Permanent Member, in a case where there appears to be a threat to, or breach of peace, or an act of aggression.* The Assembly can consider the matter immediately in order to make recommendations to Members for collective measures to maintain, or restore, international peace and security. In the interest of maintaining international security and peace, the United Nations General Assembly shall treat the matter as urgent and may call for Emergency Special Sessions (ESS) to introduce the matter to its Member States so that the matter may be solved with immediate effect.

The "Uniting for Peace" resolution was adopted on 3 November 1950, after fourteen days of Assembly deliberations. The resolution was intended to provide the United Nations with an alternative means for responding whenever at least one P5 member vetoes a United Nations Security Council resolution acting in line with its functions as provided for in the UN Charter.

In the case of a deadlocked Security Council, to facilitate an urgent action by the General Assembly, the resolution has been invoked a total of 12 times, out of which the assembly convened an Emergency Special Session (ESS) 11 times (as of 2025).



The 11 Emergency Special Sessions of the General Assembly are as follows:

1st Session: Middle East (1-10 November, 1956)

2nd Session: Hungary (4-10 November, 1956)

3rd Session: Middle East (8-21 August, 1958)

4th Session: Question of Congo (17-19 September, 1960)

5th Session: Middle East (17-18 June, 1967)

6th Session: Situation in Afghanistan (10-14 January, 1980)

7th Session: Question of Palestine (22-29 July, 1980; 20-28 April, 1982; 25-26 June, 1982; 16-19 August, 1982; and 24 September, 1982)

8th Session: Question of Namibia (13-14 September, 1981)

9th Session: Situation in the occupied Arab territories (29th January - 5th February, 1982)

10th Session: Illegal Israeli actions in Occupied East Jerusalem and the rest of the Occupied Palestinian Territory

11th Session: Situation in Ukraine

Unlike the preceding ESSs, the tenth and eleventh ESS sessions have been repeatedly 'adjourned' and 'resumed' over the years of their operation, now still under temporary adjournment. Indeed, more than ten separate 'plenary meetings' have been held by the Assembly during the tenth ESS since 2000, and over twenty during the eleventh ESS since 2022.

The past instances of invoking of the “Uniting for Peace” resolution have resulted in the United Nations being able to produce useful and beneficial results by adopting several resolutions to solve various issues and crises. These include Resolution 1000 (ES-1), mandating UN Emergency Force (UNEF); Resolution 1004 (ES-I), mandating a commission of inquiry into foreign intervention in Hungary; Resolution 1237 (ES-II), calling for early withdrawal of foreign troops from Jordan and Lebanon; Resolution 1474 (ES-IV), confirming the mandate of the UN Operation in the Congo (ONUC); Resolution ES-6/2, calling for the immediate, unconditional and total withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan; Resolution ES-9/1, declaring Israel a non-peace-loving State and calling on members to apply a number of measures on Israel; Resolutions 2253 and 2254 (ES-V), calling on Israel to rescind unilateral measures in Jerusalem; Resolutions (ES-7/2 through ES-7/9), calling for the unconditional and total withdrawal of Israel from territories occupied since 1967; and more.



Changes in the Powers and Functions of the UNGA

The General Assembly was originally created with the intention of serving as a recommendatory body, wherein the resolution passed would not impose a legal obligation on the Member States to follow that resolution. The resolutions passed serve to provide a general perspective of all Member States on a certain matter.

The Uniting for Peace resolution, however, increases the gravitas of resolutions passed by the General Assembly. By mandating the General Assembly to “consider the matter immediately” and to make recommendations for collective measures, including use of armed force when necessary, the resolution practically gave the UNGA room to step into the traditional function of the United Nations Security Council. This is a clear extension of the Assembly's mandate, transforming the UNGA from a purely recommendatory body to an active forum addressing security issues when the United Nations Security Council faltered.

This resolution introduces the mechanism of Emergency Special Sessions (ESS). In brief, if the Security Council for any reason does not seem to act because of the lack of unanimity among its permanent members, the General Assembly can call an ESS meeting to convene within 24 hours. This mechanism has been invoked several times during these decades, most notably during the Suez Crisis in 1956, thereby solidifying the UNGA as an important alternative venue for addressing breaches of international peace.

Nonetheless, Assembly recommendations continue to be non-binding, but their political and normative weight greatly increases their impact. Additionally, it allows the committee to recommend collective measures. The Uniting for Peace resolution allows the UNGA to offset the veto-dominated decision-making mechanism of the Security Council, further contributing to the law-making fashioning of customary international law on collective security.

Essentially, through the formal channel for which the General Assembly acts in deadlocked situations of the Security Council, the "Uniting for Peace" resolution converted the UNGA from being only a place for debate into a quasi-active participant in the international security system. This mandate has not only allowed the Assembly to recommend for urgent issues, including possible use of force, but also strengthened its role as an international norm setter on issues concerning peace and security.



REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENTS AND POWER TRANSITIONS

Revolutionary Movement

Definitions and Characteristics

According to American sociologist Charles Tilly, revolutionary movements are "*a social movement advancing exclusive competing claims to control of the State, or some segment of it*".

In simple terms, revolutionary movements are collective actions aimed at radically changing the political, social, or economic structures of a society. It is an attempt to change the government, regime, society, or all three by violence; a revolutionary outcome is a successful change of government, regime, society, or all three by violence.

Revolutionary movements are often born out of widespread dissatisfaction with the status quo and can vary in their methods, goals, and outcomes. They are those which seek to completely change every aspect of society unlike other social movements which are directed to one particular field of society.

Stages of Revolutionary Movements

Revolutionary movements typically progress through several stages. The first stage is called the emergence/preliminary stage where initial awareness of grievances and the formation of a collective identity among dissatisfied groups happens. In the second stage, coalescence, there is organization and mobilization of resources, and people join together and organize in order to publicize the issue and raise awareness. The third stage is called bureaucratization where there is proper formalization of structures and strategies to sustain the movement's activities. Therefore, when people fall away and adopt a movement, one of two things happen – either the movement successfully brings about the change it sought, or, when people no longer take the issue seriously, the movement falls into the decline stage.



Revolutionary Movements & Key Events in the Middle East

The Iraqi Revolt of 1920

For many months in 1920, people all across Iraq rose up to fight the British military administration that had seized control of the country during the First World War. The popular uprising brought together Sunnis and Shias, elites and commoners, city dwellers and tribespeople. It caught the British by surprise, and changed the trajectory of modern Iraqi history.

The great Islamic revolution of 1920 led by the 'Ulama' in Iraq became known as the 'Revolution of 1920' as it took place on the 30th of June 1920, and as most of those who wrote of it dated their articles and the events of the revolution according to the Christian calendar.

Armed revolt broke out in the fertile plains south of Baghdad, as bands of tribespeople swept in from the desert to attack isolated British military outposts and destroy vital railway lines. These incursions continue to shape public memory of the uprising. For Iraqis and outsiders alike, the image of unexpected, violent resistance to European rule on the part of heroic mounted warriors epitomizes the 1920 "revolution."

By 11th October, many regions had been liberated and governors and district chiefs had been appointed in them. Among these was the city of Twayrij, where the chief had been appointed by the revolutionaries. However, certain badly regulated measures enabled the British to occupy the city and head towards Karbala' where some people surrendered and the city fell. This pattern was followed in other cities, though the revolution was still ablaze despite certain regions falling into British hands.

In the Battle of al-Suwar, one of the most important battles in the region of Al Hchaym, the British lost 1200 men. However, various circumstances led to the end of the revolution on 20 November, after 170 days of bitter and bloody fighting, when the British had thousands of dead and wounded, and hundreds of prisoners of war, and lost much weapons and materials. It was, in truth, a profound lesson for the arrogant occupiers. It opened their eyes to the Muslims, particularly the leaders and 'Ulama' in al Najaf al-'Ashraf and Karbala'. From that date on, the



arrogant powers began to keep a close watch and wait for an opportunity to tear down the center of religious learning in al-Najaf al'-Ashraf and take revenge on the Muslims, particularly the 'Ulama'.

Multiple factors were instrumental in the discontinuance and abortion of the revolution, and helped the occupiers to overpower it. However, in spite of that, we see that there were many positive achievements made by the glorious religious revolution. Among them were the following:

- The creation of a revolutionary spirit among the 'Ummah', and its experience of the revolution and the uprisings following it, which trained it in rebellion, disobedience and non-surrender to foreigners and non-believers, and created in it the desire for just Islamic rule.
- A declaration of the effectiveness of religion and its hold on the Ummah, and of how the element of faith could mobilize the 'Ummah' to struggle against oppression, humiliation and subjugation.
- It taught the British a painful lesson, which they remember to this day, despite all the poison which they had directed against the Iraqi Muslims and their sincere 'Ulama'.

Fall of the Ottoman Empire in 1922

In the 1900s, the Ottoman Empire started to decline and it led to the creation of several States in the Middle East, Balkans and North Africa. All these countries gained independence through wars, treaties and revolutions.

After the defeat of the Ottoman empire in World War I, the Treaty of Sevres was signed in 1920 between the allied powers and the Ottoman Empire. This treaty divided the land which was under Ottoman control into territories under British and French control while some became independent. After World War I ended, the Allies or the Entente continued occupying land under the League of Nations Mandate and the Sykes-Picot Agreement. It is important to note that the Treaty of Sevres was a secret treaty which informally divided the Ottoman Empire. It was superseded later by an official Treaty of Lausanne which formally redistributed the territories under the former Ottoman Empire.



In 1919, Turkish nationalists under Mustafa Kemal Atatürk launched military campaigns against Allied forces such as France and Great Britain. The revolution concluded the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, ending the Ottoman sultanate and the Ottoman Caliphate, establishing the Republic of Turkey.

The British were successful in capturing Baghdad in March 1917 and after the defeat of the Ottoman empire, the British Mandate of Mesopotamia was established by the League of Nations mandate. The responsibility to control Iraq was given to the United Kingdom but it was superseded by the Anglo-Iraqi treaty, which was an agreement between Britain and Iraq. On the urge of King Faisal, the British granted independence to Iraq in 1932 but retained their military bases in Iraq.

In 1919, the Kingdom of Syria (from the Taurus mountains in Turkey to the Sinai desert in Egypt) was established under Emir Faisal I of the Hashemite dynasty, who later became the King of Syria. Soon, the French forces attacked Syria under the Sykes-Picot Agreement and were successful in capturing Syria and forced the King, Faisal I to flee. In San Remo, Syria was split into Syria-Lebanon which was under French mandate.

In 1940 during World War II, Syria came under Vichy France until the British and Free French occupied the country in July 1941. In April 1946, the British left Syria in the hands of the Republic government which was formed during the mandate.

During World War II when the Vichy government gained power over French territory in 1940. During World War II, fearing that the Nazi Government would gain control of Syria and Lebanon by pressurizing the Vichy government, Britain launched Operation Exporter. The British and French forces invaded Syria and Lebanon in June, 1941 during World War II to prevent the Nazi government from gaining control of Syria and Lebanon.

The Algerian Revolution of 1954

Algerian nationalism developed out of the efforts of three different groups. The first consisted of Algerians who had gained access to French education and earned their living in the French sector. Often called assimilationists, they pursued gradualist, reformist tactics, shunned illegal actions, and were prepared to consider permanent union with France if the rights of Frenchmen could be extended to



native Algerians. This group, originating from the period before World War I, was loosely organized under the name “Young Algerians” and included (in the 1920s) Khaled Ben Hachemi (“Emir Khaled”), who was the grandson of Abdelkader, and (in the 1930s) Ferhat Abbas, who later became the first premier of the Provisional Government of the Algerian Republic.

Algerian War, (1954-62) war for Algerian independence from France. The movement for independence began during World War I (1914-18) and gained momentum after French promises of greater self-rule in Algeria went unfulfilled after World War II (1939-45). In 1954, the National Liberation Front (FLN) began a guerrilla war against France and sought diplomatic recognition at the UN to establish a sovereign Algerian State. Although Algerian fighters operated in the countryside – particularly along the country’s borders – the most serious fighting took place in and around Algiers, where FLN fighters launched a series of violent urban attacks that came to be known as the Battle of Algiers (1956-57). French forces (which increased to 500,000 troops) managed to regain control but only through brutal measures, and the ferocity of the fighting sapped the political will of the French to continue the conflict. In 1959, Charles de Gaulle declared that the Algerians had the right to determine their own future. Despite terrorist acts by French Algerians opposed to independence and an attempted coup in France by elements of the French army, an agreement was signed in 1962, and Algeria became independent.

