SHIS MUN 2025

CONTINUOUS CRISIS COMMITTEE

BACKGROUND GUIDE

LETTER FROM THE EXECUTIVE BOARD

Greetings!

We would like to tell you that it gives us immense pleasure to serve as your Executive Board for the simulation of the CCC at SHISMUN 2025!

We have made a background guide to help you kick start your research. The background guide has been written with the thought that it will serve as a map for you to navigate through the mass of information which you may cross in your preparation for the conference. It will guide you to understand the different angles to the forthcoming discussion, a sort of a reflection of what is in store for you. Thus, as the name "map" may be hinting, it will not provide you with all the information or analysis on the agenda at hand but a path for you to carry out your research. For doing that, your research has to be comprehensive and non-exhaustive. More importantly, you have to understand your research and be able to use it. In other words, your research documents are not your arguments. You use your research to form your argument; your research cannot be your only argument. That is where analysis steps in.

It is extremely important for you to listen to everything other delegates talk about in the committee, so don't keep yourself too occupied writing your own speeches, but truly listen to what other delegates speak in the committee. It will help you give direction to the debate happening in the committee and also some point to elaborate on or rebuttal.

With regards to that, try not to read from documents without really understanding what they mean and try forming your own arguments based on what you read in those documents. The trick here is to make sure you make notes of the documents that you have read and formulate arguments from the same.

To start, you can briefly read about the agenda and break down the agenda in various subtopics that exist within that agenda, now these topics that you have written are also the topics that will be discussed in the committee as the moderated caucus topics. All that you have to do now is to research the subtopics of the agenda that we have written.
Now when you research on particular subtopics, you don't just jot down information that you have collected through various articles, but rather try to make an argument for that subtopic while researching or simply provide your countries viewpoint on the given sub topic. Logic and foreign policy combined with in-depth research and knowledge are necessary to be a successful delegate. As delegates, you are expected to promote the interests of your nation and as delegates of representing different nations, you are required to know your foreign policy on the agenda and the issues related to the same. Try to highlight the same during the tTWO days of the conference. Having said that, if you have any questions or doubts pertaining to any matters concerning this committee, please feel free to contact us. We shall be happy to help!

Waleed Ahmar	Ruhaan Mahajan
(Director Of Mossad)	(Crisis Director)

About United Nations

The United Nations was established on October 24, 1945. The United Nations (UN) was the second multipurpose international organisation established in the 20th century that was worldwide in scope and membership. Its predecessor, the League of Nations, was created by the Treaty of Versailles in 1919 and disbanded in 1946. Headquartered in New York City, the UN also has regional offices in Geneva, Vienna, and Nairobi. Its official languages are Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian, and Spanish. For a list of UN member countries and secretaries-general. In addition to maintaining peace and security, other important objectives include developing friendly relations among countries based on respect for the principles of equal rights and self-determination of peoples; achieving worldwide cooperation to solve international economic, social, cultural, and humanitarian problems; respecting and promoting human rights; and serving as a centre where countries can coordinate their actions and activities toward these various ends.

Changes in the nature of international relations resulted in modifications in the responsibilities of the UN and its decision-making apparatus. Cold War tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union deeply affected the UN's security functions during its first 45 years. Extensive post-World War II decolonization in Africa, Asia, and the Middle East increased the volume and nature of political, economic, and social issues that confronted the organisation. The Cold War's end in 1991 brought renewed attention and appeals to the UN. Amid an increasingly volatile geopolitical climate, there were new challenges to established practices and functions, especially in the areas of conflict resolution and humanitarian assistance. At the beginning of the 21st century, the UN and its programs and affiliated agencies struggled to address humanitarian crises and civil wars.

ABOUT THE COMMITTEE

The Continuous Crisis Committee (CCC) is a distinctive and dynamic simulation within the Model United Nations (MUN) framework. Unlike traditional committees that follow a structured agenda and predetermined topics, the CCC mimics real-world decision-making by presenting delegates with continuously evolving crises. The committee's design challenges participants to respond to unforeseen developments and rapidly changing scenarios, reflecting the unpredictable nature of real international diplomacy and crisis management.

