



**Committee:** Historical Security Council

**Presidents:** Jaroslav Vlasak & Juan Mateo Medina

**Topic A:**

The Implementation of Glasnost and Perestroika in Eastern

**Topic B:**

The Oil Crisis of 1973

## Table of Contents

<b>Letter from the Chair</b> .....	3
<b>Introduction to Committee</b> .....	4
<b>Topic A: The issue of private and public lobbying on policy making</b> .....	5
Introduction .....	5
Historical Context .....	5
Current Situation .....	10
Major Bloc Positions .....	10
Guiding Questions .....	11
Sources.....	11
<b>Topic B: Venezuela and the Oil Trade</b> .....	13
Introduction .....	13
Historical Context .....	14
Current Situation .....	15
Major Bloc Positions .....	16
Guiding Questions .....	17
Sources.....	18

**Letter from the Chair**

Greetings Delegates,

It is a pleasure to have you as part of CNGMUN XLI's Historical Security Council. The United Nations has been the core of international politics through the mid and late 20th century, as it became the catalyst for peaceful resolution and cooperative action amongst the international community. Model United Nations grants us the opportunity to recreate this historical period, being part of such an influential institution with the purpose of truly understanding past international crises and how these have shaped the contemporary global context.

Topic A, the Implementation of Glasnost and Perestroika in Eastern Europe, takes the committee to the final years of the Cold War where international cooperation takes charge in reforming Eastern European governments. Here you will discuss the bases for these reforms, whether they were at all necessary or if other options are better to consider.

Topic B, the Petrol Crisis of 1973, explores an economic and energetic crisis that takes its origin in religious and cultural tensions that broke into warfare within the Middle East. This topic will take the committee into a conflict reminiscent of modern tensions within the region and akin to current international economic and energetic crises.

Within the committee we expect all of you to be prepared for vigorous discussion through which we will not only learn the roots of the issues we face today but also the basis for effective and integral solutions.

With much anticipation,  
Jaroslav Vlasak González and Juan Mateo Medina

Contact us at [jarkovlasak212@gmail.com](mailto:jarkovlasak212@gmail.com) or [jmedina@cng.edu](mailto:jmedina@cng.edu)

Opening speeches are required for each topic and may not be longer than one minute thirty seconds.

### **Introduction to committee:**

The Security Council has existed since the foundation of the United Nations and is one of its six main organs. This committee is tasked with maintaining peace and security and also takes the lead in identifying any threat to them. The committee itself is composed of 5 permanent members that hold veto powers and 10 non-permanent ones that rotate every two years. In order for a resolution to pass 9 out of the 15 members of the Security Council must vote in favor and no veto power must vote against. Furthermore, every U.N. member must comply with any decision made by the Security Council.

The Security Council has the functions of:

- Maintaining peace and security in accordance to the principles of the United Nations
- Investigating conflicts which might lead to international friction
- Recommending solutions to disputes or terms of settlement
- Determining acts threatening to international peace and recommending proportional responses to them
- Calling members to apply economic sanctions and other diplomatic measures to prevent or stop aggression
- Taking military action against an aggressor
- Recommending on the admission of new Members
- Exercising the trusteeship functions of the United Nations in strategic areas ●
- Recommending the general Assembly on the appointment of the Secretary-General and on the election of the Judges of the International Court of Justice

The broad reach of the Security Council and its varied capabilities in turn make its resolutions precise, throughout, and most importantly decisive. These characteristics are expected to be seen within resolutions drafted in the committee.

While the Historical Security Council shares many traits with the Security Council, with the crucial difference is that the Historical Security Council takes place in the past. This means that existing policies and political environments vary depending on the current date of the committee.

Any event that occurred during the established date(s) will occur as happened historically. Furthermore, while sources from the current day may be used, it is important to take note what information your delegation has access to, for example if your delegation takes sides against the

US in either topic it can be deduced that your delegation won't know about US specific information.

## **Topic A: The Implementation of Glasnost and Perestroika in Eastern**

### **Europe Introduction:**

The eighth and final leader of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev, established a series of reforms for the Soviet Union with the goal of reviving its economy and establishing democratic values. These reform plans were called Glasnost (openness) and Perestroika (restructuring) which had the goal of changing Soviet society top to bottom. At their core, Glasnost and Perestroika were policy plans that sought to transition the U.S.S.R. toward the structure of Western States.