The revolution contributed significantly to accelerating the decolonization process by reinforcing the principle of the right to self-determination and independence. This principle was enshrined in United Nations Resolution 1514 (XV), adopted on December 14, 1960.

The allure of Algeria extended far beyond its borders, attracting freedom fighters and revolutionaries from across the globe even during its struggle for sovereignty. This report explores how Algeria’s struggle became a beacon for anti-imperial movements, a connection that was powerfully illustrated by interactions with figures like Nelson Mandela and organizations such as the African National Congress (ANC), and by partnerships with international allies like Cuba. Algeria’s revolutionary influence transformed it into a Mecca of liberation for many global activists, not just after independence but actively during the independence movement itself.



The Arab-Israeli War of 1973

The war started with a surprise attack launched by Egypt and Syria against Israel on October 6, 1973. It was primarily fought in the Sinai Peninsula and the Golan Heights.

The main cause of the war was that Egypt and Syria wanted to reclaim the territories they had lost to Israel in 1967, during the Six-Day war. The Egyptian and Syrian forces planned a coordinated attack on Israel. The US and Soviet Union were also involved in the conflict but indirectly.

On the Egyptian border, Egypt launched Operation Badr, sending tens of thousands of troops across the Suez Canal and used advanced military equipment such as SAM air defense systems to stop Israeli counterattacks. They were successful in recapturing parts of Sinai. At the same time, Syria launched an attack on the Golan heights consisting of Syrian soldiers along with hundreds of tanks.

Israel sent forces which crossed the Suez Canal and surrounded the Egyptian army. They also heavily counter-attacked on the Golan Heights Front which led the Syrian Forces to back off while the Israeli forces advanced towards Damascus.

Soon the US and the Soviet Union indirectly got involved in the war when the US supplied weapons to Israel and when the Soviet Union supplied arms to Egypt and Syria. However, the UN passed Resolution 338, calling for a ceasefire and soon the war ended.

The war led to the OPEC Oil Embargo in which the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Nations (OPEC) led by Arab Nations decided to cut oil supplies to the U.S. and its allies for supporting Israel. This caused the oil prices to rise rapidly leading to a global oil crisis, fuel shortage and inflation in oil prices. The oil prices before the embargo were just 3\$ a barrel but skyrocketed to 12\$ a barrel after the embargo. The Western countries are faced by economic crises and recessions due to fuel shortages. Soon OPEC became a powerful economic force which started to control oil prices. Soon the embargo was lifted on March 1974 but oil prices remained high.

Note: The Iranian Revolution, Lebanese Civil War, Egyptian Revolution, Iraqi-Kurd War, and Yom Kippur War have been elaborated upon in the later sections of the Study Guide.



Power Transition

Definition

During a Revolution, the nation goes under multiple changes as it reshapes its policies, economy, etc. Typically, such a nation not only increases its wealth and its industrial strength but also grows in population and improves the efficiency of its political institutions. Since economic development, population size, social mobility, and political mobilization are among the major determinants of national power, an industrializing nation also increases its power, i.e., its ability to influence the behavior of other nations. It goes through a “power transition.”

Power Transition Theory

Power has determined how the international system is structured. The idea of power finds its most significant expression in the theory of realism which has been interpreted by various thinkers in different ways. A. F. K. Organski to whom the theory of power transition is identified presents a realistic perspective of power and how the rise of States can be determined. Organski provides a theoretical framework in which he identifies military, economic and technological capabilities of States to identify them in the power hierarchy of States in the international system.

“The probability of a major war is greatest when a challenger to the dominant power approaches parity and is dissatisfied with the existing international order.”

His key arguments include:

- The international system is hierarchical, not anarchic.
- Peace prevails when a dominant (satisfied) power maintains clear superiority.
- War is most likely when a dissatisfied challenger grows powerful enough to rival the dominant State.



Power Transitions in the Middle East and Key Actors

Ottoman Conquest of Constantinople in 1453

1. Ottoman Empire led by Sultan Mehmed II
2. Byzantine Empire led by Emperor Constantine XI Palaiologos

Iraqi Revolution of 1958

1. Free Officers Movement led by Brigadier Abd al-Karim Qasim and Colonel Abdul Salam Arif
2. Kingdom of Iraq Headed by King Faisal II, along with Crown Prince Abd al-Ilah and Prime Minister Nuri al-Said

Egyptian Revolution of 1952

1. Free Officers Movement led by a group of nationalist military officers
2. Kingdom of Egypt represented by king Farouk I

Turkish Military Coup of 1960

1. Turkish Armed Forces led by officers including General Camel Gursel
2. Democratic Party Government headed by Prime Minister Adnan Menderes

Iranian Coup d'État 1963

1. USA, UK through their respective intelligence agencies
2. Iranian Military and Royals, supporters of Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi
3. Iranian Government led by Prime Minister Mohammad Mossadegh

Iranian Revolution of 1979

1. Revolutionary forces including Islamists led by Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini
2. Pahlavi Regime represented by Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi and his government



THE IRANIAN REVOLUTION

Introduction

Reza Shah Pahlavi became the ruler of Iran in 1925, after the decline of the Qajar dynasty. During his Rule, he built roads, industries and modernized Iran. He also banned the Hijab and westernized Iran. However, due to his ties with Germany in World War 2, Great Britain and the Soviet Union invaded Iran leading to his downfall. His son, Mohammed Reza Pahlavi became the next Ruler of Iran in 1941. In 1953, a CIA backed coup, termed Operation Ajax overthrew the Iranian Prime Minister, Mohammed Mossadegh which made him an absolute Monarch.

During his rule, The White Revolution took place in 1963. During this period, he introduced modernization policies to transform Iran into a modern and industrialized State. These policies helped to reduce poverty and aimed at the weakening of traditional elites. These policies also helped to strengthen the monarchy and increased the powers of the Shah (Ruler of Iran). The White Revolution benefited the Women, Youth, the middle class and the industrialists. It also helped it strengthen relations with Western nations and due to this, the western nations especially USA became a close ally of Iran.

However, this revolution was greatly opposed by the Shia Muslims who had lost control over their land and religious courts. It was also opposed by rural peasants, landowners and workers. The White Revolution mainly followed Western policies which were greatly opposed by the Iranian locals who claimed it to be anti-Islamic. This White Revolution which was introduced to make Iran a modernized State resulted in the increased opposition to the Shah. The White Revolution became one of the major causes of the Iranian Revolution in 1979.

After the White Revolution, Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini condemned the White Revolution causing protests to be seen all over Iran opposing the Shah's rule. However, The Shah's forces killed multiple protesters with Khomeini being arrested and exiled to Iraq.



In 1977, Ali Shariati died under mysterious circumstances in Southampton, London. Shariati was a major ideological threat to the Shah's rule. Shariati was also under Iranian surveillance and had been imprisoned several times before leaving Iran. Thus, many people believed that he was assassinated by the SAVAK, the Shah's secret force. In 1977, Mostafa Khomeini, the eldest son of Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini also died under mysterious circumstances in Najaf, Iran. Mostafa had played an influential role in the revolutionary movement and he was a close advisor to his father. He was also a huge threat to the Shah's rule due to his close connections with the Islamic activists in Iran. Thus, it was also suspected that he was assassinated by the SAVAK only.

These protests were Revolutionary Movements which demanded the removal of the Shah. These protests included strikes and demonstrations which played a crucial role in paralyzing the country. Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini, a prominent Shia religious leader, became the opposition to the Shah's rule which further affected the revolutionary movements. Due to these movements, the Shah left Iran in January, 1929. In February, Khomeini returned to Iran where he was received with joy. The last Prime Minister of the monarchy, Shapour Bakhtiar tried to maintain power but was overthrown. The military also declared neutrality leading to the collapse of the Pahlavi dynasty. In April, the Iranians established the Islamic Republic with Khomeini becoming the Supreme Leader of the nation.

The Iranian Coup

The Iranian Coup of 1953, known as Operation Ajax (by the CIA) and Operation Boot (by British Intelligence) was a covert operation planned by the CIA (USA) and MI6 (United Kingdom) to overthrow the elected Prime Minister of Iran, Mohammed Mossadegh. The coup resulted in establishing a pro-Western government and led to the strengthening of ties between them and the Shah of Iran. The major reasons for the Coup were:

During the 1950s, the Iranian oil industry was controlled by the Anglo- Iranian Oil Company (AIOC) which was owned and controlled by the British. However, the Iranian population supported nationalizing the oil industry to grow the economy and this was greatly supported by the Prime Minister causing the British to lose control. And the British responded by imposing an oil embargo on Iran which negatively impacted its economy.



At first, the Britishers tried to overthrow Mossadegh through political maneuver but their plan failed. This resulted in the Iranian government expelling British diplomats along with MI6 agents from Iran.

Then, the MI6 collaborated with the CIA to execute the operation. This operation was led by Kermit Roosevelt Jr. (CIA) and included bribing politicians, military officials and journalists to spread propaganda against Mossadegh. They also started planning riots and protests which would create instability in this region.

Due to U.S pressure, the Shah agreed to replace Mossadegh with General Fazlollah. But Mossadegh refused to give up his position and with the help of loyal military forces, he was able to arrest the coup plotters. Due to this incident, the Shah of Iran had to first flee to Iraq and then had to go to Italy.

On August 19th, 1953, the CIA covertly supported efforts to incite public demonstrations and civil unrest in Tehran as part of a broader operation to influence political developments in Iran. During this period of heightened instability, Prime Minister Mohammad Mossadegh's residence sustained damage, and he was subsequently taken into custody. Following the operation, the Shah returned to power, and General Fazlollah Zahedi was appointed as the new Prime Minister of Iran.

The Coup helped the Shah to strengthen his powers and he established a monarchy in Iran. Moreover, the leftist and nationalist movements were suppressed and Iran became a very close ally of the U.S.A. The Coup also helped Western nations, especially the US and United Kingdom to gain control over a portion of Iran's oil. The Coup was also the biggest reason for the start of the Iranian revolution as many Iranians saw the Coup as a foreign interference in their democracy.



The SAVAK

SAVAK (Sazeman-e Ettela'at va Amniyat-e Keshvar), which is also known as the Organization of Intelligence and National Security, was the Shah's secret police, intelligence and security organization. It was established in 1957 with the help of the CIA and Mossad. It was notorious for spying, censorship, torture and for suppression of political opposition.

After the 1953 Coup, the Shah had to consolidate his power and thus established the SAVAK while the CIA and Mossad trained its agents in surveillance, counter intelligence and interrogation techniques. The first director of SAVAK was Teymur Bakhtiar.

During the 1970s, SAVAK had about 50,000 agents with a huge informant network which operated both in and outside of Iran. The SAVAK was directly under the Shah.

Methods used by SAVAK

1. **Extensive Surveillance and Intelligence Gathering** – They used to infiltrate political groups, universities, labor unions and mosques and carried out excessive surveillance to receive critical information. They also used methods like wiretapping, mail interception and informants to gain information.
2. **Propaganda** – The SAVAK controlled newspapers, television and radio and banned anti-government publications. They used to manipulate the media to promote the Shah's rule.
3. **Torture** – In order to gain information from the opposition, they used brutal interrogations methods which included beatings, electrocutions, and whipping. They would also use methods such as sleep deprivation and psychological torture to extract information. During the 1970s, the Evin Prison in Tehran became infamous as the SAVAK torture facility.
4. **Targeting Opposition** – SAVAK was popularly known for targeting opposition leaders, Marxists, Islamists, and student activists. They conducted killings in Iran as well as outside of Iran.



5. **Suppressing Islamic Nationalist Movements** – They also worked with the CIA and the Mossad to suppress Islamic nationalist movements all over the world. Moreover, they spied on Iranian exiles and cooperated with the Interpol to eliminate such people.

Famous Cases of the SAVAK

1. **The 1963 Massacre** – After Ayatollah Khomeini denounced the Shah, demonstrations began all over the country, however, SAVAK was successful in suppressing these demonstrations and hundreds were killed with Khomeini being arrested and later exiled to Iraq.
2. **The 1971 Marxist Breakdown** – In the 1970s, the Leftist guerilla groups such as Fedayeen carried out attacks against the Shah, however, thousands of Marxist rebels were arrested and executed by the SAVAK.
3. **The 1978 Cinema Rex Fire** – The fire at Cinema Rex in Abadan which killed over 400 people was also blamed upon the SAVAK by many people.