Delegates are immersed in a simulation where scenarios are fluid and subject to change. This could involve anything from geopolitical conflicts and humanitarian emergencies to economic crises and environmental disasters. The committee's hallmark is its emphasis on crisis management, requiring delegates to make swift decisions, engage in strategic planning, and navigate complex negotiations. The interdisciplinary nature of these crises means that delegates must draw on knowledge from various fields, including international relations, security studies, and humanitarian aid.

The structure of the CCC includes several key roles. The Chair oversees the sessions, introduces new developments, and ensures the simulation progresses smoothly. They facilitate debates and guide discussions to keep the committee focused and productive. The Crisis Staff, composed of experts and role players, provide updates on the evolving situation, offer insights, and assist delegates in understanding the ramifications of their decisions. Delegates, representing various countries, organizations, or other entities, are tasked with responding to crises, proposing solutions, and negotiating with other participants.

The primary objectives of the CCC are to foster adaptability, strategic thinking, negotiation skills, and collaboration. Delegates must be flexible, adapting to new information and changing scenarios. Strategic thinking is crucial for making informed decisions that balance immediate needs with long-term outcomes. Effective negotiation and diplomacy are essential for resolving conflicts and building consensus, while collaboration among delegates is key to developing and implementing successful strategies.

Scenarios in the CCC can vary widely, but typical situations include responses to geopolitical conflicts, humanitarian emergencies, economic crises, and environmental challenges. For example, delegates might address sudden escalations in regional conflicts, manage the impact of a natural disaster or disease outbreak, respond to economic disruptions or trade issues, or tackle environmental disasters and resource shortages.

Delegates should conduct thorough research on potential crisis scenarios, stay informed about current global events, and develop crisis management skills. Familiarity with decision-making under pressure, effective negotiation techniques, and adaptive strategies will be advantageous. Engaging in role-playing exercises can also help delegates practice responding to dynamic situations and refining their approach based on new information.

Rules of procedure:

Roll Call- Attendance shall be kept by the Chairpersons with a Roll Call at the beginning. Delegates shall establish their presence by raising their placards and declaring "Present" or "Present and Voting". Delegates having declared themselves Present and Voting cannot abstain during votes on all matters until the next Roll Call.

Procedural Matters- Procedural matters are those matters relating to the structure of the Session. They include, but are not limited to, voting on establishing a Speaker's List, motions and the adjournment of the Human Rights Council session. All delegates must vote on procedural matters by raising their placards and no delegate may abstain.

Quorum- Roll Call, conducted by the Chairpersons in accordance with rule shall be used to confirm attendance before the start of each session. Unless otherwise directed by Secretariat, theCouncil shall begin its session with the number of delegates already present if quorum is not reached thirty (30) minutes after the scheduled start time of the session. Participants who arrive during or after the Roll Call must write the Chair a message confirming their attendance at the Council.

Participants will not be acknowledged or permitted to cast a vote if they have not notified the Chair of their Arrival.

Motion to Establish a Speakers' List

A delegate must make a Motion to establish a Speakers' List before creating the list of Speakers. Calculating the duration of each speaker. A simple majority is required to carry the Motion, which must first be accepted by the Chair before it can be voted on. If more than one motion to create a speakers' bureau. They will be voted on in order of least disruptive to most disruptive, with each list recommending a different Speaker's Time.

Debate

1. Formal Debate.

A committee shall by default be in Formal Debate unless otherwise advised by The Chair. Delegates should refer to the Speakers' List for the speaking order.

2. Informal Debate.

During formal debate a motion can be made by any delegate for a Moderated Caucus or an Unmoderated Caucus both of which constitute informal debate. Informal debate can only occur on substantive issues and is out of order once a motion to close debate has been passed.

Speeches

1. Motion to establish the speaker's time.

A Delegate may move to set a time limit on speeches. The Chair may either rule the Motion dilatory at his/her discretion or put it to vote. A Delegate exceeding the allotted time for a speech may be called to order by the Chair.

2. Relevance of Speech.

A Chair may call a Delegate to order if his/her speech is not relevant to the subject matter being discussed.

Yields

1. Yield to Points of Information (POIs) or Questions:

During a formal MUN debate, delegates have the opportunity to yield to Points of Information or questions from other delegates. When a delegate yields to POIs, they are inviting other participants to interrupt their speech to seek clarifications, request additional information, or challenge their arguments.Yielding to POIs fosters active engagement and encourages delegates to think on their feet, as they must respond promptly to the questions raised by their Peers.

