

BACKGROUND GUIDE FOR THE HISTORIC SECURITY COUNCIL

DNMUN 2023



Agenda - Yom Kippur War
Freeze Date - October 6th 1973,

Table of Contents

<u>S.No</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.	Mandate	2
2.	Letter from Chairperson	4
3.	History	5
4.	Six Day War	6
5.	United Nations Security Council Resolution 242	8
6.	Khartoum Resolution	10
7.	Jarring Mission	11
8.	Rogers Plan	12
9.	War of Attrition	14
10.	Black September	16
11.	Military Preparation	17
12.	Build Up to the War	19
13.	Guide to a Crisis	20
14.	Conclusion	21
15.	Position Paper Details	22

Mandate

The mandate of the United Nations Security Council, as outlined in the UN Charter, includes the following key aspects:

1. Maintenance of international peace and security: The Security Council is responsible for identifying threats to international peace and security and taking appropriate actions to address them (Article 24, Paragraph 1).
2. Peaceful settlement of disputes: The Council encourages the peaceful settlement of disputes through negotiation, mediation, or other peaceful means. It can recommend methods of settlement or propose terms of settlement to the parties involved (Article 33).
3. Use of collective security measures: The Security Council has the authority to determine the existence of any threat to peace, breach of peace, or act of aggression and can take measures to maintain or restore international peace and security. This includes the use of economic sanctions, arms embargoes, and even the authorization of military force if deemed necessary (Article 39 and Article 42).
4. Authorization of peacekeeping operations: The Council can establish and authorize UN peacekeeping operations to help countries affected by conflicts in maintaining peace, stability, and the protection of civilians (Article 41, Article 42, and Chapter VI).
5. Enforcement of decisions: The Security Council has the power to enforce its decisions and ensure compliance by member states. It can impose sanctions, impose arms embargoes, and take other measures to enforce its resolutions (Article 25 and Article 48).
6. International cooperation: The Council promotes international cooperation in addressing threats to peace and security. It works closely with member states, regional organizations, and other UN organs to foster collaboration and coordinate efforts in resolving conflicts and addressing global security challenges (Article 11, Article 44, and Article 51).
7. Monitoring of disarmament and non-proliferation: The Security Council has a role in overseeing and promoting disarmament efforts, non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and the peaceful use of nuclear energy. It can adopt resolutions and establish specialized committees or panels to monitor compliance with these objectives (Article 26 and Article 39).
8. Protection of civilians and human rights: The Council recognizes the importance of protecting civilians in armed conflicts and addressing human rights violations. It can take action to ensure the protection of civilians, hold parties accountable for human rights abuses, and establish or authorize tribunals to prosecute individuals responsible for war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide (Article 39, Article 41, and Article 42).
9. Peacebuilding and post-conflict reconstruction: The Security Council supports peacebuilding efforts in post-conflict situations by promoting reconciliation, good governance, the rule of law, and sustainable development. It may establish or guide

specialized missions or entities to facilitate the transition from conflict to peace (Chapter VI and Chapter VII).

10. Consultation with non-member states: While primarily composed of member states, the Security Council can consult with non-member states, particularly those directly affected by conflicts under consideration, to gather information, seek their cooperation, or involve them in the resolution of specific issues (Article 54 and Article 99).

It's important to note that the interpretation and implementation of the Security Council's mandate may vary depending on the specific circumstances and the political dynamics among its members.

Letter from Chairperson

I hope you are reading this background guide in good health and high spirits. As the chairperson of the UNHSC it is my pleasure to welcome you to the 10th edition of DNMUN. With great anticipation, I am looking forward to the stimulating discussions, diplomatic negotiations, and collaborative problem-solving that lie ahead.

I have compiled together all the information every delegate must know before stepping into the committee in this background guide. I would still recommend delegates delve deeper into the agenda and various topics mentioned in the background guide because the more knowledge you possess, the better equipped you are to craft effective solutions. Knowledge is the key that unlocks the doors to innovative problem-solving.

Throughout the conference, my role as the Chairperson will be to facilitate the smooth operation of the committee, guide the discussions, and ensure a fair and inclusive environment for all participants. I am here to support you and the entire committee in navigating the complex issues before us. Do not hesitate to approach me if you have any questions or concerns, or if you require any assistance during the conference.