The Downfall of SAVAK

As the Iranian Revolution gained power and control, the SAVAK lost its power and international pressure and mass strikes exposed its brutality. When the Shah fled Iran, many agents fled the country and on February 11th, SAVAK was disbanded. The post-revolutionary regime replaced it with SAVAMA.



The Revolutionary Movements in Iran

The revolutionary movements in Iran were primarily led by students and workers. These movements caused the workers of multiple industries to go on strikes, including the oil industry, which paralyzed the economy of the nation.

1. The 1963 Massacre

During the 1960s, opposition to the rule of Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi intensified, largely as a reaction to the reforms implemented under the White Revolution. A significant moment in this growing resistance occurred when Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini delivered a powerful speech at the Feyziye Seminary in Qom. In his address, Khomeini sharply criticized the Shah, comparing him to Yazid—the infamous Umayyad caliph responsible for the martyrdom of Imam Hussein—and accused the Shah of serving as a puppet of the United States.

The following day, in response to his remarks, agents of SAVAK, the Shah's intelligence and security agency, raided Khomeini's residence and placed him under arrest. He was subsequently transported to Tehran and imprisoned in Qasr Prison. News of Khomeini's arrest rapidly spread across the country, prompting widespread protests in cities such as Qom, Tehran, Mashhad, and Shiraz. Tens of thousands of demonstrators took to the streets, chanting slogans such as "Death to the Shah," and demanding Khomeini's immediate release.

In an effort to suppress the escalating unrest, the Shah deployed both the army and SAVAK. The regime resorted to the use of tanks and machine guns, opening fire on unarmed demonstrators. The resulting crackdown was brutal: thousands of civilians were killed, many more were arrested, and numerous detainees were later executed. Despite his imprisonment and subsequent exile—first to Turkey, and then to Iraq—Khomeini's influence only grew. These events marked his emergence as the foremost figure in opposition to the Shah.

The violent suppression of protests and the targeting of religious and political figures like Khomeini further radicalized both Islamist and leftist factions. Consequently, anti-Shah sentiment intensified, fueling a broader and more militant resistance movement across Iranian society.



2. The 1971 Marxist Crackdown

By the late 1960s, opposition to the Shah's rule had increased due to his dictatorship and due to the brutal operations by SAVAK which targeted opposition groups and students.

During the late 1960s, two important Marxist guerilla groups emerged:

- i. Fedayeen-e-Khalq – A secular Marxist Leninist group advocating armed struggle.
- ii. Mojahedin-e-Khalq (MEK) – It was a group which had followed an Islamic ideology and Marxism, and also supported armed resistance.

The Siahkal Incident:

A group of Fedayeen guerillas attacked a gendarmerie post in Siahkal, a rural town in northern Iran. The goal of this attack was to seize weapons and to inspire an uprising against the Shah. However, the attack failed, and the Shah's forces quickly surrounded them.

SAVAK's Brutal Response:

After the Siahkal incident, the Shah ordered the SAVAK to eliminate all leftist movements. Thus, the SAVAK started arresting hundreds of Marxist activists and students. Most of them were tortured and executed and some were even publicly executed by the Shah. The SAVAK started infiltrating universities and labor unions. They started targeting Fedayeen MEK safe houses and started killing militants. They carried out several raids in Tehran and Mashhad and were successful in weakening the guerilla networks. Despite the crackdown, the MEK and Fedayeen continued their resistance and started using tactics such as bombing and assassinations. This attack increased the support for the Iranian revolution and it was also one of the major reasons for the Iranian Revolution

3. The Black Friday Massacre

This movement occurred on September 8, 1978, when hundreds of demonstrators assembled in Jaleh Square in Tehran to demand the removal of the Shah's regime. In response to the growing unrest, the Shah declared martial law in an attempt to reassert control. However, the imposition of martial law only escalated tensions. Government troops were deployed to the square and, without warning, opened fire on the unarmed protestors. The brutal crackdown resulted in the deaths of hundreds of civilians.



This tragic event, which came to be known as "Black Friday" marked a critical turning point in the revolutionary movement. Rather than quelling dissent, the use of extreme force deepened public outrage and further delegitimized the Shah's authority in the eyes of the Iranian population. As a result, support for Ayatollah Khomeini significantly increased, as he was viewed as the leading voice of resistance against the monarchy. The massacre at Jaleh Square thus served to galvanize opposition forces and intensified the momentum of the revolution.

4. The Cinema Rex Fire

An incident occurred in Abadan when a movie theater was deliberately set on fire, resulting in the deaths of over 420 individuals. This catastrophic event stands as one of the deadliest arson attacks in Iranian history. In the aftermath, the Iranian government swiftly attributed the attack to Islamic militants, claiming it was an act of religious extremism aimed at undermining public safety and order. However, a significant portion of the population remained unconvinced by the official narrative.

5. Tasu'a Protests

The Tasu'a protests of 1978 occurred on September 8, 1978, during a period of heightened political unrest in Iran. The protests were part of a broader wave of opposition to the regime of Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi. Demonstrators gathered in Tehran, demanding political reform and the removal of the Shah from power. The protests coincided with Tasu'a, a religious observance commemorating the martyrdom of Imam Hussain, and were largely organized by opposition groups, including religious leaders and political activists.

In response to the protests, the Iranian government, which had imposed martial law in various cities earlier that year, deployed military forces to disperse the demonstrators. The situation escalated when government troops opened fire on unarmed protestors, resulting in significant casualties. While the official government account blamed Islamic militants for the violence, many observers and opposition groups contended that the excessive use of force by the military contributed to the deaths of hundreds of protestors.

The Tasu'a protests marked a significant moment in the Iranian Revolution, increasing public dissatisfaction with the Shah's regime and further galvanizing the opposition movement, including religious and leftist factions. The tragic events of September 8, 1978 intensified calls for the Shah's resignation and played a key role in the eventual overthrow of the monarchy in 1979.



Threats Posed by the Militarization of the Revolution

The Fight for Power – Due to the Militarization of the Revolutionary Movements, multiple armed groups gained access to arms and explosives which may lead to them fighting with one another for power. This would cause instability and would increase the violence in Iran.

Collapse of the Military – The Iranian Army had collapsed which posed a great threat to the internal security of Iran. It also threatened separatist movements which would lead to the formation of new States from Iran.

Degradation of the Relations between Iran and USA – A major reason for the Revolutionary Movement were the close ties between the US and Iran. With the revolutionaries gaining military access, it greatly affected the security of American citizens in Iran.

Armed Local Uprisings – The Leftist groups who opposed Khomeini's government also gained access to military weapons which increased the threat of Armed local uprisings by these groups which would greatly affect the economy of Iran.

Effects of the Iranian Revolution

1. The Iranian Revolution led to a change in power from a monarchy to an Islamic Republic. The Monarchy under Mohammed Reza Pahlavi maintained close ties with Western countries and adopted policies which benefited the Urban middle class, whereas, The Republic under Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini believed in ruling the State on Islamic principles and greatly supported the Shia Muslims.
2. The Power Transition led to the removal of Secular laws and the introduction of Sharia-based laws.
3. The newly established Islamic Republic of Iran, aimed at eliminating foreign influence and rather aimed at spreading Islamic Revolution.



REVOLUTIONARY GROUPS

Mojahedin-e-Khalq

The Mojahedin-e-Khalq (MEK) was founded in 1965 by a group of students of Tehran University who opposed the Shah, Mohammed Reza Pahlavi. They aimed at establishing a socialist State in Iran. The founders of the MEK were Mohammad Hanifnejad and Ali Asghar Badiadzadegan who attracted primarily young and well-educated Iranians. During their first five years, they engaged in primarily ideological work but were banned in Iran.

During the 1970s, the MEK carried out a series of attacks against Iranian and Western targets and also attempted to kidnap Douglas MacArthur II, the U.S. Ambassador to Iran.

By August 1971, the MEK's Committee included Reza Rezai, Kazem Zolanvar, and Brahram Aram. During 1971 and 1972, several arrests and executions were made by the SAVAK, along with inter-party politics which caused the party to shatter. In August and September, 1971, SAVAK were successful in arresting and executing several members of the MEK along with their co-founders. The surviving members reestablished the group with a three men central committee. Each of the three central committee members led a separate branch of the organization. Two of the original central committee members were replaced in 1972 and 1973, and the replacing members were in charge of leading the organization until the internal purge of 1975.

By 1973, several MEK members declared themselves Marxist-Leninist and launched an "internal ideological struggle", and by 1975, two rival MEK factions had formed, one being Muslim and the other Marxist. Along with that, members who did not convert to Marxism were reported to SAVAK. This led to the creation of two rival Mojahedin, each with its own publication, its own organization, and its own activities. The Marxist offshoot was initially known as the Mojahedin M.L. (Marxist-Leninist). Before the Iranian Revolution, the majority of the Marxist Mojahedin renamed themselves Peykar (Organization of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class) in 1978. The Muslim offshoot of MEK including Massoud Rajavi were mainly in prisons from 1973.



Between 1973 and 1975, the Marxist-Leninist offshoot increased their militant activities in Iran. In 1973, they were engaged in two street battles with Tehran police and bombed about ten buildings including Pan-American Airlines, Shell Oil Company, Hotel International, Radio City Cinema. In February 1974, they attacked a police station in Isfahan. In April, they also bombed a reception hall, the Oman Bank, gates of the British embassy, and offices of Pan-American Oil company in protest of the Sultan of Oman's State visit. On 19 April 1974, they launched an attempt to bomb the SAVAK centre at Tehran University. On 25 May, they detonated bombs at three multinational corporations. Also Lt. Col. Louis Lee Hawkins, a U.S. Army comptroller, was assassinated in Tehran by MEK militants in 1973. In May 1972, an attack on Brig. Gen. Harold Price was also executed by the MEK. These assassinations were carried out either by the Marxist offshoot or Islamist branch of the MEK.

In August 1976, three American employees of Rockwell International were attacked leading to their death. The Marxist offshoot took responsibility for these attacks and claimed that it was a retaliation for the recent death sentences.

It soon entered into conflict with Khomeini, and became a leading opposition to the new theocratic regime. By early 1979, the MEK had organized themselves and recreated armed cells, especially in Tehran and contributed to the overthrow of the Shah. In January 1979, Massoud Rajavi was released from prison and rebuilt the MEK together with other members that had been imprisoned.

Fedayeen-e-Khalq

The Fedayeen was a radical leftist guerilla group, established in 1971. By the 1960s the Shah's ability to repress dissent was decreasing. During the Shah's rule, he used harsh violence to repress opposition in 1963, paving the way for more radical groups to form.

The army's growing tendency to gun down protestors forced opposition into guerilla groups. The OIPFG was formed and influenced by three different activist groups. The first was founded by Bijan Jazani, an activist and Marxist intellectual, in 1963. A student of political science, he had been in and out of prisons since the 1950s. The second was an offshoot of the growing student movement in 1967, led



by Ahmadzade and A.P. Pouyan. The third group was formed in 1965 in Tabriz by a group of intellectuals including the poet Ali Reza Nabdel, who would go on to write pamphlets for the organization. All three groups merged in 1971, when both came to the conclusion that armed struggle was the only way to defeat the Shah's rule and American influence.

The groups started to overlap in 1970, with the first armed attack being a robbery of a bank in Tehran in order to bankroll the new organization. By the end of the year, the group was unified and had a three-cell structure. An "urban team," a "publication team," and a "rural team."

Tudeh Party

The Tudeh party is described as communist by historians, but it is also described as a leftist or Stalinist by others.

Birth of the Communist Movement in Iran

Marxism first became introduced to Iran's working and intellectual class in the late 19th century due to growth of industry and due to the change in the country's economy from a feudalistic to a capitalistic system. Iran also became the primary centre of underground Marxist political activity, causing several groups to be formed.

The Communist Party of Iran was founded in June 1920 in Bandar-e Anzali, in Gilan, as a result of the first congress of Iranian social democrats. Haydar Khan Amo-Oghli, a leader of the Constitutional Revolution of Iran, became the national secretary of the new party. Mirza Kuchik Khan, another leader of the Constitutional Revolution, established the Socialist Soviet Republic of Gilan with the assistance of the Red Army of the Soviet Union.