2. Yield to Another Delegate:

In an MUN conference, delegates are typically given a limited amount of speaking time on a specific topic. When a delegate yields to another delegate, they voluntarily give up their remaining speaking time to allow another delegate to take the floor. This gesture demonstrates cooperation and respect for other delegates' viewpoints, ensuring that multiple perspectives are represented and facilitating a more inclusive and well-rounded debate.

3. Yield to the Executive Board/Chair:
The Executive Board or Chairs in an MUN conference are responsible for moderating the proceedings, maintaining order, and enforcing the rules of procedure. When a delegate yields to the Executive Board, they indicate that they are giving up their speaking time to allow the chairs to manage the session effectively. This can be done to seek procedural guidance, ask for clarification on rules, or allow the chairs to make announcements or intervene if necessary.

POINTS

1. Point of Personal Privilege.

A Delegate may rise to a Point of Personal Privilege if a matter impairs him/her from participating fully in committee activities. The Chairpersons shall try to effectively address the source of impairment. This point may interrupt a Speaker only due to inability.

2. Point of Order.

A Delegate may rise to a Point of Order if a rule of procedure is not properly observed by a Delegate or by Chairpersons. The Chair will rule on the validity of the point. A Delegate rising to a Point of Order may not comment on the topic of discussion. A Point of Order ruled dilatory by the Chair may not be appealed. This point may not interrupt a Speaker.

3. Point of Inquiry.

A Delegate may rise to a Point of Inquiry requesting an explanation from the Chair on the Rules of Procedure. This point may not interrupt a Speaker.

4. Point of Information

A question, normally after a delegate has delivered his speech. This is your chance to attack or support the speech made by a delegate, so be sure to consider how you will formulate your point of information.

Rights

1. Right of Reply.

A Delegate whose personal or national integrity has been impugned by another Delegate's comments may rise to a Right of Reply. Disagreement with the content of a Delegate's speech is not grounds for a Right of Reply. The Chair will

recognize the Right of Reply at his/her discretion as well as decide on how to resolve the motion.

About the agenda:

The Entebbe hijacking of 1976 was one of the most dramatic and successful hostage-rescue missions in history. It involved the hijacking of an Air France flight by pro-Palestinian militants, the holding of over 100 hostages in Uganda, and a daring rescue operation by Israeli commandos.

The Hijacking

On June 27, 1976, Air France Flight 139 took off from Tel Aviv, Israel, bound for Paris, with a scheduled stop in Athens, Greece. After taking on new passengers in Athens, the flight continued toward Paris. Soon after departure, four hijackers seized control of the aircraft: two members of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine – External Operations (PFLP-EO) and two members of the German left-wing militant group Revolutionary Cells.

The hijackers forced the crew to divert the aircraft first to Benghazi, Libya, where they refueled and released one hostage. After several hours, the plane flew to Entebbe Airport in Uganda, landing on June 28. Uganda's dictator, Idi Amin, welcomed the hijackers and provided support. The hostages were moved to the old terminal building at the airport, guarded by both hijackers and Ugandan troops.

The Demands

The hijackers demanded the release of 53 Palestinian and other militants imprisoned in Israel, France, Germany, Kenya, and Switzerland. They gave a

deadline: if their demands were not met by July 1, they would begin killing hostages. They released non-Jewish hostages and retained only Israelis and a few others identified as Jewish or Israeli sympathizers, reducing the number of hostages to just over 100. This selective release made it clear that the hijacking was politically and ideologically motivated, mainly targeting Israelis and Jews.

The Israeli Response

Israel was initially unsure how to respond. Negotiating with terrorists was against long-standing Israeli policy. At the same time, the safety of over 100 civilians was at stake. Israeli intelligence services began collecting information rapidly. They used testimonies from released hostages, aerial reconnaissance, and blueprints of the Entebbe terminal—which had been built by an Israeli construction company years earlier—to piece together the layout and prepare for a rescue mission.

After intense deliberations, Israel approved Operation Thunderbolt (later renamed Operation Entebbe, and posthumously Operation Yonatan, in honor of the mission's commander, Yonatan Netanyahu).