I am confident that, as a delegate, you possess the skills, knowledge, and enthusiasm to contribute significantly to our committee's deliberations. Together, let us strive to make this Model United Nations Conference a resounding success.

I eagerly await our first committee session and the exciting discussions that lie ahead. Until then, please do not hesitate to contact me should you require any further information or assistance. Wishing you the best of luck in your preparations.

Yours sincerely,

Jitesh Kamnani

UNHSC Chairperson

DNMUN 2023

History

In the early 1960s, the Middle East was a region rife with tension, and nowhere was it more evident than in the ongoing Arab-Israeli conflict. The year 1963 was no exception, as the already strained relationship between Israel and its Arab neighbors reached a boiling point.

Amidst the backdrop of the Arab-Israeli conflict, the Palestinian refugee issue loomed large. Palestinians who had been displaced by the 1948 war sought to reclaim their lost homes, adding fuel to the already volatile situation. Arab countries, driven by a sense of nationalism and solidarity, stood united in their demand for the right of return for Palestinian refugees. Meanwhile, Israel adamantly opposed any such resolution, fearing that it would undermine its existence.

Border disputes and territorial claims further exacerbated tensions. The status of the West Bank, including the holy city of Jerusalem, remained a contentious issue. The region had been under Jordanian control since the 1948 war, but Israel contested this, viewing it as an integral part of its historical and religious heritage. Similarly, the Golan Heights, which had been under Syrian control, posed another source of friction between Israel and its neighbors.

Control over water resources, particularly the Jordan River, added another layer of complexity to the conflict. Israel and its neighbors relied on these vital water sources for agricultural purposes, and the allocation of water became a contentious issue.

The broader geopolitical context of the Cold War further intensified tensions. The United States and the Soviet Union were engaged in a global rivalry, and the Middle East became a battleground for their respective interests. Israel, with its close ties to the United States, was seen as a strategic ally in the region. In contrast, Arab countries aligned themselves with the Soviet Union, amplifying the ideological divide.

Throughout 1963, border incidents and skirmishes between Israel and its Arab neighbors escalated, resulting in casualties and heightened tensions. Both sides engaged in military posturing, further deepening the sense of mistrust and hostility.

At the heart of it, all was the rise of pan-Arab nationalism, led by charismatic figures like Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser. Nasser sought to unite Arab states against Israel and championed the cause of Palestinian liberation. His influence and rhetoric resonated across the region, further fuelling the anti-Israel sentiment.

As the year progressed, the tensions remained unresolved. Little did the parties involved know that the situation would continue to deteriorate in the coming years, culminating in major conflicts such as the Six-Day War in 1967.

The tension in 1963 served as a harbinger of the challenges to come, with the Arab-Israeli conflict proving to be a long-lasting and deeply entrenched issue in the Middle East.

Six Day War

In the scorching heat of the Middle Eastern summer in 1967, the stage was set for a clash that would shape the region's history and ignite a war of unimaginable proportions. Tensions between Israel and its neighboring Arab states had reached a crescendo, and the world held its breath as a powder keg of animosity threatened to explode.

Amidst a backdrop of mutual distrust and territorial disputes, Israel found itself encircled by a coalition of Arab nations: Egypt, Jordan, and Syria. Egged on by fiery rhetoric and a fervent desire to wipe Israel off the map, their leaders amassed troops along Israel's borders, their war machines revving like engines hungry for battle.

In the early hours of June 5, 1967, the air crackled with anticipation. The desert winds carried whispers of impending doom as Israeli jets streaked across the skies, their engines roaring like thunder. In a daring pre-emptive strike, the Israeli Air Force unleashed a devastating onslaught, decimating the Arab airfields and leaving their adversaries stunned and scrambling for cover.

The element of surprise had been achieved, but it was only the beginning. Israel's ground forces swiftly sprang into action, their determination unwavering. With lightning speed, they advanced into the heart of the Sinai Peninsula, meeting fierce resistance from the Egyptian army. In a battle of tanks and artillery, the desert sands became a graveyard of metal and destruction. Explosions rocked the landscape, sending plumes of smoke and fire into the air, painting a picture of chaos and devastation.