These policy plans were implemented in the Soviet Union along with being recommended to Eastern European socialist countries (Including Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Hungary, and Bulgaria). Due to Gorbachev's leadership, there was a new sense of political self-determination in Eastern Europe, as each of them implemented Glasnost and Perestroika in varying degrees or implemented other political and economic reforms.

Gorbachev's reforms had the purpose to reform the Communist State into one compatible with the global economy, a reform which could only be achieved with cooperation among the international community. Throughout the committee, you will discuss the implications and effectiveness of Glasnost and Perestroika in order to recommend to Eastern European countries how to implement, adapt, eliminate, or outright change such policies.

### **Historical Context:**

#### *Gorbachev and the Origin of Glasnost and Perestroika*

“The concept of the restructuring of the economic mechanism has now become clearer to us. In continuing to develop the centralized principle in the accomplishment of strategic tasks, we must more boldly advance along the path of expanding the rights of enterprises and their independence, introduce economic accountability and, on this basis, increase the responsibility and stake of labor collectives in the final results of work.”

– Mikhail Gorbachev, 1985

Gorbachev arrived to power during a period through which the Soviet Union was suffering economic stagnation, declining production, major shortages, and poor living conditions. The country's resources were being invested into the Soviet-Afghan war and any attempt at economic development suffered from a centralized and bureaucratic State (Shvangiradze, 2022). Gorbachev's response to these issues was creating integral reforms to the Soviet government and economy.

Perestroika was the foundation for an economic reform within the country. Its purpose was to create economic spaces through which individuals, independent of the State, would develop the country's economy. This would reduce the internal bureaucracy within the Soviet State and decentralize its economy. Among the laws meant to uphold this economic reform



was the 1987 Law on State Enterprise. The Law on State Enterprise gave enterprise autonomy in the management of output levels, which relied on consumer demand. In essence, this law allowed enterprises to function independently of the State to better respond to the current market demands. The State maintained ownership of the means of production, as these industries did not assume the

full costs of accountability. Nonetheless, the Law of State Enterprises entailed a massive change within Soviet industry (Shvangiradze, 2022). The Law on Cooperatives continued the chain of radical reforms in May of 1988. This law permitted the existence of collective ownership of enterprises in both the manufacturing and service sectors. This led to a transformation of life within the country as cooperative stores and restaurants became part of day-to-day life (Shvangiradze, 2022). Perestroika encompassed, in addition to those previously mentioned, other laws which sought drastic changes in the Soviet economy, which attempted to give individuals ownership and independence within this area of life.

Glasnost, instead, focused on creating a transparent media and perception of the outside world. This reform challenged the foundation of information control created during Stalin's regime. This decrease in censorship led to an outburst of civil liberties to Soviet society. With these liberties came the ability to see the living conditions within the U.S. and Western Europe and to criticize the government, even Gorbachev himself, without the fear of persecution.

While seemingly independent, these reforms' functionality is dependent on each other. Perestroika stimulates the economy by democratizing it and giving autonomy to workers. This is only effective if Glasnost is also implemented as it democratizes the political and public aspects of Soviet society. By stimulating the autonomy of the proletariat in both

areas of life, the supposed effect was an economic revival (Rakos, 1991).

Once implemented, Glasnost and Perestroika faced various problems. Primarily, these reforms in essence were contradictory to several principles of the Communist State. Perestroika went against the principles of State ownership held within Communism, and Glasnost eliminated the governmental authoritative strength required for general function. These contradictions created friction with members of the Communist Party which opposed Gorbachev's reforms. The failures of these reforms also came with their different pace. The accelerated implementation of Glasnost in comparison to Perestroika led to public upheaval which called for internal economic change, which the economic reform could not achieve at a proportional pace. In other words, Glasnost was too fast for Perestroika.



“We have irrevocably begun restructuring and have taken the first steps on this path ... At the same time, we see that changes for the better are taking place slowly, that the task of restructuring has turned out to be more difficult than it had seemed to us earlier, and that the causes of the problems that have accumulated in society are more deep-rooted than we had thought. The more deeply we go into restructuring work, the clearer its scale and importance become; more and more new unsolved problems inherited from the past are coming to light” – Mikhail Gorbachev, 1987.