The Rescue Operation

On July 3, 1976, a team of approximately 100 Israeli commandos, supported by transport aircraft and medical teams, flew over 2,500 miles (4,000 km) from Israel to Entebbe. They landed under the cover of darkness, using a black Mercedes and Land Rovers to mimic Idi Amin's convoy and deceive Ugandan guards.

The operation began at approximately 11:00 PM local time and lasted about 90 minutes. The commandos stormed the terminal and quickly neutralized all seven hijackers. During the operation, three hostages were killed—two in the crossfire, and one later by Ugandan forces at a hospital where she had been taken earlier. The Israeli commander, Yonatan Netanyahu, was also fatally shot—the only Israeli commando killed.

Ugandan soldiers who tried to resist were engaged and killed. The Israeli forces also destroyed several Ugandan MiG fighter jets on the ground to prevent pursuit. In total, 102 hostages were rescued and flown back to Israel via Nairobi, Kenya, which had covertly assisted the operation.

Aftermath and Impact

The raid was hailed globally as a stunning example of precision military planning and bravery. It demonstrated Israel's firm stance against terrorism and its willingness to act decisively to protect its citizens. The operation was widely praised in the West but condemned by Uganda and some Arab nations. Idi Amin retaliated by murdering the remaining hostage, Dora Bloch, a 75-year-old Israeli-British woman who had been hospitalized before the raid.

The success of the mission had a lasting influence on counter-terrorism strategy worldwide. It remains a benchmark in hostage rescue operations and has been depicted in several books and films. For Israel, it became a symbol of national pride and resilience, while for the broader world, it highlighted both the growing threat of international terrorism and the potential for bold, effective responses.

Problems and concerns with the hijacking on a global scale:

The Entebbe hijacking and the events surrounding it, while ultimately resolved through a highly successful military operation, involved numerous serious problems and challenges—both logistical and ethical. These issues affected the hostages, the international community, and the long-term political consequences.

Here are the main problems associated with the Entebbe hijacking:

1. International Terrorism and Civilian Targeting

- The hijacking was a blatant act of terrorism, targeting innocent civilians to achieve political goals.

- The selective separation of Jewish and Israeli passengers by the hijackers evoked disturbing echoes of Nazi-era practices and highlighted the antisemitic nature of the attack.

- It marked a growing trend of airplane hijackings in the 1970s, creating fear and insecurity for international travelers.

---

2. State Support for Terrorism

- Ugandan dictator Idi Amin offered direct support to the hijackers, violating international law.

- Ugandan troops helped guard the hostages and allowed the use of a national airport for terrorist activities, raising serious concerns about state-sponsored terrorism.

- This created a diplomatic crisis, as Uganda's protection of terrorists made negotiation or intervention by other countries more complicated.

---

3. Limited International Cooperation

- While Israel eventually coordinated with Kenya for refueling and medical access, few nations offered open support.

- Most countries were reluctant to get involved, fearing political backlash or reprisals from Arab states or militant groups.

- This lack of broad international response exposed the weakness of the global system in addressing cross-border hostage crises.

---

4. High-Stakes Risk to Hostages

- The Israeli rescue operation, though successful, involved immense risk.

- One hostage, Dora Bloch, was left behind in a Ugandan hospital and was later murdered by Ugandan forces.

- Three hostages died during the rescue, showing that even the most well-planned operation can result in civilian casualties.

- A failed rescue would have led to mass killings, making the operation ethically and tactically controversial before its success.

---

5. Political Repercussions and Military Escalation

- The raid deeply embarrassed Idi Amin and worsened Uganda's international standing, but it also heightened tensions in East Africa.

- Israel's action, though widely praised in the West, was condemned by some African and Arab nations as a violation of Ugandan sovereignty.

- It sparked debates about the legality of cross-border military interventions, even in extreme humanitarian situations.

---

6. Implications for Future Hijackings

- While the success of the mission deterred some future attacks, it also set a precedent that could inspire copycat tactics among both terrorists and states.

- Hijackers might become more violent or guarded, knowing that military rescues were possible.

- There was a risk that states would rely more on force than diplomacy in future hostage situations.

---

7. Ethical and Moral Dilemmas

- Israel had to make the difficult decision between negotiating with terrorists or risking lives in a military raid.

- The choice to prioritize certain hostages (Jewish/Israeli) after the hijackers' own segregation raised broader moral questions about the value placed on specific lives in global hostage situations.