Meanwhile, on the eastern front, the rugged hills of the West Bank and the ancient streets of Jerusalem bore witness to the clash of armies. Israeli soldiers, driven by a deep-rooted sense of purpose and the longing to protect their ancestral homeland, engaged in intense street-to-street combat against Jordanian forces. The Old City of Jerusalem, with its sacred sites and ancient stones, became a battleground, echoing with the sounds of gunfire and the cries of the wounded.

But the drama did not stop there. As the Israeli forces fought on multiple fronts, the Syrian Golan Heights stood as a formidable challenge. Israeli tanks roared up the steep slopes, defying gravity and the odds. Amidst the thunderous explosions, bravery and desperation intertwined as soldiers hurled themselves into the abyss of battle, their fate hanging in the balance.

Amid the chaos, the fate of nations hung in the balance. The world watched, gripped by a mixture of horror and fascination, as the outcome of this titanic struggle remained uncertain. Diplomatic efforts flickered like a dim candle, their efficacy overshadowed by the fire and fury on the ground.

But fate had chosen its path. Within six days, a mere blink of an eye in the annals of history, Israel emerged triumphant. The Arab armies, battered and broken, retreated in disarray. The Israeli flag, a symbol of resilience and defiance, now fluttered proudly over the territories it had captured.

The aftermath of the war was profound. Borders were redrawn, ancient cities and sacred sites changed hands, and the geopolitical landscape of the Middle East shifted dramatically. The scars of battle ran deep, seared into the collective memory of nations forever altered by the crucible of war.

The Six-Day War of 1967 left an indelible mark on history, forever etching its name into the consciousness of generations. It was a clash of wills, a collision of ancient grudges and contemporary aspirations, played out on a stage where the stakes were nothing short of existence itself.

United Nations Security Council Resolution 242

United Nations Security Council Resolution 242, adopted on November 22, 1967, is one of the most significant and influential resolutions regarding the Israeli-Arab conflict. It was passed in the aftermath of the Six-Day War in 1967 and aimed to provide a framework for achieving a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. Here's an overview of the key elements and implications of Resolution 242:

1. **Land for Peace principle:** Resolution 242 called for the principle of "land for peace," emphasizing the need for Israel to withdraw from territories occupied during the war in exchange for the recognition and acceptance of its sovereignty and right to live within secure and recognized borders.
2. **Withdrawal from occupied territories:** The resolution called for the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied during the conflict, including the Sinai Peninsula, the West Bank (including East Jerusalem), the Gaza Strip, and the Golan Heights. However, the resolution did not specify a complete withdrawal from all territories.
3. **Recognition of sovereignty and security:** Resolution 242 recognized the right of every state in the region, including Israel, to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries, free from threats or acts of force. It emphasized the importance of acknowledging and respecting the sovereignty, territorial integrity, and political independence of all states in the region.
4. **Negotiations and peaceful settlement:** The resolution stressed the necessity of achieving a just and lasting peace through negotiations between the parties involved. It called for negotiations to be based on several principles, including the non-acquisition of territory by force, respect for the sovereignty and political independence of all states in the region, and the rights of refugees to return or receive compensation.
5. **Role of the United Nations:** Resolution 242 affirmed the Security Council's role in promoting and assisting the peace process, urging the Secretary-General to designate a special representative or envoy to facilitate negotiations and implementation of the resolution.
6. **Scope of the resolution:** Resolution 242 explicitly acknowledged that a just and lasting peace would require addressing all aspects of the Middle East conflict, including the refugee problem and the secure and recognized boundaries of all states in the region.

Israeli Prime Minister Levi Eshkol initially expressed reservations about the resolution, particularly regarding the ambiguity surrounding the extent of Israeli withdrawal from the occupied territories. However, Israel eventually accepted the resolution as a basis for negotiations and engaged in diplomatic efforts to shape its interpretation in a manner that aligned with its national interests.

The Arab states' reactions to Resolution 242 varied. Egypt and Jordan, which had lost territories to Israel during the Six-Day War, rejected the resolution because it did not specify

a complete Israeli withdrawal from all occupied territories. They argued that it fell short of their demands for a full restoration of pre-war borders.