### *Glasnost and Perestroika and its Perception in Eastern Europe*

Eastern Europe during the period was at the dawn of a social and political change. The newfound attitude of the USSR in terms of military suppression, non interventionism in Eastern Europe, and political and economic reforms created a situation within the region which fostered both changes and social upheaval. During this period, the Soviet Union no longer dictated the internal policy within Eastern Europe. This newfound autonomy led to Poland, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Romania, Hungary, and Bulgaria to develop different reform strategies within their countries. This flexibility was not completely beneficial for the Communist parties as this attitude also entailed that the Soviet Union would not intervene militarily according to the Brezhnev Doctrine, as it had done in the past to suppress social protest. This left after December



1988, Eastern European countries “defenseless” against their own population (Kozłowski, 2021). As mentioned in the introduction, Glasnost and Perestroika were meant to be replicated by other Communist States in Eastern Europe in an attempt to transition these countries into a more open international context market. Such policies were not forced upon each country, giving them autonomy in how they were implemented, if implemented at all. This flexibility resulted in a variety of proposals in each country which was intensified by the different social and economic needs each country had.

In the case of Poland, roundtable talks between the Communist government and union leaders descending from the Solidarity movement took place during February 1989. While the government had established martial law in an attempt to combat protestors, the absence of Soviet military support forced the State into negotiating with the movement. This space and the pressure created by protestors created the basis for the primary political and economic reforms for Poland. Among the most important agreements were the relegalization of Solidarity (unions), allowing the participation of other political parties, and future presidential elections. Social upheaval forced t reforms in the case of Poland (Kozłowski, 2021).



Meanwhile, in East Germany a quite different

situation took place. Erich Honecker and the Communist Party of Germany were against the establishment of any sort of reform to the economic and political systems of the country. This opposition even resulted in condemning the reforms that took place in neighboring countries such as Poland. Honecker stated, “We are anxious to find in each case such solutions as suit our national conditions best ... In the process, we would be well advised not to copy from the other socialist countries.” This divergence reached the point of censoring certain excerpts of Gorbachev’s speeches pertaining to reforms (Childs, 1989). The presence of the Berlin Wall in conjunction with institutions such as the Stasi allowed East Germany to control social upheaval in early 1989.



In contrast, Hungary looked at Glasnost and Perestroika with praise. Unlike other countries, Hungary's Communist party was composed of liberal leaders. This melded effectively with Gorbachev’s proposals. On the 27th of November of 1987, Hungarians were able to cross the Iron Curtain and on the 30th of December of the same year the creation of private companies was legalized (Bogdanova, n.d.). Political and economic policy advances within Hungary reached the point in which, by 1988, there was a McDonald's, a fast food chain representative of American





capitalist foundations, in Budapest, Bulgaria, Romania, and Czeslovakia, in turn, faced and responded differently to the ideological foundation and reform proposals created by Glasnost and Perestroika. Taking all of this into account, when understanding the possible effects and means for implementing different political and

economic reforms, it is important to understand the political and social differences amongst countries in Eastern Europe.

### *International Reaction to Glasnost and Perestroika*

Ronald Reagan's Evil Empire speech in 1983, compared to the New Year's Messages between Gorbachev and Reagan in 1989, depicts a clear transition in both U.S. and Soviet international relations. International cooperation was essential for the Communist bloc to political and economic transition. Glasnost and Perestroika's effectiveness depended on international assistance. Support from the World Bank in establishing transitional policies and bailouts in the debt of Eastern European countries was a necessity in the eyes of the Soviet State.

The reaction of Western Europe and the United States to Gorbachev's proposals were mixed. Glasnost on one hand was aligned with the democratic values held in the west but Perestroika, instead, was insufficient. While it created and strengthened a minor private sector, it did not go far enough. During this era, the primary method for economic stimulation supported by Western powers was mass privatization. This economic tactic developed by Milton Friedman had been fostered by the West and previously implemented in countries such as Chile (Orenstein, 1998). This economic policy aims to establish such change through shock. In turn, this entails an initial economic deterioration and a need for an authoritative government.