---

8. Security Failures

- The hijacking exposed vulnerabilities in airport security, especially at Athens airport, where the hijackers boarded the flight.

- The ease with which armed individuals could smuggle weapons onboard showed a serious lapse in international aviation safety protocols at the time.

Conclusion

The Entebbe hijacking was not only a moment of bold military action but also a reflection of complex global issues—terrorism, political alliances, ethical decision-making, and the risks of international intervention. Despite the operational success, the situation revealed deep flaws in global security, diplomacy, and counter-terrorism preparedness, many of which remain relevant today.

Relations between Middle east and Africa (Post Raid)

The Entebbe Hijacking was one of the sole causes which made the African Nations rethink their alliances. The impact of the hijacking in context to diplomatic relations between the middle east and Africa is listed as follows -

1. Relations between Uganda & Israel collapsed :

Israel - Uganda relations were completely severed because of the support given by Idi Amin to the hijackers. Post the entebbe raid , Amin openly criticizes Israel for violating their sovereignty.

2. Mixed Image of Israel in the African continent

The governments of various African nations were in a confusing statepost the Entebbe raid . For some nations , they thought this was a violation to the sovereignty of Africa but some presented the message of commendable effort to the Israeli defence forces.

3. Kenya

Kenya-Israel ties during and post the Entebbe raid was strengthened. Kenya allowed Israel to refuel in Nairobi during the raid. Idi Amin seeing this, even ordered the killing of hundreds of Kenyan citizens in Uganda.

4. Organization of African Unity (OAU) & other organizations

This organization was either very critical or silent about the actions of Israel as they believed that Israel violated African Sovereignty. This also caused the aspect of internal divisions in the OAU as the question was WHO TO SUPPORT ?

African Bloc did not condemn the hijacking due to their relations with the Arab league back then

5. Aspect of Yom Kippur war and the Entebbe raid

Post the Yom Kippur war, many African nations cut their ties with Israel due to the diplomatic pressure put by the Arab League, post the Entebbe hijacking - African nations questioned the instability of Arab states and began to question their alliances with organizations like PFLP.

RESEARCH AID

(This is just a suggested pattern, you can research your way, individual differences make us all special but these suggestions may aid you in understanding where to start)

1. Start From Knowing
a. United Nations
b. Your committee
c. Mandate of the committee (functions and power)
d. Bodies it works with
e. Final result of your committee
f. Funding channels

2. Know Your Agenda
a. Historical background
b. Current trends
c. Future aims
d. International legal instruments

3. Within the Agenda Cover the Following Areas
a. Political
b. Economic
c. Social
d. Technology and its role

e. Arms and army strength

f. Legalities

g. Impacts and implications of (a-f) on historical background, current trends, future aims and international legal instruments.

Sample Crisis Update given below:

From ,
Office of the Director of Mossad,
Tel Aviv , Israel

DATE : 27th June 1976

Shalom !

An Air France flight AF 139 (Airbus A300) departed from Tel Aviv to Paris with a stop in Athens **has been hijacked**. The reports were received by **captain michel bacos**. The captain via communication with air traffic control informed minutes after the plane was hijacked

The Air traffic control after maintaining active tracking and communication have made probable flight paths and have analysed the situation , The aircraft is currently heading towards the following region :

1. Egypt
2. Tunisia
3. Libya

After the distress call made by the pilot , reports by the Air Traffic Control (ATC) suggest that soon the hijackers took over and cut off all communication sources in the cockpit (radio communication to be specific) and even disconnected the transponders.

The Hellenic Civil Aviation authority has provided the Israeli government with the list of passengers currently present in the aircraft. After scrutinising the list, **subordinate analysts in the research division have found that an air marshall and ex "Shayetet 13" commando whose name is EITAN ROSENBLOOM is also in the flight. THE IDENTITY OF THE HIJACKERS IS YET TO BE FOUND.**

A meeting at 1430 hours is been called to **analyse and assess the further situation**

Regards,
Yitzhak Hofi,
Director of Mossad

Yitzhak Hofi

Research Links

https://www.britannica.com/event/Entebbe-raid

https://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/israel-rescues-hostages-from-uganda

https://www.nytimes.com/search?query=Entebbe+1976

https://www.timesofisrael.com/topic/operation-entebbe/

https://unausa.org/model-un/