Syria vehemently opposed Resolution 242, as it did not explicitly address the return of the Golan Heights, which had been occupied by Israel. Syria rejected any negotiations that did not guarantee a full Israeli withdrawal from the Golan Heights, leading to continued hostilities between the two countries.

At the time of Resolution 242's adoption, the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) was not included in the negotiations. The PLO initially rejected the resolution, demanding the complete liberation of Palestine and the establishment of a Palestinian state.

Khartoum Resolution

The Khartoum Resolution was a joint declaration issued by Arab leaders during a summit held in Khartoum, Sudan, in September 1967, shortly after the conclusion of the Six-Day War between Israel and the Arab states. The resolution was a response to the United Nations Security Council Resolution 242, which was passed in the aftermath of the war. Here are the key aspects and implications of the Khartoum Resolution:

1. **The Three No's:** The Khartoum Resolution is famously known for its declaration of the "Three No's":
 - a. **No peace with Israel:** The Arab states declared that they would not negotiate or make peace with Israel.
 - b. **No recognition of Israel:** The Arab states refused to recognize the state of Israel.
 - c. **No negotiations with Israel:** The Arab states rejected any form of direct negotiations with Israel.
2. **Rejection of territorial compromise:** The Khartoum Resolution reiterated the Arab states' refusal to accept any territorial compromise with Israel, emphasizing their commitment to the "full liberation of Palestine."
3. **Unity and solidarity:** The resolution expressed Arab unity and solidarity in the face of Israeli occupation and aggression, reaffirming their support for the Palestinian cause.
4. **Rejecting peace initiatives:** The Khartoum Resolution rejected any peace initiatives or proposals that did not fully meet the Arab states' demands, particularly the complete withdrawal of Israeli forces from the territories occupied during the Six-Day War.
5. **Impact on negotiations:** The Three No's of the Khartoum Resolution created significant challenges for peace negotiations between Israel and the Arab states. The resolution effectively closed the door to immediate negotiations and led to a period of diplomatic stagnation in the region.

In conclusion, the Khartoum Resolution's analysis reveals a staunch commitment to Arab unity and solidarity in the face of Israeli occupation. The Three No's embodied the uncompromising position of the Arab states, rejecting peace, recognition, and negotiations with Israel.

Jarring Mission

The Jarring Mission refers to the diplomatic initiative led by Swedish diplomat Gunnar Jarring, who served as the United Nations Special Representative for the Middle East. The mission took place in the aftermath of the Six-Day War in 1967 and aimed to facilitate negotiations and bridge the gap between Israel and the Arab states.

1. **Mission Objectives:** The primary objective of the Jarring Mission was to bring Israel and the Arab states to the negotiating table based on the principles outlined in United Nations Security Council Resolution 242. Resolution 242 called for the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the territories occupied during the war and recognition of the sovereignty, territorial integrity, and political independence of all states in the region.
2. **Mediation Efforts:** Gunnar Jarring embarked on a series of diplomatic visits to key countries in the region, including Israel, Egypt, Jordan, and Syria. He held numerous discussions with political leaders, engaging in shuttle diplomacy and attempting to bridge the gaps between the parties involved.
3. **Negotiation Attempts:** Jarring encouraged direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab states, seeking to facilitate dialogue and encourage compromise. He proposed confidence-building measures and explored potential frameworks for resolving outstanding issues, such as border disputes and the status of Jerusalem.
4. **Limited Success:** Despite Jarring's efforts, the Jarring Mission achieved limited success in its primary goal of facilitating negotiations. Both Israel and the Arab states held firm on their positions, with Israel insisting on direct negotiations and the Arab states demanding Israeli withdrawal from occupied territories as a precondition.
5. **Stagnation and Aftermath:** The Jarring Mission faced several obstacles that hindered progress. The Arab states remained committed to the Three No's declared in the Khartoum Resolution, and Israel insisted on direct negotiations without preconditions. As a result, the mission gradually reached a stalemate, failing to achieve substantial breakthroughs or substantial progress toward a comprehensive peace settlement.