Foundation of the Tudeh Party

The British-Soviet Allied invasion of 1941 resulted in the end of Reza Shah's rule and forced him to exile to South Africa. Many political prisoners received general pardon by his successor, Mohammad Reza Pahlavi.

Nationalist and socialist groups once again flourished. Members of the Marxist “Group of the 53” members comprised a portion of these political prisoners. Following their release, some of the "Group of the 53 members" including Iraj Iskandari met with Soviet representative at the residence of Soleiman Eskandari to form the Hezb-e Tudeh-ye Iran (The Party of Iranian masses), a Marxist–Leninist party. Thus, the Tudeh party was founded on 29 September 1941 with Soleiman Eskandari as the party president.

Within months of its founding, the party moved rapidly to the left.

Initial Years

In 1944, the party entered the 14th Majlis elections and eight of its candidates were elected. It also established the secret Tudeh Party Military Organization of Iran, or TPMO which was made up of officers in the military. The TPMO provided the party with intelligence and information from the military to protect it from the security forces and give it military strength.

The party supported women and called for equal pay which helped them to grow immensely and to become a major force in Iranian politics. By early 1945, the party had managed to create the first mass organization in Iran's history.

This period was called the height of the party's intellectual influence due to the Soviet Union's propaganda of them being the world's most progressive nation. The party's influence over intellectual life started to decline after the resignation of Jalal Al- e Ahmad, a celebrated writer. He resigned to form a socialist group, called Third Force in protest against the Tudeh's pro-Soviet policies.



The appeal of the Tudeh party was tarnished in 1944-1946 due to the Soviet Union. Previously, the Tudeh deputies in Majles had demanded the nationalization of the whole petroleum industry, however; the Tudeh party supported granting the Soviet petroleum industry in Iran. From 1946, it was clear that Tudeh was a pro-Soviet organization.

1949 Crackdown

In February 1949, there was an assassination attempt on the life of Shah Mohammed Reza Pahlavi. This attempt was blamed on the Tudeh party and they were banned. Their assets were confiscated and their organizations were dissolved by the government.

However, the party continued to function underground and by 1950 it had organized its supporters under the banner of the Iran Society for Peace. In December 1950, the TPMO, its military organization, managed to arrange for the escape of key members of the party leadership who had been in jail since early 1949."

Aftermath

The party played an important role both directly and indirectly during the pivotal era of Iranian history that began with the 1951 nationalization of the British Anglo-Iranian Oil Company (AIOC), and ended with the 1953 overthrow of Mohammad Mosaddegh by a CIA-led coup d'état. The party's policy kept on changing, first attacking Mosaddeq as an agent of American imperialism, then giving him some support during and after the July 1952 uprising.

On 15 August a coup attempt against Mosaddeq was unsuccessful due to the information uncovered by the Tudeh TPMO military network, but two days later, party militants helped destabilise the government by organizing demonstrations to pressure Mosaddeq to declare Iran a democratic republic. Mosaddeq called out troops to suppress the demonstrators. The party was unavailable to fight the coup the day after as they demobilized late. By 1957 the TPMO was crushed and thousands of party members had been arrested.



Oil Nationalization

Following World War II, Iranian public support was growing for the nationalization of the British Anglo-Iranian Oil Company (AIOC) as their profits had greatly exceeded its royalty payments to the Iranian government. In 1951, Mohammad Mosaddegh, the head of the nationalist movement (known as the National Front of Iran), led the movement for the nationalization of AIOC, and was appointed as the prime minister by the Shah shortly after. Mosaddegh oversaw the takeover of British oil facilities and rising economic difficulty as the AIOC withdrew its employees and retaliated with a boycott of Iranian oil.

In April 1951, the Tudeh launched strikes and riots protesting low wages and poor housing and delays in the nationalization of the oil industry. Demonstrations were organized on the streets along with strikes in Tehran and other major cities. Police opened fire on demonstrators making it clear that Mosaddegh was not a communist and that the Tudeh did not control the government.

Tudeh followed the leftist policy and refused to ally with Mosaddegh and opposed his programs, although they had worked for the nationalization of the AIOC. In July 1952, Mosaddegh resigned after the Shah refused to accept his nomination for War Minister. Mosaddegh continued to appeal for support from the public and when the Tudeh officials saw the popular support for Mosaddegh, they came to his aid. In the July Uprising, Tudeh played an important part which helped them gain thousands of supporters. Mosaddegh capitalized on the uprising to establish an emergency rule, which allowed him to bypass the Majles.

1953 Coup

During this time the US government became more and more frustrated with Mosaddegh.

And as Americans gave up hope on Mosaddeq, their covert action campaign against the Tudeh, called TPBEDAMN, expanded to include him. In 1953, American CIA and British intelligence agents, began plotting to overthrow Mosaddeq in a coup d'état, because of their fear that rising internal tensions might lead to a breakdown of government authority and open the way for at least a gradual assumption of control by Tudeh, replacing a democratic regime and constitution with a pro-Soviet, one-party Communist government.



The Tudeh sensing a coup created vanguard cells that, along with the TPMO, identified key military installations, army depots, and command and control centres in the capital, Tehran to react violently to any coup attempt.

The USA's first attempt involved convincing the Shah to issue an order dismissing Mosaddegh and replacing him with retired General Fazlollah Zahedi, while arresting Mosaddegh. On 15 August the plot was uncovered by Tudeh supporters in the military, and the contingent sent to arrest Mosaddegh were arrested themselves. Colonel Mohammad Ali Mobasherri, was a member of the TPMO's three-man secretariat, but was also an active member of Tehran Military Governor, which was the center of the coup operation. Major Hehdi Homaouni served in the Shah's Imperial Guard and discovered and reported the coup to the party.

On the morning of 17th August, an angry crowd began to attack buildings and demanded the abolition of monarchy. The next day, the regime ordered the military into the streets, and about 600 Tudeh activists were arrested in Tehran alone.

Taking advantage of the situation, the CIA and its Iranian allies struck again, and on 19 August the coup d'état replaced Mosaddegh with Zahedi. After the coup, Mohammad Reza Pahlavi assumed dictatorial powers and banned most political groups, including Mosaddegh's National Front, which along with the Tudeh Party, continued to function underground.

Crackdown following the Coup

After the coup, The Shah conducted mass arrests, destroyed Tudeh's organizations and executed about 50 leaders which essentially destroyed the Tudeh. Between 1953 and 1957, Iranian security forces using brute force tracked down 4,121 party members. This constituted the whole Tudeh underground and more than half the party membership. A Tudeh colonel had been in charge of the Shah's personal security as well as that of Vice President Richard Nixon when he visited Iran. Thus, the Tudeh had the opportunity to assassinate the Shah and the U.S. vice president but not to launch a coup. Most of the Tudeh officers were in non-combat posts, they were in a position to access and distribute weapons, thus they could have stopped a coup. Thus, the Tudeh were backed by military officers with access to weapons, making them powerful.



With the TPMO collapsing, the Tudeh network was compromised as the TPMO had acted as a shield for the party. Many Tudeh leaders were arrested or forced to flee the country.

Late 1950s and 1960s

In the early 1960s, one Maoist group broke away from Tudeh.

In 1965, the party faced the second division between the mainstream of the organization and the splinter faction, which orchestrated a violent struggle against the government by arming the tribes of southern Iran. This faction caused a great deal of damage and three years later, the unity of the party was restored.

In 1966, several party members, including Ali Khavari and Parviz Hekmatjoo of the Central Committee, and Asef Razmdideh and Saber Mohammadzadeh, were arrested and sentenced to death. This resulted in an international outcry and hunger strikes in Europe which forced the government to reduce the sentences to life imprisonment. These events helped unify the party after the split. After this point, The Tudeh Party became established as one of the strongest underground movements and greatly helped to pave the way for the Iranian Revolution of 1979.

Iranian Revolution of 1979

In the early 1970s, the Iranian guerrilla movement began in northern Iran. The 1970s also witnessed several worker strikes and demonstrations. The Tudeh Party also increased its activities by recruiting many youths and organizing regional committees, supporting the Islamic Revolution.



THE LEBANESE CIVIL WAR

Cause of the War

The main cause of the civil war was the escalating tensions between Christian and Muslim populations in Lebanon. It was also due to the Palestinian armed presence, Sectarian Political System and external interventions.

The Lebanese government was based on a sectarian power sharing system. Under this system, the Maronite Christians held disproportionate political power while the Muslims had less representation. Although the Muslim population grew, Christians formed the major part of Lebanese politics and had more power compared to the Muslims which resulted in rising tensions among both these groups.

The Palestinian Liberation Organisation (PLO) was deeply involved in the conflict. The PLO had launched an attack on Israel from Lebanon which resulted in Israeli airstrikes and invasions.

The immediate cause of this war was when the Maronite Christians launched an attack on a bus carrying Palestinian fighters and civilians in Beirut, which resulted in the death of 27 people.

The War

The groups formed alliances with the militia such as the Christians made the Lebanese Front and the Muslims made the Lebanese National Movement.

The Syrian military entered Lebanon with the aim of controlling the situation but ended up supporting the Christians which further escalated the war.

The War also led to several massacres such as the Karantina Massacre which led to the death of thousands of Palestinians in the hands of Christian militias and the Damour Massacre which led to the death of hundreds of Christian civilians by the PLO and its allies.



In 1978, the Israeli government launched Operation Litani in which Israel invaded South Lebanon to push out the PLO. The primary objective of this operation was to drive out the PLO which had been launching several cross -border attacks into Israel. The operation was a response to the Coastal Road Massacre in which PLO militants hijacked a bus on Israel's coastal highway which led to the killing of 38 Israeli civilians.

By the end of the operation, they were successful in occupying a large portion of Southern Lebanon but soon had to withdraw due to international pressure while leaving the control of the region to the SLA (Southern Lebanon Army). This invasion strained Lebanon's already fragile situation.

Consequences of the War

1. Loss of Power of the Central Government

The Central Government of Lebanon lost most of its powers, with the de facto potestas or actual power residing in armed militias operating within or through the country.

2. Economic Damage

Lebanon suffered extensive losses with damage to infrastructure, possible long-term economic stagnation and expensive post-war reconstruction efforts.

3. Legitimacy of Armed Militias

Armed groups such as the Christian or Palestinian militias, along with left-aligned blocs gained legitimacy and territorial control.



THE EGYPTIAN REVOLUTION

Introduction

The Egyptian Revolution of July 23, 1952, signified a crucial moment in Egypt's contemporary history and greatly impacted the wider political scene in the Arab world. Driven by the Free Officers Movement – a secretive coalition of nationalist military leaders headed by Gamal Abdel Nasser and initially led by General Muhammad Naguib – the uprising sought to eradicate British colonial power, overthrow King Farouk's monarchy, and dismantle the deep-rooted feudal system in Egyptian society. The revolution concluded with the founding of the Republic of Egypt in 1953, with General Naguib serving as the first president of the country. Nonetheless, he quickly became sidelined by Nasser, who strengthened his authority by 1954.

In the subsequent years, the path of the revolution became closely linked to Egypt's military conflicts with Israel. A significant setback happened with Egypt's loss in the Six-Day War of 1967, leading to the loss of the Sinai Peninsula, a hit that greatly weakened Nasser's standing as the prominent advocate of pan-Arabism. Nevertheless, Nasser continued to be a powerful political figure until his passing in 1970, at which point Anwar Sadat took over the presidency.

Cause Of the Uprising

Egypt was under British rule since the late 1800s, though it was officially acknowledged as an independent nation in 1922. The British held considerable sway over Egyptian politics, particularly by managing the Suez Canal, an essential shipping path, and keeping military installations in Egypt. The ongoing British control fostered bitterness among Egyptians, particularly since the nation's independence was still undermined. Additionally, King Farouk I, who governed Egypt from 1936 to 1952, was commonly viewed as a corrupt and ineffective ruler. His extravagant way of living, controversies, and failure to meet the people's needs intensified public dissatisfaction and incited hatred towards him, which significantly contributed to the uprising.



The primary and most straightforward cause of the uprising was the Free Officers Movement. Numerous officers felt disenchanted with the political system, particularly regarding the government's corruption and ineffectiveness, along with the military's subordinate position under British control. Their motivation stemmed from a wish to modernize the nation, eradicate corruption, and tackle the socio-economic issues that Egypt encountered. The officers were likewise disheartened by the military losses in Egypt, especially during the 1948 Arab-Israeli War, in which the Egyptian army faced humiliation.