This difference in reform policies created a point of divergence between Soviet and Western interest, as while Gorbachev wanted to implement transitional reforms, Western Powers were interested in drastic and rapid changes.

## **Current Situation**

The date is February 27th 1989, and the world is at the dawn of change. Eastern Europe is undergoing constant transition through economic and political reforms proposed by the Soviet Union. The Berlin Wall stands high, roundtable talks in Poland between the Communist government and protests are progressing, and the need for change is ever present in the region. The Security Council will meet to discuss the implementation of Glasnost, Perestroika and/or other possible reforms in Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Hungary, and Romania.

## **Major Players**

### *Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*

The U.S.S.R. seeks to promote and make feasible the implementation of Glasnost and Perestroika reforms in Eastern Europe. This bloc is interested in creating transitional reforms for socialist States and wants to cooperate with Western nations to achieve such.

### *United States of America*

The U.S.' block is interested in pushing Friedman economics as the primary means of reforms in Eastern Europe. Moreover, the U.S. is interested in ending the humanitarian oppression present behind the Iron Curtain.

### *The People's Republic of China*

Unlike Eastern European Communism, China has followed a different form of Communism and correspondingly has reformed it under principles different to Glasnost and Perestroika. Interests among this bloc concentrate in pushing alternate principles for reforms within the region.

### *The German Democratic Republic*

This bloc strongly establishes that there should be no reforms carried out throughout Eastern Europe and instead the basis of European Communism should prevail.

### *The European Union*

This bloc integrates the interests of the European Union within the topic at hand, which prioritizes international cooperation and is interested in creating a common European

home.

### **Guiding Questions**

- Which Laws and Policies correlate to Glasnost and Perestroika reforms?
- How does each Eastern European country (Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria) vary in terms of political, economic, and social necessity?
- Is my delegation interested in a transitional reform or a drastic reform if any at all?
- What role does international cooperation hold in implementing my delegation's preferred reform?
- What are the implications of each policy option?
- What were the effects of Glasnost and Perestroika post Cold War?
- What were the effects of mass privatization in Eastern Europe?
- What capabilities has the Security Council have in recommending internal policy?
- How can my delegation integrate its proposal with other possible reforms?

### **Sources:**

Blanton, T. (n.d.). *The end of the Cold War*. The End of the Cold War | Wilson Center Digital Archive. Retrieved January 14, 2023, from <https://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/essays/end-cold-war>

Bogdanova, S. (n.d.). (rep.). *Glasnost and Perestroika in Hungary and East Germany*.

Childs, D. (1989). East Germany: Coping with Gorbachev. *Current History*, 88(541), 385–401. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/45316270>

Kozłowski, T. (2021, May 28). *The long route to Poland's Round Table Agreement*. Polish History. Retrieved January 14, 2023, from <https://polishhistory.pl/the-long-route-to-polands-round-table-agreement/>

Mikhail Gorbachev, on Convening the Regular 27th CPSU Congress and the Tasks Connected with Preparing and Holding it. (1985, May 22). *Seventeen Moments in Soviet History*. Retrieved January 14, 2023, from [https://soviethistory.msu.edu/1985-2/perestroika-and-glasnost/perestroika-and-glasnost-texts/gor\\_bachev-proposes-restructuring/](https://soviethistory.msu.edu/1985-2/perestroika-and-glasnost/perestroika-and-glasnost-texts/gor_bachev-proposes-restructuring/).

Mikhail Gorbachev, Report to the Plenary Session of the CPSU Central Committee. (1987, January 28). *Seventeen Moments in Soviet History*. Retrieved January 23, 2023, from [https://soviethistory.msu.edu/1985-2/perestroika-and-glasnost/perestroika-and-glasnost-texts/gor\\_bachev-challenges-the-party](https://soviethistory.msu.edu/1985-2/perestroika-and-glasnost/perestroika-and-glasnost-texts/gor_bachev-challenges-the-party)

Orenstein, M. (1998, February 26). *155. shock therapy in Latin America, Russia, and Eastern Europe*. Wilson Center. Retrieved January 14, 2023, from <https://www.wilsoncenter.org/publication/155-shock-therapy-latin-america-russia-and-eastern-europe>