In conclusion, the Jarring Mission represented a significant diplomatic effort to mediate between Israel and the Arab states after the Six-Day War.

Rogers Plan

The Rogers Plan, officially known as the "United States Proposal for Peace in the Middle East," was a diplomatic initiative introduced by U.S. Secretary of State William P. Rogers in December 1969. The plan aimed to address the Israeli-Arab conflict and establish a framework for peace negotiations in the region.

1. **Background:** During the late 1960s, the Israeli-Arab conflict remained unresolved, marked by tensions, military skirmishes, and diplomatic impasses. Against this backdrop, Secretary of State Rogers sought to develop a comprehensive plan that would bring the parties to the negotiation table and pave the way for a lasting peace settlement.
2. **Objectives:** The Rogers Plan had several key objectives:
 - **Ceasefire:** The plan called for an immediate and comprehensive ceasefire between the parties involved, aiming to halt the ongoing violence and hostilities.
 - **Negotiations:** It aimed to create an environment conducive to negotiations, encouraging direct talks between Israel and the Arab states.
 - **Land for Peace:** The plan emphasized the principle of "land for peace," suggesting that Israel would be required to withdraw from territories captured during the Six-Day War in exchange for recognition and normalized relations with the Arab states.
 - **Security Arrangements:** The plan sought to establish security arrangements that would provide assurances to all parties involved and ensure the stability of the region.
3. **Proposal Details:** The Rogers Plan proposed a step-by-step approach to achieving peace in the Middle East. The plan consisted of four main phases:
 - **Phase 1: Ceasefire and Military Disengagement:** The immediate objective was to achieve a comprehensive ceasefire and disengagement of forces on all fronts.
 - **Phase 2: Negotiations and Withdrawal:** Once a ceasefire was established, negotiations would commence, to reach agreements on Israeli withdrawal from occupied territories.
 - **Phase 3: Final Settlement Negotiations:** Negotiations would address the final status of the territories, including the question of borders, refugees, and the status of Jerusalem.
 - **Phase 4: Implementation and Peace Treaty:** The final phase focused on implementing the agreements reached and concluding a comprehensive peace treaty between the parties involved.
4. **Reception and Implications:** The Rogers Plan received mixed reactions from the parties involved. Israel expressed reservations, primarily regarding the proposed withdrawal and concerns about the security of its borders. Arab states, while generally welcoming the plan, emphasized the need for Israel to fully withdraw from occupied territories.

Ultimately, the plan did not gain sufficient traction or consensus among the parties involved. It faced various obstacles, including deep-seated mistrust, differing interpretations of the

plan's provisions, and political dynamics within the region. The plan's implementation remained elusive, and the conflict continued to persist.

War of Attrition

The War of Attrition, also known as the War of Exhaustion, was a period of protracted conflict between Israel and Egypt that lasted from 1967 to 1970. It occurred in the aftermath of the Six-Day War, during which Israel captured the Sinai Peninsula from Egypt. The War of Attrition was characterized by frequent military engagements, border clashes, and intermittent artillery bombardments.

1. **Causes and Objectives:** The primary cause of the War of Attrition was the unresolved Israeli-Egyptian conflict following the Six-Day War. Egypt sought to regain control of the Sinai Peninsula and break the Israeli occupation. Both sides aimed to wear each other down through a war of attrition, hoping to gain strategic advantages and leverage for future negotiations.
2. **Initial Stages and Border Clashes:** The conflict began shortly after the Six-Day War, with Egypt launching small-scale incursions and sporadic artillery attacks against Israeli positions in the Sinai. Israel responded with retaliatory strikes, intensifying the cycle of violence along the Suez Canal and the Sinai border.
3. **Military Operations:**
 - **Air and Artillery Attacks:** Egypt employed Soviet-supplied surface-to-air missiles (SAMs) to target Israeli aircraft, leading to significant losses for both sides. Israeli forces, in turn, conducted air raids against Egyptian military infrastructure and strategic targets.
 - **Ground Operations:** Israel initiated several ground incursions into Egyptian territory to disrupt Egyptian military capabilities and fortifications.
4. **International Involvement:** International powers, including the United States and the Soviet Union, sought to mitigate the conflict and prevent its escalation into a full-scale war. Diplomatic efforts were made to broker ceasefires and negotiations, including the Jarring Mission led by UN envoy Gunnar Jarring.
5. **Impact on Civilians and Infrastructure:** The war had a profound impact on civilian populations in both Israel and Egypt. The continuous shelling and aerial bombings resulted in civilian casualties and significant damage to infrastructure, particularly in border towns and areas close to the Suez Canal.
6. **Stalemate and Ceasefire:** The War of Attrition eventually reached a stalemate as both sides realized the limitations of the strategy. Neither Israel nor Egypt could achieve a decisive military victory, and the cost of continuing the conflict was high. In August 1970, a ceasefire brokered by the United States and the Soviet Union came into effect, officially ending the hostilities.
7. **Geographical Information:**
 - **Sinai Peninsula:**
 1. Intense fighting and military operations took place in the Sinai Peninsula, which was captured by Israel during the Six-Day War.
 2. The region witnessed ground offensives, air raids, and artillery exchanges as both Israel and Egypt sought control over strategic positions.