Geo-Political Change

Despite initially upholding his predecessor's policies, Sadat gradually altered Egypt's political direction. Under Gamal Abdel Nasser, who took complete power by 1954, Egypt embraced a non-aligned yet firmly anti-imperialist position. Nasser established Egypt as a prominent figure in the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), opting not to officially align with either the United States or the Soviet Union during the Cold War. Nonetheless, Egypt gravitated towards the Soviet bloc for support in military and economic matters, especially after the 1956 Suez Crisis, when Britain, France, and Israel executed a failed military intervention in response to Egypt's nationalization of the Suez Canal. This crucial juncture significantly boosted Egypt's regional status and represented its defiance against Western control.

This transformation reached its peak with the Corrective Revolution of 1971, in which Sadat removed Soviet-aligned officials and initiated a strategic pivot toward the West, preparing for substantial modifications in Egypt's internal and external policies. This marked a pivotal moment in Egyptian foreign policy as Egypt fully aligned with the Western bloc and began to weaken its connections with the Soviet Union and associated entities. This, along with the Camp David Accords in 1978, demonstrated additional collaboration with the West and the creation of diplomatic relations with Israel. These diplomatic relations resulted in significant opposition from other Arab countries, which viewed this as a betrayal and thus, as a result: a) The Arab League condemned and expelled Egypt and shifted their headquarters from Cairo to Tunis. Egypt was also forced to cut off ties with countries like Syria, Iraq, Libya and Algeria just to proceed with the peace talks with Israel.



Significance of the Revolution

The Revolution marked a pivotal change in British colonial influence in Egypt. British imperial interests were deeply entrenched in Egypt, especially because of the Suez Canal, a vital international shipping route. The Free Officers Movement, which overthrew King Farouk, was fundamentally motivated by a desire to expel British influence and gain greater sovereignty. Therefore, the Revolt successfully quelled British influence in Egypt.

The revolution led to the establishment of secular, socialist policies under Nasser, who implemented significant reforms aimed at modernizing Egypt's economy and society. This included land reforms, industrialization, and the expansion of education.

The rise of Nasser and his policies after 1952, particularly his stance on Arab unity and socialism, influenced the Cold War geopolitics. Initially, Nasser was somewhat non-aligned, but his resistance to Western imperialism, particularly during the Suez Crisis, led to closer ties with the Soviet Union. Furthermore, later the policy with the 1971 Corrective Revolution led to a further, more radical change in Egypt's foreign policy.



THE IRAQI KURD WAR

Background

Kurdish Identity and Marginalization in Iraq

When the Ottoman Empire crumbled and modern Iraq emerged in 1920, the Kurdish folks – mainly up north – suddenly found themselves part of a brand-new State. They never received the level of self-rule they'd dreamed of, since an Arab nationalist government was busy tightening its own grip. In 1920, the Treaty of Sèvres had hinted at an independent Kurdistan, but that promise faded away with the 1923 Treaty of Lausanne. Instead of being free, the Kurds ended up squeezed into Iraqi State structures, their cultural and political expression heavily clipped. And then oil was discovered around Kirkuk and Mosul, making these Kurdish areas all the more crucial; Baghdad just wasn't ready to let go of that control.

Even before the full-scale wars kicked off, there were a series of uprisings. Take 1931–1932, for example, when Sheikh Mahmoud Barzanji led a revolt against British rule – and later against the Iraqi monarchy – demanding a Kurdish State of their own. Then, between 1943 and 1945, Mullah Mustafa Barzani, a key Kurdish figure, tried his hand at rebellion in northern Iraq. His attack didn't pull off as planned, and he eventually fled to the Soviet Union in search of political backing.

There was also a brief moment with the Republic of Mahabad in 1946. Barzani and his fighters jumped in to support this short-lived Kurdish State in Iran, but once Iranian forces crushed the experiment, they had no choice but to escape northward into Soviet territory. His exile from 1947 to 1958, oddly enough, helped him secure Soviet support – a factor that would later shape conflicts in Iraq.



First War

Reasons for the First War

- 1) Kurdish aspirations for autonomy – The Kurds demanded autonomy and acknowledgement of their language, culture, and political rights.
- 2) Baghdad's refusal to negotiate – The Iraqi government led by Abdul Karim Qasim declined to accord federal status to the Kurdish area.
- 3) Land and economic tensions – Iraq's domination of Kirkuk's oil reserves led to tensions between Baghdad and the Kurds.

Key Events

1. Government Crackdown and Ba'athist Takeover (1963–1968)

In 1963, the Iraqi monarchy had been overthrown, and the Ba'ath Party briefly took power, followed by Abdul Salam Arif. The new government launched a major military offensive, using artillery and airstrikes against Kurdish villages. However, Barzani's forces continued guerrilla resistance from the mountains.

2. Soviet and U.S. Involvement

The Soviet Union aided Iraq, providing arms and advisers to suppress the Kurdish uprising. The United States and Iran covertly assisted the Kurds, viewing them as a useful counter to Iraq's pro-Soviet government.

3. The 1970 Peace Agreement

Following almost a decade of conflict, the new Iraqi leader, Saddam Hussein, wanted to bring the conflict to an end. In March 1970, Iraq and the Kurds had signed a peace treaty, providing limited autonomy for Kurdistan. The agreement provided for Kurdish representation within the government and language rights but was never fully put into effect.



Second War

Relations between the Kurds and Baghdad had broken down by 1974, triggering the Second Iraqi-Kurdish War.

Causes

- Saddam Hussein was unwilling to introduce full autonomy for the Kurds.
- Barzani resumed military resistance, with Iranian and U.S. backing.
- Iraq retaliated with huge military campaigns, and in March 1975 Iraq signed the Algiers Agreement with Iran, which resulted in the withdrawal of Kurdish support from Tehran.

Important Landmarks in the Second War

1. 1970 Autonomy Agreement (1974)

The Kurdish-Iraq peace agreement of March 1970 had guaranteed autonomy for the Kurdish area. Saddam Hussein's regime postponed the implementation of major provisions, such as:

- The fate of Kirkuk, a rich oil-producing area both sides claimed.
- The allocation of political authority to Kurdish leaders in Baghdad.
- Recognition of Kurdish as an official language.

2. Outbreak of War (April 1974)

Iraqi military bases were attacked by Peshmerga Kurdish forces in northern Iraq. The Iraqi military, aided by tanks and airstrikes, counterattacked with a large-scale operation. The Kurds at first fought hard, making use of mountains to defend themselves against Iraqi offensives.



3. Geopolitical support and foreign backing (1974-1975)

Iran and the United States started aiding the Kurds in expectation of undermining the pro-Soviet Iraqi regime. Israel covertly provided weapons to the Peshmerga, viewing them as a balance against Iraq. The Soviet Union also continued to support Iraq, offering weapons and military advisers.

4. Kurdish gains and major battles (Mid 1974 - Early 1975)

Kurdish troops seized a number of towns and key positions in northern Iraq. Iraq retaliated with vicious air attacks on Kurdish villages, causing large-scale civilian displacement. The Iraqi army, though numerically superior, failed to defeat the well-trained Kurdish guerrillas.

5. Algiers Agreement (March 6, 1975) – Betrayal of the Kurds

Iraq and Iran entered into the Algiers Agreement in March 1975, in which Iran agreed to cease aid to the Kurds in return for Iraq relinquishing border disputes in the Shatt al-Arab waterway. The United States, which had secretly aided the Kurds, also pulled aid. This disabled the Kurdish resistance as Iran sealed the border, preventing Kurdish access to arms and supplies.

6. Collapse of the Kurdish Resistance (March - April 1975)

Lacking Iranian and American support, the Kurds were soon overrun by Iraqi troops. April 1975: Barzani and thousands of his adherents escaped to Iran, bringing an end to the war. Iraq undertook savage repression in Kurdish regions, including:

- Mass arrests, executions, and coerced exile of Kurdish communities.
- Arabization of Kirkuk, where Iraqi officials forcibly expelled Kurds and brought in Arabs.



THE YOM KIPPUR WAR

Introduction

The Yom Kippur War, the October War, or the Ramadan War was a turning point conflict fought between a coalition of Arab States under the leadership of Egypt, Syria and Israel from 6th October to 25th October, 1973. The war was the fourth large-scale Arab-Israeli conflict and was deeply rooted in the unsettled tensions in the aftermath of the Six-Day War of 1967, when Israel had taken the Sinai Peninsula from Egypt, the Golan Heights from Syria, and the West Bank and East Jerusalem from Jordan. The war of 1973 was given the name Yom Kippur after the holiest day in the Jewish faith when the Arab alliance staged a surprise attack on the Israeli forces.

Historical Context

After their crushing defeat in the Six-Day War, Egypt and Syria both aimed to recover their lost territories and restore national honor. Egyptian President Anwar Sadat, committed to regaining the Sinai Peninsula and restoring Egypt's regional power, viewed military conflict as a method for ending the diplomatic impasse and compelling superpower intervention – that of the United States above all. Syrian leader Hafez al-Assad, also dedicated to winning back the Golan Heights, worked with Egypt to move in concert in a coordinated assault that would surprise Israel.

Causes

1. **Territorial Occupation** – Israel's occupation of the Sinai Peninsula and the Golan Heights was deemed illegal by Arab nations and was widely criticized throughout the Arab world. The failure to make substantial gains in negotiations after UN Security Council Resolution 242 (1967), which demanded the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from occupied territories, angered Arab leaders.



2. **Military Pride and Political Legitimacy** – The humiliating defeat of the Arabs in 1967 undermined the political positions of Arab governments, particularly Egypt and Syria. Winning – or even a good military showing – was viewed as essential to re-establishing domestic legitimacy and morale.
3. **Diplomatic Standstill** – No meaningful negotiations or peace process had been able to meet Arab demands despite efforts from the international community. Egypt specifically tried to utilize limited war as a means of reopening diplomatic avenues.

Stakeholders

Primary Stakeholders

1. **Egypt** – President Anwar Sadat led Egypt's efforts to reclaim the Sinai Peninsula. The Egyptian army successfully crossed the Suez Canal in a surprise attack, initially making significant gains on the ground.
2. **Syria** – President Hafez al-Assad of Syria sought to regain the Golan Heights. Syrian forces attacked the Israeli-held plateau but were ultimately repelled.
3. **Israel** – Prime Minister Golda Meir and Defense Minister Moshe Dayan led Israel, which at first was unprepared for the surprise attack. After initial setbacks, it launched a counteroffensive, reconquering lost territory and making gains into hostile territory.

Regional Players

1. **Jordan** – While officially aligned with Syria and Egypt, King Hussein stood back cautiously, keeping Jordanian involvement minimal, fearing further territorial loss and instability within the kingdom.
2. **Iraq** – Iraq provided troops and weapons to aid Syria, seeing the war as part of the larger Arab effort against Israel.



3. **Saudi Arabia and Gulf States** – These States did not contribute militarily but were major financial supporters of the Arab war. Chiefly, they withheld their oil from the West in an attempt to force aid to Arab goals.

Foreign Involvement

1. **United States** – A staunch ally of Israel, the U.S. airlifted military supplies to help Israel recover from early losses. Washington's support was vital to Israel's military turnaround and had major implications for U.S. relations with the Arab world.
2. **Soviet Union** – The USSR supported Egypt and Syria with arms and diplomatic backing. Soviet advisors and equipment were present before and during the conflict, and Moscow also sought to limit escalation to avoid direct confrontation with the U.S.

The UN Security Council played a central role in diplomatic efforts to end the war. Resolution 338, passed during the war, called for a ceasefire and reaffirmed the call for negotiations under Resolution 242. While ceasefires were initially violated, international pressure eventually led to the cessation of hostilities.

Post War Results and Consequences

Geneva Peace Conference (December 1973)

- **Convened by** – U.S. and USSR under the UN umbrella.
- **Participants** – Egypt, Israel; Syria and Jordan declined or were absent; PLO was not invited.
- **Goal** – Launch a diplomatic process under international supervision.
- **Result** – Largely inconclusive, but it established a precedent for future bilateral talks.



Disengagement Agreements (1974-1975)

- **Sinai I (January 1974)** – Egypt and Israel agreed to disengage; a UN buffer zone (UNEF II) was established.
- **Golan Heights Agreement (May 1974)** – Syria and Israel agreed to a buffer zone (monitored by UNDOF).
- **Sinai II (September 1975)** – Further Israeli withdrawal; included U.S. guarantees to both sides.
- **Impact** – These reduced tensions and paved the way for peace negotiations.
- **Camp David Accords (September 1978)** – Led by Anwar Sadat (Egypt), Menachem Begin (Israel), brokered by U.S. President Jimmy Carter.