Rakos, R. F. (1991). Perestroika, glasnost, and international cooperation: A behavior analysis. *Behavior and Social Issues*, 1(1), 91–100. <https://doi.org/10.5210/bsi.v1i1.191>

RICHDALE, K. G., & LIU, W. H. (1991). THE POLITICS OF “GLASNOST” IN CHINA, 1978–1990. *The Journal of East Asian Affairs*, 5(1), 104–143. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23254083>

Shvangiradze, T. (2022, February 11). *The Gorbachev era: Glasnost & perestroika pre-fall of the Soviet Union*. The Collector. Retrieved January 14, 2023, from <https://www.thecollector.com/gorbachev-era-glasnost-perestroika-fall-of-soviet-union/>

## **Topic B: The Oil Crisis of 1973**

**Start date of the Topic:** 18th of October 1973

### **Relevant dates**

#### **- 6th of October 1973**

- The Yom Kippur War begins, when the Arab Coalition, led by Egypt & Syria, attack Israel on the Jewish holy day of Yom Kippur or on the Islamic holy month of Ramadan.

#### **- 12th of October 1973**

- Both the USSR and the US begin operations to provide material support for their respective sides. Turning the regional conflict into a proxy conflict.

#### **- 17th of October 1973**

- Arab OPEC states institute an oil embargo on Israel's allies, namely, the United States, and cut production.

#### **- 18th of October 1973**

- Day of first committee session.

### **Introduction**

During a period of six months between October 1973 to March 1974, Arab oil producing countries of OPEC issued and enforced an oil embargo for those countries which supported Israel during the Yom Kippur War (6th to 25th of October 1973) which resulted in the first ever oil crisis. An oil crisis is defined by the sudden increase in the price of oil, often accompanied by the decrease in supply. This sort of economic crisis has quite the important consequences if not handled properly, as oil is the main source of energy for advanced industrial economies. This sort of crisis can endanger the economic and political stability of not only the directly affected countries, but also the global market.

During Topic B, delegates will have the opportunity to discuss and explore the possibilities for the solution to the crisis at hand, a crisis which left the industrialized world, and the non-industrialized world as well, at the will of the Arab coalition. Delegates will consciously debate and explore options to the ongoing crisis and propose solutions to solve the

crisis and conflict at hand and try to prevent it from ever happening.

### Historical Context

The 1973 oil crisis came as a surprise to many countries, unprepared and faced with the dire reality of the supreme importance of oil in advanced industrial economies the oil crisis would see effects such as, in the US, barren superhighways, fuel siphoned from parked cars, in all measures, it was paralyzing. While it didn't look the part of a large-scale crisis, its economic effects and possible political effects were a worry for large segments of the global population.

The crisis first originated in the 6-day war in 1967 with hostilities escalating with a preemptive strike by Israeli forces on Egyptian military air assets, this escalation would result in a lightning Israeli victory, (thus the name for the war) which resulted with Israel quadrupling its size, seizing the strategic Golan heights from Syria, the capture of the west bank and East Jerusalem, and Egypt losing the Gaza Strip and the strategic Sinai Peninsula. This was a disastrous defeat for the Arab coalition, which would continue through small-scale, sporadic fighting to regain control of the lost territories.

After the Six-day war and the death of Gamal Abdel Nasser, Anwar el-Sadat became president of Egypt, he found the country could ill afford to continue with the conflict, yet with the great successes from Israel in the Six-day war it was doubtful Israel



would agree to terms that favored Egypt with this in mind Anwar el-Sadat would go on to in 1972, expel 20,000 soviet advisors from Egypt and open up new diplomatic channels with the US while also forming a new alliance with Syria. With a new coalition being created to take back the territories taken by Israel in 1967

in a joint surprise attack, Egyptian and Syrian forces launched strikes on the 6th of October during Yom Kippur day, in the background the Soviet Union gave material support to its Arab allies while the US did the same with Israel further inflaming the war and bringing the two Superpowers once again in a proxy conflict.