3. Significant damage was inflicted on infrastructure, including roads, buildings, and military installations.
- Suez Canal:
 4. The Suez Canal, a crucial waterway linking the Mediterranean Sea and the Red Sea, played a significant role during the war.
 5. Egypt attempted to disrupt Israeli shipping and imposed a blockade on the canal, hindering Israeli access.
 6. The canal was targeted by Israeli airstrikes and naval operations to hamper Egyptian control.
 - Gaza Strip:
 1. The Gaza Strip, a Palestinian territory bordering Israel and Egypt, was heavily impacted.
 2. Israel conducted airstrikes, artillery shelling, and ground incursions into the Gaza Strip to disrupt Egyptian military infrastructure.
 3. The civilian population in Gaza faced displacement, destruction of homes, and loss of life.
 - Israel's Southern Border:
 1. Israel's southern border, adjacent to the Sinai Peninsula and the Gaza Strip, experienced frequent border clashes.
 2. Egypt launched cross-border attacks and artillery shelling into Israeli communities, prompting Israeli retaliation.
 3. The security concerns along the southern border disrupted the lives of civilians living in communities near the frontlines.

In conclusion, the War of Attrition was a prolonged and intense phase of conflict between Israel and Egypt following the Six-Day War. Characterized by frequent military engagements and border clashes, the war resulted in a stalemate and highlighted the need for diplomatic efforts to achieve a lasting peace settlement in the region.

Black September

1. Hijacking of TWA Flight 840:
 - On August 29, 1970, members of the Palestinian militant group Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) hijacked TWA Flight 840 en route from Rome to Tel Aviv.
 - The hijackers diverted the plane to the Jordanian desert and demanded the release of Palestinian prisoners held in Israeli jails.
2. Jordanian Crackdown:
 - Following the hijacking, tensions between Palestinian militant groups and the Jordanian government escalated rapidly.
 - King Hussein of Jordan saw the growing power and influence of the Palestinian factions as a threat to his regime and the stability of the country.
 - The Jordanian military, under the leadership of the Arab Legion, launched an offensive against the Palestinian militants, to drive them out of Jordan.
3. Battle of Amman:
 - The most intense and prolonged battle of the Black September events took place in the Jordanian capital, Amman.
 - Palestinian militants, including elements of Black September, fortified themselves in Palestinian refugee camps such as Baqaa, Amari, and Jabal Hussein.
 - The Jordanian Armed Forces, backed by tanks, artillery, and air power, launched a full-scale assault on these camps, leading to heavy casualties and extensive damage.
4. Eviction and Relocation:
 - As the battle intensified, King Hussein decided to expel the Palestinian militant groups from Jordan.
 - The Jordanian forces forcibly evicted the militants and their leaders from the country, leading to their relocation primarily to Lebanon.
 - This expulsion significantly weakened the influence of the Palestinian groups within Jordan but also contributed to their concentration and radicalization in Lebanon, where they continued their armed struggle against Israel.
5. International Reactions:
 - The Black September events drew international attention and concern.
 - The involvement of Western hostages in the hijackings, as well as the Jordanian military offensive and expulsion, prompted responses from various countries and organizations.
 - The United States and other Western nations expressed support for King Hussein's efforts to maintain control and stability in Jordan while also condemning the tactics and violence employed by the Palestinian militants.