GEOPOLITICAL HISTORY OF THE MIDDLE EAST

Prior to 1979, the Middle East exhibited a varied range of governance types. Numerous States operated under centralized monarchies, such as Saudi Arabia, whereas others, like Egypt, evolved into military-led republics after revolutions. In this section, we have elaborated upon the different systems of governance in the Middle East, as well as upon the Ottoman Empire.

Monarchies

The term monarchy, derived from the Greek word ‘monarkhes’, meaning sole ruler describes a form of sovereign governance, wherein supreme authority is vested in the monarch, who may rule by hereditary right or customary succession and whose authority might either be absolute or limited by a constitutional framework.

The definition, therefore speaks of two different kinds of monarchies, notably:

- i. **Absolute Monarchy** – It is a system of governance where a single ruler rules by some inherent right and has complete centralized authority or sovereignty over the State and government.
- ii. **Constitutional Monarchy** – It is a system of government where a single ruler rules by an inherent right and has either complete or partial centralized authority over the State and government, while being limited by some constitutional or legal framework.

Iran

Iran functioned under an absolute monarchy, namely the Pahlavi Dynasty, originating from the coup leading to the fall of the previous Qajar Dynasty in 1925. The Pahlavi dynasty of Iran consisted of two rulers: Reza Shah Pahlavi who ruled from 1925-1941 and his son Mohammad Reza who ruled from 1941-1979.



Iraq

Iraq functioned under a constitutional monarchy, led by Sharif Ali Bin al-Hussein, related to the Hashemites, defined under the 1932 Constitution of Iraq. It modelled the government as a monarchy with a parliamentary structure similar to that of Great Britain's. The 1958 Free Officers Movement led to the overthrow of this monarchy and the establishment of the First Republic of Iraq.

Theocratic Monarchies

These monarchies were absolute, yet governed by religious beliefs and non-secular ideals. They consisted of monarchical governance intertwined with religious intervention and justification. For example: the Iranian monarchy was greatly influenced by Islamic sects of society, Saudi Arabia was governed under the Wahhabi interpretation of Islam and other Muslim Brotherhood movements influenced the governance of governments like Egypt and Syria.

Colonial Mandates

Colonial mandates were internationally sanctioned systems, set up by the League of Nations, where member nations were given authority to govern decided territories, ostensibly to guide them towards self-determination while exerting a system of colonial control.

Palestine

Palestine was administered under a sanctioned British Mandate from 1920-1948, leading a form of semi-governance, ending with the formation of Israel as a separate State.

Egypt

Egypt functioned as a “constitutional monarchy” under a British protectorate till 1952, following nominal governance in which the British retained control of key aspects of the military, territory and the Suez Canal.



Syria and Lebanon

They were governed under League-sanctioned French Mandates until after World War 2 by which the mandates expired on the dissolution of the League.

Military Administrations

They are forms of governments where the armed forces hold power and exercise control over the State, or alternatively play an active role in the day-to-day governance of a nation and its external and internal relations.

A revolutionary republic is a State that emerges from a revolution, rejecting previous monarchy or colonial rule and establishing a new republican system, often grounded in ideology.

The governments below showed a combination of the two:

Egypt (Post-1952)

After the overthrow of the monarchy, the State became entrenched in Socialism under Nasserism. This also included deep involvement of the armed forces in the governance of the country and led to the establishment of a military-led republic.

Iraq (Post-1958)

Iraq, after 1958 fell under the category of a military republic, influenced by Ba'athist leaders.



The Ottoman Empire

An empire refers to a sovereign State or political unit that extends its dominion beyond its original borders and maintains authority over subject peoples or territories, either directly or through indirect governance. These empires often justified rule through divine right, religious mandate or mission to spread ideology.

The Ottoman Empire was the last Imperial Caliphate lasting for approximately 600 years from 1299-1922. The Ottoman Empire, based its authority on religion and its warrior-sultans, expanded their territory in the name of religion.

Governmental Structure

The Ottoman Empire followed a complex and multifaceted form of governance, with a hierarchical structure, consisting of:

1. **The Sultan-Caliph** – This entity was at the highest rung with complete religious legitimacy and absolute power, working on combined political and spiritual authority.
2. **The Divan (Imperial Council)** – This council consisted of viziers, ulema and military leaders, which formed the consultative and recommendatory body to the Caliph.
3. **Millet System:** It was a system that provided religious autonomy to minorities like the Christians and Jews.

Territory

At its height (16th–17th centuries), the Ottoman Empire ruled over the following territories.

- **Middle East** – Anatolia, Levant, Hejaz, Iraq
- **North Africa** – Egypt, Libya, Tunisia, Algeria
- **Southeast Europe** – Balkans, Greece, parts of Hungary
- **Arabian Peninsula** – Including holy cities, Mecca & Medina



(The names of nations and regions given are in accordance with present day geographical boundaries.)

Division of the Ottoman Empire

After the fall of the Ottoman Empire in the early 20th century, the territory covered by the Empire was subsequently divided into multiple nations.

The core Anatolian region of the Ottoman Empire was made Turkey, established formally in 1923, after the Turkish War of Independence led by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk. Syria came under a French governing mandate after the Sykes-Picot Agreement, as did Lebanon.

Iraq was formed from the Mosul, Baghdad and Basra provinces and came under a British Mandate in 1920 as did Jordan and Ottoman Palestine. Saudi Arabia which was previously part of Ottoman controlled Hejaz and Nejd and unified by Ibn Saud in 1932.



FOREIGN INFLUENCE IN THE **MIDDLE EAST**

The enduring presence of foreign influence in the Middle East remains one of the most defining and debated features of the region's modern history. From the legacy of imperial mandates to the contemporary dynamics of strategic alliances and external interventions, foreign powers have played a significant role in shaping the political, economic, and security landscapes across the Middle East. While often justified under the pretext of stability, development, or counterterrorism, such involvement has frequently intersected with local complexities, sovereign concerns, and broader geopolitical ambitions. As a result, the region continues to grapple with the long-term implications of external engagement on its path toward self-determination, regional cooperation, and sustainable peace.

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR)

The USSR framed its policy in the Middle East around anti-imperialism, anti-colonialism and support for national liberation movements. Official Soviet policy firmly opposed western imperialism while supporting socialistic development and was in favour of establishing relations with non-aligned socialist nations.

In 1948, the USSR originally supported the creation of Israel in order to support the creation of a socialist State. In 1955, the USSR entered into an arms trade deal with Egypt via Czechoslovakia, providing advanced weaponry.

Following Egypt's nationalization of the Suez Canal, the USSR threatened military intervention against UK, France, and Israel's invading forces. In 1958, it supported and recognized Iraq's new republic after the monarchy's overthrow.

In 1971, the USSR established a naval base on the island of Socotra, enhancing its strategic presence in the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean. Further, in 1972, a 15-year treaty was signed between Iraq and the USSR, solidifying military and economic cooperation. The USSR assisted in developing Iraq's oil industry and supplied extensive military aid.



United States of America (USA)

The United States of America's involvement in the Middle East began primarily after World War 2, with the end of the governing mandates of the UK and France. It supported Israel in its formation by formally recognizing it minutes after its declaration and furthermore provided diplomatic and in some cases, military assistance during the Six Day War of 1967 and the Yom Kippur War of 1973.

In 1948, minutes after the declaration of Israel as an independent State, the United States of America, under President Truman announced its formal recognition of Israel. The US marked its first strategic oil-based alliance with Saudi Arabia in the early 1950s, where the US and Saudi Arabia split the profits on any oil discovered in Saudi Arabia.

In 1953, the United States and the UK orchestrated a coup to overthrow the democratically elected Prime Minister Mohammed Mossadegh in order to prevent a Soviet-backed takeover in Iran. In 1967, during the Six Day War, the United States provided military and diplomatic assistance to Israel, leading to their victory.

The Sinai Interim Agreement of 1975 and the Camp David Accords of 1978, both with the United States acting as a mediator, solidified the United States' role as the Middle East mediator.

The Nixon Doctrine

The Nixon Doctrine was announced by US President Richard Nixon on July 25, 1969, as a new doctrine of foreign policy for the United States. The main objectives of the Doctrine were:

- a) The United States would honor all its treaty obligations and defense commitments.
- b) In the case of nuclear threats, the United States would provide a nuclear umbrella for its allies.
- c) For conventional threats, the US will assist allies through military and economic aid, but the primary responsibility of defense would be of the country itself.

Under the Nixon Doctrine, the United States adopted a "Twin Pillars" strategy in the Persian Gulf, relying on Iran and Saudi Arabia. Furthermore, the US aimed to dispense aid to countries through its designated regional allies.



France

France had a significant impact on the Middle East, specifically through the governing mandates under which it governed various nations under sanction by the League of Nations. France, under the Franco-Syrian Treaty of Independence of 1936, agreed to give Syria gradual independence but it was never ratified by the French Parliament, becoming a source of Syrian discontentment and distrust towards the West.

The Sykes-Picot Agreement of 1916 was a secret treaty concluded between the UK and France and agreed upon by the USSR to divide Ottoman territories among themselves during World War I. According to this, France would control what is now Lebanon, Syria and parts of southeastern Turkey. This directly contradicted promises made to Middle Eastern leaders, adding to Western hate.

France also supported UN Security Council Resolution 242 (1967), calling for Israel's withdrawal from occupied territories and recognition of all States. During the 1967 Six Day War, France called for the imposition of arms embargoes on all involved parties and cut off the Franco-Israeli relations. This marked France's shift to a more pro-Arab policy, deviating from the usual policy adopted by Western nations.

United Kingdom

The United Kingdom had a controversial role in the Middle East. It began with the McMahon–Hussein Correspondence of 1916 which promised Arab independence in exchange for revolt against Ottomans. The Balfour Declaration of 1917 and supported the formation of a Jewish State in Palestine.

The Anglo-Iraqi Treaty of 1930 set up Iraq for a semi-independent State in 1932 where Britain maintained control of air bases and had military access. The British also played a part in suppressing a massive Arab revolt in Palestine against the rule of the current government and Zionist immigration.

In the Syria-Lebanon campaign of 1941, British and French forces intervened to prevent accumulation of Axis powers in the Levant.



China

China's involvement in the Middle East began when it recognised the National Liberation Front during the Algerian War of Independence and it provided aid- as a result, Algeria became China's diplomatic link to the Middle East. China then supported Egypt in the Suez Crisis of 1956 and supported Egyptian sovereignty. The 1958 Sino- Egyptian Trade Agreement further solidified their relations. China maintained good relations with Syria, especially after 1956. China strongly condemned Zionism. They too, advocated for Palestinian self-determination in various UN speeches over the years.

China publicly supported Egypt and Syria's efforts to reclaim occupied territories from Israeli control and provided symbolic and moral aid to them during the Yom Kippur War of 1973.



ARMS TRAFFICKING IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Definition

The illicit trade and movement of arms and ammunition, in violation of national or international laws. This includes the unauthorized manufacture, possession, transfer, or sale of small arms and light weapons.

Arms Trade Routes to the Middle East

The major arms trade routes to the Middle East consisted of legal, overt routes commonly used for international trade and covert backchannels used for illicit supply of arms. There is no doubt that both were equally implicit in fuelling the Middle East conflict at large, despite their legality.

Iran-Iraq-Syria-Lebanon Corridor

The Iran–Iraq–Syria–Lebanon corridor, often referred to in policy and intelligence circles as the "Shia Crescent" land corridor, is a strategic land route that has evolved into a critical axis for military, political, and logistical influence in the Middle East. This corridor was used to supply Small Arms & Light Weapons (SALW's), short-range ballistic missiles, drones and IED components and explosives.

Sudan–Chad–Libya–Egypt–Gaza Axis

The Sudan–Chad–Libya–Egypt–Gaza axis forms a critical transcontinental corridor through which illicit arms have flowed for decades, linking conflict zones in sub-Saharan Africa with militant groups in North Africa and the Eastern Mediterranean. Characterized by weak border control, overlapping wars and constant proliferation of arms, this backchannel is very often used.