Within 12 days, the Arab oil producing states issued and enforced an embargo on the United States and other Israel allies as the war started going in Israel's favor, further announcing monthly 5% cuts to oil production. These actions and first deployment of the "oil

weapon” would lead to oil quadrupling its price and leading to a recession in the most affected countries.

It is important to note that this escalation and deescalation of hostilities had been a common thing up to the crisis, which left it viewed mostly as a regional affair rather than a more reaching issue. As hostilities ensued during the days leading up to the crisis, many of the Arab nations started viewing oil as an effective weapon to have their political concerns heard as mostly they were underdeveloped militarily, economically, and politically. This so-called “oil weapon” which nowadays is viewed as ineffective had some wide-reaching issues such as the recession experienced between 1973 - 1975 in the United States and various oil shortages.

Several years before the crisis, negotiations between OPEC members had led to OPEC affixing the price of oil to gold after Nixon had removed the US dollar from the gold standard



which led to a devaluation of the dollar which hurt OPEC members who mostly gained in dollars, this decision would further the severity of the crisis to come. The demands from the Arab coalition were simple; return of the territories taken by Israel in the Six-day war, and the securing of their own financial interests, this set of interests from the Arab coalition laid clear the challenges and complications of US Middle East

policy, balancing staunch support for Israel and the preservation of close ties with the Arab oil-producing countries. With these challenges in mind, the Nixon administration began parallel negotiations with key oil producers to end the embargo, and with Egypt, Syria, and Israel to arrange an Israeli pullout from the Sinai and the Golan Heights. Initial discussions between Kissinger and Arab leaders began in November 1973.

### **Current Situation**

It's the 18th of October 1973, it's been a day since the oil embargo was announced and already worldwide the effects are starting to be felt with many advanced industrial economies already moving to secure their energy source, There are fears that the US might military intervene to secure its oil, but that would bring the Soviet Union into conflict as the western powers encroach in the Middle East. The Security Council has been called to see to the crisis before the oil crisis starts destabilizing the world and this regional issue spills further.

## Major Players

*United States of America* has a privileged position in this conflict, though tormented by the dual interests of supporting Israel and keeping good relations with the Arab oil-producing countries this position can easily be turned into one of strength or one of peace by mediation between the two parties of the conflict. Yet it must balance each decision carefully, lest this conflict grow.

*Union of Soviet Socialist Republics* while aloof from the conflict, the USSR supports the Arab Coalition with material and could easily use this position to further its interests in the Middle East, this position allows it to be flexible while also allowing it to further increase their support without much cost. The USSR must weigh their choices well, lest this proxy conflict grows into something larger as the capitalist economies feel the effects of the oil embargo.

*Israel* is under attack from a renewed Arab coalition with the newest Soviet technology, though its quick victory in 1967 is still in the minds of its people this war may not be the same as it was in 1967. Israel's material support from the United States provides it some security, it will have to keep lobbying the Americans to prevent a shift in interests as the oil embargo takes its toll on the American economy.

*Egypt* alongside its allies in the Arab coalition have made some gains at the beginning of the war, yet their position of dominance may change quickly with the memories of the six-day war still in the military and populace Egypt must secure its interests quickly or brave out prolonged war hoping the economic and political machinations in the background try to bring the Arab coalition a stronger position. Yet, Egypt mustn't forget its diplomatic channels with the US if it ever decides it cannot bear the cost of the war and decides to abandon its allies.

*Syria* has something to prove, with the loss of the strategic Golan heights and the rise of its new president Hafez Al-Assad, its position is supported by Soviet material support it must like its Arab allies secure their interest quickly, may it lobby for further support from other Warsaw pact nations or may it attempt to extend the war betting on the recently announced Arab oil embargo, its position is precarious, but it can easily turn it into one of strength if Syria can show leadership.

*Iraq* has sent forces to fight in this war, helping its allies in Egypt and Syria, further alongside the rest of the Arab oil-producing OPEC members Iraq has issued an embargo on key Israeli allies, its position allows it some flexibility, being one of the founding members of OPEC it could use its influence in OPEC to further the oil embargo to put pressure on the powers



supporting Israel. Alongside Syria, if Iraq shows leadership, it could easily extend the support for the Arab cause on the international stage.