Military Preparation

Prior to the outbreak of the Yom Kippur War, all sides involved engaged in extensive military training and preparations. Here is an overview of the military training efforts undertaken by Israel, Egypt, and Syria:

Israel:

1. Regular Training:
 - Israel maintained a robust and well-trained military force following the Six-Day War. Its armed forces had a reputation for discipline, professionalism, and innovation.
 - Regular training exercises were conducted to enhance operational readiness and maintain a high level of combat effectiveness.
2. Intelligence Gathering:
 - Israel's military intelligence agencies played a crucial role in gathering information on Arab military capabilities and intentions.
 - Intelligence units closely monitored Egyptian and Syrian military activities, including the acquisition of advanced weaponry from the Soviet Union.
3. Air Force:
 - The Israeli Air Force (IAF) underwent rigorous training programs, focusing on aerial combat tactics, close air support, and interdiction operations.
 - Pilots and ground crews participated in simulated combat scenarios and conducted live-fire exercises to enhance their proficiency.
4. Ground Forces:
 - Israeli ground forces, including infantry, armored units, and artillery, regularly conducted combined-arms training exercises.
 - Emphasis was placed on offensive and defensive operations, urban warfare, and counterinsurgency tactics.

Egypt:

1. Soviet Training and Equipment:
 - In the years leading up to the Yom Kippur War, Egypt received significant military assistance from the Soviet Union.
 - Soviet advisors provided training and guidance to Egyptian military units, focusing on modern armored warfare, air defense, and infantry tactics.
2. Crossings over the Suez Canal:
 - Egyptian forces conducted extensive training exercises to prepare for the planned crossing of the Suez Canal.
 - Amphibious assault training, engineering operations, and coordination between infantry and armored units were key components of their training regimen.
3. Air Defence:
 - Egypt established a comprehensive air defense network along the Suez Canal, comprising surface-to-air missile systems, radar installations, and anti-aircraft artillery.
 - Training efforts focused on effectively utilizing these systems to counter Israeli air superiority.

Syria:

1. Soviet Training and Equipment:

- Similar to Egypt, Syria received substantial military support from the Soviet Union, including advanced weaponry and training assistance.
 - Soviet advisors provided training and expertise in armored warfare, air defense, and infantry operations.
2. Offensive Operations:
- Syrian forces conducted training exercises to improve their offensive capabilities, particularly in regaining control of the Golan Heights.
 - Combined arms exercises involving tanks, artillery, and infantry were carried out to enhance coordination and effectiveness.
3. Air Force:
- The Syrian Air Force engaged in training programs aimed at enhancing air combat skills and ground attack capabilities.
 - Pilots underwent simulated combat scenarios, aerial maneuvers, and target engagement exercises.

Both Egypt and Syria sought to exploit their access to Soviet military technology by training their forces in the effective use of these advanced systems. Meanwhile, Israel focused on maintaining its military edge through continuous training, intelligence gathering, and the development of innovative tactics.

Build Up to the War

Leading up to the outbreak of the Yom Kippur War on October 6th, 1973, several significant events and days had an impact on the course of the conflict. Here are the notable days before October 6th, 1973, with significant implications:

1. September 25th, 1973:
 - Egyptian and Syrian forces began massing troops along their respective borders with Israel in preparation for an imminent attack.
 - This build-up of forces signaled escalating tensions and the possibility of an impending conflict.
2. October 1st, 1973 (Rosh Hashanah):
 - The Jewish holiday of Rosh Hashanah began, as a day of fasting and religious observance.
 - The Israeli military, under past patterns, anticipated a low likelihood of an Arab attack during this period, thereby partially lowering their guard.
3. October 5th, 1973 (Day of Atonement):
 - The Jewish holiday of Yom Kippur, also known as the Day of Atonement, commenced.
 - Israeli intelligence received multiple warnings indicating an imminent Arab attack but considered the possibility of an assault on this holiest day for the Jewish people as remote.
 - Israeli military preparedness remained at a relatively low level, with a significant reduction in operational activities.