Turkey–Syria–Iraq Triangle

One of the primary features making this triangle a hub for arms proliferation is the porous nature of the borders. Smugglers and armed groups take advantage of poorly monitored terrain, such as the Qandil Mountains, to transport weapons between Turkey, Syria, and Iraq. A few legalized routes within this triangle are used by the United States for sending military aid and the rest is used for smuggling and illicit arms trafficking by foreign diaspora. Furthermore, this triangle is the most major source of the Kurdish rebels in the Middle East's arms supply and transfers, where they receive most military and other forms of aid in PKK bases near the Qandil Mountains.

The International Gray Arms Market

The international gray arms market operates in the nebulous zone between legal and illegal arms trade, often involving State actors, private brokers, and non-State entities. This market facilitates the transfer of weapons through covert channels, exploiting legal loopholes and weak enforcement mechanisms.

The gray arms market encompasses transactions that, while not overtly illegal, circumvent standard regulatory frameworks. These deals often involve:

- **State-sanctioned covert operations** – Governments facilitating arms transfers to proxy groups while maintaining plausible deniability.
- **Diversion of legal shipments** – Legally exported arms redirected to unauthorized recipients.
- **Use of front companies and brokers** – Intermediaries obscuring the origin and destination of arms shipments.

The Gray Arms Market with Respect to the Middle East

Prior to 1979, the international gray arms market in the Middle East was already a well-established and significant influence, impacting the region's political and military dynamics. Although not as thoroughly recorded as networks from the



post-Cold War era, this pre-1979 market functioned through a complicated network of secret dealings, informal partnerships, Cold War competitions, and proxy conflicts.

Countries like Yugoslavia, North Korea, South Africa and Bulgaria acted as the middle ground for illicit trade of arms through which external private powers supplied arms, only fuelling the conflict in the Middle East. Regimes and movements under sanction in the Middle East which were unable to procure arms legally, made use of gray channels to bypass difficulties.

Overall, the international gray arms market played a major role in influencing the Middle East up till 1979. It serves as one of the primary sources for smaller, unorganized groups and sometimes larger organizations to procure arms and carry out coordinated internal strikes, leading to the deaths of many.

Diversification of State Stockpiles

There are several cases of diversion of State-owned assets like rifles and explosives through robberies of State stockpiles by regional militants as well as cases of corruption within the government. This occurs mainly in countries where political instability and corruption prevails.

Examples include:

Palestinian Fedayeen (1948–1970s)

- **Context** – Different Palestinian groups (such as Fatah, PFLP, DFLP) conducted guerrilla warfare mainly against Israel and Jordan.
- **Mechanism of Diversion** – Arms were seized from Arab State warehouses, particularly during the 1967 Six-Day War, when Israeli troops captured Egyptian, Jordanian, and Syrian positions and some fell into Palestinian hands. Corrupt Lebanese and Jordanian military officers tended to secretly furnish or "lose" weapons for these groups.



Kurdish Rebels in Iraq (1958–1975)

- **Context** – Kurdish nationalist rebellions in northern Iraq, under the leadership of Mulla Mustafa Barzani, fought successive revolts against the government of Iraq.
- **Mechanism of Diversion** – Weapons were taken from captured Iraqi army positions during active combat. Kurdish combatants received weapons either from sympathetic military personnel or through battlefield recovery.

Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood (1940s–1950s)

- **Context** – The Brotherhood engaged in armed resistance against the British, Zionist forces, and later the Egyptian government.
- **Mechanism of Diversion** – Some Brotherhood members infiltrated the military or used connections with sympathetic officers to divert arms. They also raided police stations and armories in the late 1940s.

Cross Border Smuggling of Arms by Militants

Weapons were illicitly trafficked across borders through ideologically sympathetic or contiguous States, usually taking advantage of permeable borders, tribal identities, and surreptitious State sponsorship. Such arms supplies played a central role for non-State actors to circumvent immediate traceability back to specific suppliers. A prominent example of such smuggling has been given below.

Palestinian Fedayeen through Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon

- **Context** – During the 1950s–1970s, Palestinian guerrilla combatants were provided with weapons channeled through surrounding Arab countries.
- **Mechanism** – Weapons were smuggled via southern Lebanon and the Bekaa Valley, southern Syria, and eastern Jordan. These arms tended to come from Soviet bloc countries, delivered to Arab regimes and then trickled down to non-State actors.
- **Example** – Kalashnikov rifles, grenades, and explosives smuggled into the West Bank and Israel through Jordanian or Syrian territory.



CURRENT SCENARIOS OF REVOLT **AND MILITARY REVOLUTION**

As of 12th February 1979, the Middle East is undergoing a moment of heightened instability and political transformation. The recent overthrow of the Iranian monarchy has amplified tensions across a region already fraught with ideological divides, sectarian fault lines, and geopolitical rivalries. From rising anxieties among Gulf monarchies to shifts in the balance between secular and religious forces, the entire region is on alert.

Iranian Revolution

After the Iranian Revolution of 1979, the victory of the Shia clergy in Iran was denoted by the fleeing of the Shah Mohammed Reza Pahlavi on the 16th of January, 1979 and the subsequent return of Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini to Iran on the 1st of February.

As of 12th February, 1979, Khomeini has officially assumed leadership of the revolutionary movement and effectively seized control of Iran, abolishing the monarchy. A day before, the armed forces declared neutrality, and revolutionary groups seized key government buildings.

Furthermore, the Imperial Government of Prime Minister Bakhtiar was overthrown, and Iran as a whole is in a transitional phase, going from a secular monarchy to an Islamic Republic. Furthermore, foreign nations like the United States and the UK lost the Shah, a primary ally of theirs in the Middle East and subsequently, the USSR, sees in the new form of government, an opportunity to establish their presence in the Middle East.



Lebanese Civil War

The current situation of the Lebanese Civil War is one of fragility, marked by persistent sectarian strife, political fragmentation, and increasing foreign entanglement. The tensions between the different sectarian sections of society such as the Maronite Christians, the Islamic Shias and Sunnis and leftist groups. The State authority is largely weakened and much of the power is held by militia groups.

Syria maintains a strong military presence along with Israel, which is closely engaged in southern Lebanon. Furthermore, Palestine through the PLO, plays an active role in influencing the Islamic militias. Superpowers like the USSR and USA are indirectly involved through regional proxies.

Currently, no significant peace efforts are being undertaken, implying intensification of the war with severe deterioration of humanitarian conditions, with growing civilian casualties and large-scale displacement.

Egyptian Power Shifts

President Anwar Sadat is the sitting head of State, having taken power after the death of Gamal Abdel Nasser in 1970. A drastic shift in policy in Egypt entailed a change from Egypt's regular Arab socialism and Soviet alignment towards economic freedom and West-alignment, including close cooperation with countries like the United States.

Sadat expelled Soviet advisors in 1972 and has since embraced diplomacy with Israel and the West. Furthermore, Egypt adopted a policy of Infitah in which they welcomed foreign investment, in stark contrast to Nasser's State-controlled economy.

Furthermore, the recognition of Israel as a sovereign State via the Camp David Accords of 1978, and the adoption of a pro-Israel stance led to isolationism by Arab nations which saw the peace process as a betrayal of Palestinian and pan-Arab causes.



TIMELINE OF EVENTS

Below is a comprehensive timeline of all the events that significantly shaped the Middle East from 1925 to the 12th of February, 1979.

***DECEMBER,
1925***

The National Consultative Assembly in Iran removed the last Qajar Shah, Ahmad Shah Qajar, and established the Iranian state under Reza Khan's leadership.

British and Soviet forces invaded Iran, fearing Reza Shah's alignment with Nazi Germany. Reza Shah was forced to abdicate in favor of his son, Mohammad Reza Pahlavi.

1941

***MAY 14,
1948***

The State of Israel was established. In response, hundreds of thousands of Palestinians were displaced to Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, and Syria.

The CIA and MI6 orchestrated Operation Ajax, overthrowing Iranian Prime Minister Mohammad Mossadegh and consolidating power under the Shah.

1953

***FEBRUARY 24,
1955***

Baghdad Pact (later CENTO) was signed by Iran, Iraq, Pakistan, Turkey, and the UK. It aimed to contain Soviet influence but also aligned Iran more closely with the West.

Iran formed SAVAK, a brutal intelligence and security agency responsible for widespread human rights abuses.

1957



1963

The Shah launched the White Revolution, implementing reforms like land redistribution and women's suffrage. However, it weakened the Shi'a clergy and displaced millions of farmers, stoking unrest.

The Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) was formed as a political and military group to represent the Palestinian people.

1964

**JANUARY,
1965**

The PLO launched its first guerrilla attack on Israel's National Water Carrier, beginning its militant campaign using bases in Jordan, Lebanon, Egypt (Gaza), and Syria.

The Six-Day War was fought between Israel and its neighboring Islamic states such as Egypt and Jordan. United Nations Resolution 242 was passed, calling for immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops from occupied territories during the Six Day War.

1967

**June,
1967**

The Six-Day War: Israel defeated Arab states and seized the West Bank, Gaza, Sinai, and Golan Heights. The war caused another wave of Palestinian refugees, many of whom fled to Lebanon, including PLO leaders.

Lebanon officially allowed the PLO to operate militarily within its borders, especially from refugee camps. This increased tensions with Lebanese Christian factions.

1969

**JULY,
1970**

The Nixon Doctrine, a major US foreign policy doctrine was formally announced. It stated that the U.S. would support allies militarily and economically but avoid direct military involvement.



After fierce clashes, the Jordanian army expelled thousands of Palestinian fighters, many of whom fled to Lebanon, bolstering the PLO's military presence, especially in Beirut and the south.

SEPTEMBER, 1970 (BLACK SEPTEMBER)

SEPTEMBER 8, 1972

Following the Munich Olympics massacre, Israeli warplanes bombed ten PLO bases in Syria and Lebanon.

The Lebanese army launched an offensive against Palestinian guerrillas, using jet fighters and tanks, leading to a two-day armed confrontation.

MAY, 1973

OCTOBER 6-25, 1973

A surprise military offensive surmounted by Egypt and Syria on Israel led to the Yom-Kippur War leading to an Israeli victory.

Iran's oil boom created massive state revenues, but benefited mainly the elite, causing severe inflation and economic hardship for the middle class.

1973

APRIL 13, 1975

The Ain el-Rummaneh Bus Massacre: Christian gunmen ambushed a bus of Palestinians, triggering the Lebanese Civil War.

The Shah of Iran banned all political parties and created a one-party dictatorship, angering both leftists and religious conservatives.

1975



JANUARY, 1976

Syrian military intervention in Lebanon: Syria deployed troops to Lebanon under the justification for goals of stabilization, creating long-term military and political entanglement in Lebanon.

The Karantina and Damour Massacres: Lebanese Christian and Palestinian Muslim groups and factions committed massacres in retaliatory strikes, escalating the civil war.

JUNE-OCTOBER, 1976

MARCH 14-15, 1978

The Shah declared martial law and ordered the army and SAVAK to perform open fire on demonstrators in Jaleh Square, killing hundreds. This massacre became a major catalyst for the Iranian Revolution.

Israel invaded South Lebanon, and advanced to the Litani River as a response to a PLO attack. This became known as Operation Litani.

SEPTEMBER 8, 1978 (BLOODY FRIDAY)

SEPTEMBER 17, 1978

The Pahlavi regime collapsed. The Islamic Republic of Iran was proclaimed under Ayatollah Khomeini.

Camp David Accords was signed between Egypt and Israel, brokered by U.S. President Jimmy Carter. Egypt became the first Arab state to officially recognize Israel. In exchange, Israel withdrew from the Sinai Peninsula.

FEBRUARY 11, 1979



QUESTIONS FOR THE COMMITTEE

1. What role does the international community and a body like the General Assembly play in internal power shifts?
2. How should international law balance the right of a nation's people to self-determination with non-interference by external powers?
3. How can the provision of arms and military funding to revolutionary groups be effectively regulated—or even curtailed—without undermining the sovereign right of States to defend themselves?
4. Should revolutionary governments be given international recognition immediately, or should this be conditional on their complete demilitarization?
5. What implications can the international community draw from the changed Iran-Iraq relationship after revolutions regarding its future transition?
6. How can revolutionary regimes secure internal stability without resorting to authoritarian repression or the import of foreign militarization?
7. How do the proxy dynamics between the US and USSR aggravate military intensification of revolutionary movements?
8. Are revolutionary governments responsible for militarized activities or insurgency outside their borders?
9. How does international humanitarian law affect or could be enforced in situations of revolutionary violence and internal strife?
10. How can cross-border ethnic ties turn into regional security risk multipliers in the start of revolutions?
11. What precedent does the Iranian-Islamic Revolution set for other revolutionary movements there?
12. How should the use of State propaganda during revolutions be limited to avoid inciting violence or external conflict?