*Saudi Arabia* the rich oil monarchs, have been uneasy on utilizing the oil weapon, yet the die have been cast, and it must quickly negotiate to secure its interests, and the interests of the rest of the Arab oil-producing countries, its ties with the US also give it a privileged position allowing Saudi Arabia to obtain a position of strength on those countries dependent on it expanding the oil embargo or seeking peace and being a mediator in the possible treaties to come.

*US Allied Delegations* the regional conflict has grown. As the Arab oil-producing countries enact an embargo on the United States and other key Israeli allies, the capitalist world is shocked by the first ever oil crisis and must rush to secure its energy supplies else it suffers the consequences of severe oil shortages, may the US allied delegations assist the US in securing a quick solution to this crisis now also proxy conflict or serve their own interests securing the most important oil is yet to be determined as the crisis develops.

*Soviet Allied Delegations* viewing the Arab oil-producing countries shock the world Soviet allies mustn't fear for the immediate consequences of this crisis, as the Soviet Union has its own vast reserves in the Caucuses, yet their interest for the regional conflict that sparked this crisis is small only providing some arms asked for by the Soviets, whether that may continue to be the case going forward is still up in the air as the sides of this conflict start searching for allies in securing their own interests. One thing is for sure, if the Soviet Union decides to throw its weight in the crisis, the Warsaw pact nations are sure to follow.

### ***Guiding Questions***

- How may your delegation's primary interest affect their actions during the committee?  
Would they try to seek peace and reconciliation, or would they try to profit from the crisis?
- What possible actions can your delegation start to lessen the effects of the oil crisis, or what steps can it continue to widen such effects?
- What international trade relationships supply your delegation with energy, and how could these be strengthened/modified?

- How is your delegation currently being impacted by the oil crisis?
- How can your delegation contribute in terms of economic, humanitarian, or military assistance to a solution?
- What are the capabilities and limits of the Security Council in regard to the Yom Kippur War?
- What are the capabilities and limits of the Security Council in regard to the oil crisis?
- Your delegation is tasked with coming up with the solution to the crisis and conflict, what solution would your delegation propose to best serve its interests?
- Looking at the different situations of the other delegations, what can you deduce from their situations about what their interests are going to be?
- What delegations are your allies? Your enemies?
- How can my delegation use diplomacy to achieve its goals? What can you achieve through cooperation? What can you achieve through other diplomacy?

### Sources

Britannica, T. Editors of Encyclopaedia (2022, August 22). Yom Kippur War. Encyclopedia Britannica. <https://www.britannica.com/event/Yom-Kippur-War>

Kettell, S. (2020, January 31). oil crisis. Encyclopedia Britannica. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/oil-crisis>

Britannica, T. Editors of Encyclopaedia (2020, October 1). Arab oil embargo. Encyclopedia Britannica. <https://www.britannica.com/event/Arab-oil-embargo>

Issawi, C. (1978). The 1973 Oil Crisis and After. *Journal of Post Keynesian Economics*, 1(2), 3–26. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4537467>

GRAF, R. (2012). Making Use of the “Oil Weapon”: Western Industrialized Countries and Arab Petropolitics in 1973-1974. *Diplomatic History*, 36(1), 185–208.

<http://www.jstor.org/stable/44376141>

Office of the Historian. (n.d.). *Oil Embargo, 1973–1974*. Office of the Historian.

Retrieved January 10, 2023, from

<https://history.state.gov/milestones/1969-1976/oil-embargo>

Al Jazeera. (2018, October 8). *The October Arab-Israeli War of 1973: What happened?*

Al Jazeera. Retrieved January 10, 2023, from

<https://www.aljazeera.com/features/2018/10/8/the-october-arab-israeli-war-of-1973-what-happened>

DAVIES, J. (2014). OIL SHOCKED: A MICROHISTORY OF THE FIRST DAYS OF THE ENERGY CRISIS, OCTOBER 16-27, 1973. *Australasian Journal of American Studies*, 33(1), 51–72. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44706137>

Painter, D. S. (2014). Oil and Geopolitics: The Oil Crises of the 1970s and the Cold War. *Historical Social Research / Historische Sozialforschung*, 39(4 (150)), 186–208.

<http://www.jstor.org/stable/24145533>