Guide to a Crisis

This committee will be a semi-crisis committee, i.e., the executive board will open the floor for directives/ communiques/ press releases every once in a while. For those unfamiliar with crisis committees, do refer to the following “crisis tools” to navigate your way through the committee.

Crisis tools are of the following types:

1. **Crisis Notes:** As a delegate in this committee, you can send a crisis note to the Executive Board, which is a crisis tool containing the actions you want your country to take in light of the predicament. While writing crisis notes, delegates must keep the capabilities of their nations in mind. The Executive Board has complete discretion over the status of acceptance of the crisis note, and if accepted, the EB may choose to include or exclude the results of accepted crisis notes in crisis breaks.

Crisis notes can be of two types: overt and covert. The text of an overt crisis note, if accepted, shall be read out to the Council, whereas the actions and details of covert crisis notes shall not be disclosed to the Council. Results of such crisis notes, however, may be notified to the committee through crisis breaks. Crisis Notes are written only by one delegation and are not a collaborative effort.

2. **Directives:** A directive is a note containing collaborative actions between two or more delegations, and includes all actions taken by each party. Directives can be of two types: joint and committee wide. A joint directive contains actions by multiple delegations but is not subject to approval by the Council, whereas a committee-wide directive is put to vote in the Council and is subject to the exercise of veto (as this is the Security Council). A committee-wide directive must receive nine affirmatives. A directive requires no notes and no veto to pass. The Executive Board has the discretion to accept any joint directive. A joint directive can be overt or covert.

3. **Communiques:** These are crisis tools that delegates can use to communicate with people or nations not present in the Council before taking any action, or to aid any action in a crisis note or directive. For example, a delegate can write a communique to a nation not present in the committee, requesting military or monetary support from the nation to complement their actions.

4. **Press Releases:** If any delegation wants to make a statement to press agencies across the globe, and hence people worldwide, they must write a press release. A press release need not be addressed to anyone in particular.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the events leading up to the Yom Kippur War in 1973 were characterized by rising tensions, unresolved conflicts, and extensive military preparations. The aftermath of the Six-Day War, the War of Attrition, and the ongoing Arab-Israeli conflict set the stage for a major confrontation in the Middle East.

Israel, Egypt, and Syria engaged in significant military training and build-up. Israel, known for its disciplined armed forces, maintained a state of readiness and continuously monitored the activities of its Arab neighbours. Egypt and Syria received substantial military support from the Soviet Union, enhancing their capabilities and strengthening their resolve to challenge Israeli dominance.

Strategic planning and intelligence gathering played crucial roles during this period. Israel's intelligence agencies closely monitored the military activities of Egypt and Syria, while Arab nations sought to exploit their access to Soviet military technology and expertise.

The events leading up to the war demonstrated the deep-rooted grievances, territorial disputes, and political aspirations that fuelled the conflict. They also highlighted the delicate balance of power and the potential for escalation in the region. The Yom Kippur War would prove to be a pivotal moment in the Arab-Israeli conflict, with far-reaching consequences for regional dynamics, diplomacy, and military strategies.

Understanding the complexities and context of the events preceding the Yom Kippur War provides valuable insights into the causes and dynamics of the conflict, shedding light on the challenges and complexities of achieving lasting peace in the Middle East.

Position Paper Details

The position paper must be submitted to unhsc.dnmun23@gmail.com by the **4th of July**, failure of which may lead to disqualification from any awards.

The position paper can contain: -

- An introduction stating your country's perspective on the assigned topic,
- A brief historical context explaining your country's stance,
- A comprehensive presentation of your country's policy, supported by strong arguments and evidence,
- An overview of previous actions and resolutions taken, proposed solutions or recommendations, identification of potential alliances or collaborations, acknowledgment of challenges or counter-arguments,
- A concluding statement emphasizing the commitment to finding a resolution.

Basic Format of a Position Paper

Position Paper of the (country)

From: The delegation of (country)

To: The Executive Board

Committee: The United Nations Historic Security Council

Agenda: the Yom Kippur War

(content)

- You can include additional details such as your country's flag and emblem.
- Submit the Position Paper via either Word Document or PDF and **not** as a Google Docs.