PAPERWORK GUIDE

All paperwork is to be sent to the committee email ID:
unhgadisec@lmcmun2025.com

The standard font for all committee paperwork must be Times New Roman and font size must be 12.

The accepted paperwork the UNHGA-DISEC committee is the following:

- Position Paper
- Presidential Statement
- Communique
- Memorandum of Understanding
- Action Order
- Working Paper
- Draft Resolutions

For details and specifics regarding different forms of paperwork, delegates are to refer to the conference handbook. The following are certain committee-specific recommendations for the same.

Note: The UNHGA-DISEC committee will not be accepting any paperwork before the committee begins, other than the Position Paper.

Position Paper

The position paper holds immense significance as it is the first piece of paperwork which any delegate needs to send. It encompasses and contains all the extensive research done by a delegate, their policy and the solutions that they have thought of. The first time the executive board analyses every delegate is through the position paper which needs to be sent prior to the committee. It is highly advisable to produce a high-quality position paper to have an excellent first impression before your executive board. A position paper consists primarily of three parts – ‘Statement of the Problem’, ‘Country Policy’ and ‘Solutions’.



Statement of the Problem

The first section of the position paper entails the agenda itself, explained through a neutral perspective. It contains the history of the problem, the possible causes and current State of the crisis or the problem. It is a representation of the delegate's comprehension of the agenda and the problem while also giving a first glimpse of the depth of the delegate's research. It is advisable to keep this part brief and only include the most important aspects in the view of the delegate.

Country Policy

The second part of the position paper is country specific and includes how each individual country views the agenda, their involvement in the crisis and the stance that the delegate will be taking in committee in accordance with the country's foreign policy. It also elaborates on the country's history in regard to the agenda, the past actions (if any) taken by the country and how the crisis presently affects the country. Any conventions, treaties or organizations created or supported by the country along with any action taken with international organizations particularly the United Nations must also be enlisted here.

Solutions

The most vital part of the position paper is the solutions section which is again delegate specific and not generic in nature. It should include unique and viable solutions which can be pitched in committee and those that can be accepted by the international community. All potential solutions listed by the delegate in this section must be in compliance with their foreign policy. It is advised that every delegate takes into consideration their country's advantage while proposing these solutions.

Delegates are also advised to include citations in their position papers.

Sample Position Paper: [Position Paper](#)

NOTE: THE DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION OF POSITION PAPERS IS THE 10th OF MAY, 2025. It is strongly advised that the delegates keep the content of their position papers under 4 pages.



Communique

The dynamism of the committee must have become evident by now having read and understood the agenda and the various aspects that it holds. In a committee like this which is characterized by a lot of complexities and crises, a quintessential tool which we expect all delegates to use is – communique.

A communique is written by the delegate representing the country used to contact entities outside of your committee in order to involve them with the crisis in a certain way. They are written as formal correspondence to outside actors as a way of enticing them to take action, even though they aren't under your direct control. These communiques are essentially used to take executive action either openly or covertly. However, this document requires a fair share of key points to be fulfilled. The communique should be realistic and naturally viable, they should be ordinarily highly detailed with pain-stricken attention to details, a covert communique need not follow international rules and regulations. Essentially a communique is one of the strongest ways in which a delegate can express their creativity in committee.

Another indispensable feature of a communique is that it can be used as a response to updates given in committee. Delegates can create a series of inter-related communiques in order to achieve a particular objective as well. All communiques, however, are subject to ratification by the executive board before it can be considered viable enough in committee. Communiques can primarily be distinguished on the basis of accessibility and number of authors

On the Basis of Accessibility

Public Communique – These communiques are open to the entire committee and all delegates will know which country is behind the action that has taken place in the communique. This type must be used if a delegate is interested in making the entire committee aware of an action that he has taken. It is advisable to only include those actions which can be internationally accepted, not subject to criticism and judicially mandated.

Private Communique – These communiques, otherwise known as covert communiques, are essential to take secretive action and only the delegate(s) who has sent it will be aware of it. These communiques can be used effectively as a response to updates given by the executive board or to carry out actions which are



not internationally warranted. It can also be used to connect to government officers or other entities not in the committee. These communiques are also subject to ratification by the executive board before it can be brought up in any way in the committee. Moreover, the executive board also has the right to give the contents of the communique as an update in committee with or without altering some contents.

On the Basis of Number of Authors

Individual Communique – This type of communique is written by an individual (one) delegate or delegation and only they are aware of its contents and intentions.

Joint Communique – This type of communique is written by two or more delegates present in committee together. This can only be the result of a symbiotic benefit where both the delegates agree upon a common cause or objective and both benefit from the success of that particular action.

Note: A communique must contain the type of communique (Private, Public, Joint private, Joint Public), A “From:” portion (Name of Delegate sending it), “To:” portion (Recipient of Communique) and a few lines containing a brief summary of the entire communique. (All these are to be present on the first page). The delegate can then move into the details of the communique. It is highly advisable to keep the communique reasonably short around 6-7 pages at most.

Sample Public Communique: [Public Communique](#)

Sample Private Communique: [Private Communique](#)

Action Order

An action order in an MUN is a paperwork that stands for collective action undertaken by a single nation or a group of nations. This is often seen in crisis committees as they are used for strategic planning of military attacks. Action Orders are often ‘pitted’ against each other and the paperwork that is more detailed and feasible is usually ratified. It is ratified by the Executive board and is oftentimes introduced as an update.

Sample Action Order: [Action Order](#)



Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)

A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in international forums is a non-binding agreement between States or international organizations that outlines mutual intentions, goals, or frameworks for cooperation. While it lacks the legal enforceability of a treaty, an MOU often serves as a foundational step for future binding commitments. In global forums, MOUs are commonly used to promote diplomatic dialogue, enhance collaboration on issues like trade, security, or development, and formalize partnerships without the need for ratification.

Sample Memorandum of Understanding: [Memorandum of Understanding](#)

Presidential Statement

A presidential Statement is an executive order issued by the Head of State. It is primarily used to announce a change or diversion from the normal foreign policy of a country that the delegate wishes the entire committee to know. It is also very important to not abuse the powers of a Presidential Statement. Any such paperwork which does not affect the immediate flow of the committee or that which does not reflect a change in policy will not be ratified.

Sample Presidential Statement: [Presidential Statement](#)

Working Paper

A working paper is a precursor to the Draft Resolution. It is mainly a loosely formatted document that has recommendations to the committee or solutions for the given agenda that the authors feel should be implemented. A working paper is generally not formally voted upon (informal voting) and serves as a way of foreshadowing the solutions to be present in the end paperworks, i.e, the draft resolution.



Draft Resolution

Draft Resolution is a formal document that specifies a plan of action that is to be undertaken by the United Nations Security Council to address a crisis. The Draft Resolution has an extremely strict format and not adhering to the format can get the resolution scrapped. A Draft resolution starts with a “name” or “title”, followed by the names of the authors, then the signatories (delegates who wish for the resolution to be discussed in committee, not necessarily side with it) and finally enters the main body of the resolution.

The main body of the resolution can also be subdivided into two parts, first are the preambulatory clauses [separator to be used is “,”] and then the operative clauses [separator to be used is “;”]. Further, a full stop [.] signifies the end of the draft resolution.

Authors: They are the members or countries who wish to introduce the paperwork written by them.

Signatories: Are the members that want the paperwork to be discussed in committee. Being a signatory does not imply that the member supports the resolution.

Phrases: Phrases are what we start clauses with. Preambulatory Phrases are phrases [have to be italicized] to start a preambulatory clause; Operative Phrase [have to be underlined] is to begin an operative clause.

Please check the Conference Handbook for the list of phrases that will be accepted.

Note: Refer to the Conference Handbook for more information regarding Working Papers, Draft Resolutions, and the samples of the same.



RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE EXECUTIVE BOARD

Delegates of this committee are suggested to be prepared for a fast-paced update-driven committee. The Executive Board would look forward to arguments based on international law and delegates must maintain strict adherence to foreign policy, as it is a simulation of a United Nations committee. Deviation from foreign policy will be looked down upon by the Executive Board.

Each delegate must always keep in mind the freeze date. Developments up to this date – including political transitions, regional alliances, ongoing conflicts, and ideological movements – should form the foundation of arguments and proposed actions. While quoting law and charters, it must be noted that only international law prior to the freeze date will be taken into consideration.

The Executive Board also recommends the delegates to approach the committee with realism and foresight. While respecting national sovereignty and regional autonomy, the delegates should engage with a forward-looking perspective. Consider how instability or revolutionary movements if left unchecked may not only have a regional impact but also threaten international stability.

Delegates should also be well versed with the mandate and the concept of a deadlock in the Security Council. While this committee is *prima facie* a DISEC, the precarious situation in the Middle East may require decisions that require the committee to take up a more diverse role.

Delegates are expected to send logical and realistic paperwork. While the bar for creativity is limitless, delegates must ensure their ideas can be carried out with the technology that exists as per the freeze date. Delegates must ensure that the paperwork they submit is relevant to the update given on that day of the committee.

To all the first timers and people who are relatively new, we understand that this may seem daunting and overwhelming. The Executive Board will try its best to explain everything as and when they come up in committee. For the more experienced delegates the above recommendations may be known to you all. However, one thing is for sure: embracing these "tips" will be sure to separate the best delegate from the rest.



CITATIONS & FURTHER READING

“Method and Instances of Use of the United Nations Resolution 377A”, United Nations:

<https://www.un.org/en/ga/sessions/emergency.shtml>

“How the CIA and Mossad helped form SAVAK”, Islamic Revolutionary Documents Center, 11 November, 2016:

<https://irdc.ir/en/news/26/how-cia-mossad-helped-form-savak>

“Soviet-Iranian Relations”, CIA, 2008:

<https://www.cia.gov/readingroom/docs/CIA-RDP84T00926R000100040006-4.pdf>

“The day on which Imam Khomeini moved to France from Iraq”, The Tehran Times, October 4, 2024:

<https://www.tehrantimes.com/news/504549/The-day-on-which-Imam-Khomeini-moved-to-France-from-Iraq>

“Military Madness in Iran”, New Internationalist, 2nd September, 1980:

<https://newint.org/features/1980/09/01/militarymadness>

“Issues concerning the Proposed Sale of E-3 Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS) to Iran”, U.S Government Accountability Office, September 19, 1977:

<https://www.gao.gov/products/103402>

“Communism in Iran from 1941-1953”, Encyclopedia Iranica, December 15, 1992:

<https://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/communism-ii>

“The Tudeh Military Network during the Oil Nationalization Period”, JSTOR, July 12, 1987:

<https://www.jstor.org/stable/4283187>



“The Cairo Agreement, Explained”, 961 News, January 9, 2021:

<https://www.the961.com/cairo-agreement-explained/>

“The United States' Intervention In Lebanon”, JSTOR, 1985:

<https://www.jstor.org/stable/41857792>

“A proper account of the Lebanese Civil War with Military Factions”, SciencesPo, 25th October, 2011:

<https://www.sciencespo.fr/mass-violence-war-massacre-resistance/fr/document/historiography-and-memory-lebanese-civil-war.html>

“The Camp David Accords”, Peace AU, 1978:

<https://www.peaceau.org/uploads/camp-david-accords-egypt-1978.pdf>

“Egypt cuts relations with 5 Arab nations opposed to The Camp David Accords”, The New York Times, 1977:

<https://www.nytimes.com/1977/12/06/archives/egypt-cuts-relations-with-5-arab-nations-opposed-to-peace-bid.html>

“How the Palestinian Liberation Organisation forged the Modern Middle East”, August 22, 2020:

<https://nationalinterest.org/blog/lebanon-watch/black-september-remembered-how-plo-forged-modern-middle-east-167531>

“Terror Attacks in Israel”, Global Security, (no date):

<https://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/war/israel-terror.html>

“The Kurdish Uprisings in the Middle East: A Survey, DergiPark, June 2020:

<https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/1154387>

“Chronology for Kurds in Iraq”, Council on Foreign Relations, (no date):

<https://www.cfr.org/timeline/kurds-long-struggle-statelessness>