

BACKGROUND GUIDE



JCC

JOINT CRISIS COMMITTEE

AGENDA

The Vietnam War



EDITION XII

**CHIREC
MUN '24**

Represent • Reason • Resolve

LETTER FROM THE EXECUTIVE BOARD

Dear Delegates,

Welcome to CHIRECMUN 2024! We are delighted to have you join us for what promises to be an extraordinary and immersive experience. As members of the Executive Board for the Joint Crisis Committee, it is our pleasure to introduce you to this year's dynamic and challenging simulation.

You are about to embark on a journey that will test your abilities to think on your feet, engage in high-stakes diplomacy, and navigate the complexities of international relations. The JCC format is designed to simulate the intense and unpredictable nature of global crises, demanding quick thinking, strategic decision-making, and effective collaboration.

Throughout the conference, you will receive real-time crisis updates that will require you to adapt and respond swiftly. The scenarios have been meticulously crafted to reflect historical accuracy and present realistic diplomatic challenges. Your role will be crucial in shaping the outcomes of these crises, and we are confident that each of you will bring unique perspectives and skills to the table.

Lobbying and negotiation will play a significant part in your committee experience. Building alliances, persuading peers, and formulating comprehensive strategies are essential components of successful diplomacy. We encourage you to engage actively with fellow delegates, embrace the spirit of collaboration, and strive for innovative solutions.

We are committed to providing you with an enriching and intellectually stimulating environment.

Our team has worked tirelessly to ensure that this conference will be a memorable and transformative experience for all participants. We are confident that your participation will not only enhance your understanding of global issues but also refine your diplomatic and leadership skills.

We look forward to witnessing your creativity, dedication, and passion in action. Together, let us make CHIRECMUN 2024 a remarkable success.

Sincerely,

The Executive Board CHIRECMUN 2024 Joint Crisis Committee

CRISIS DIRECTOR- Aravind Belour

CABINET 1:

chairperson – Gowtham srinivas

vice chairperson- Aahna Bharthi

CABINET 2:

chairperson- fazil razak

vice chairperson- aditya saxena

CABINET 3:

chairperson- serendeep rudraraju

vice chairperson- MSMeenakshi

HOW A JOINT CRISIS COMMITTEE (JCC) FUNCTIONS

A Joint Crisis Committee (JCC) in Model United Nations (MUN) is a dynamic and complex simulation that involves multiple committees working simultaneously to address a shared crisis. The JCC format is designed to emulate real-time decision-making and strategic interactions among different factions or entities involved in a conflict or crisis. Here's an overview of how a JCC functions:

1. Structure and Setup: A JCC typically consists of two or more separate committees, each representing different factions, countries, or organizations with distinct perspectives and objectives. For example, in the context of the Vietnam War, the committees might include the United States and South Vietnamese Government, the North Vietnamese Government and Viet Cong, and the United Nations Security Council (UNSC).

2. Crisis Updates: The heart of a JCC lies in its continuous and evolving crisis updates. The crisis staff, often comprised of experienced MUN members or the conference secretariat, generates and delivers these updates. These updates simulate real-world developments and can include military movements, diplomatic communications, political shifts, and public reactions. Delegates must respond to these updates promptly, adapting their strategies and actions accordingly.

HOW A JOINT CRISIS COMMITTEE (JCC) FUNCTIONS

3. Decision-Making and Actions: Each committee is tasked with making decisions and taking actions to address the crisis. These decisions can range from military maneuvers and peace negotiations to economic sanctions and propaganda efforts. Delegates within each committee must collaborate, debate, and reach consensus on their course of action. The decisions are then communicated to the crisis staff, who determine their outcomes and impact on the overall scenario.

4. Inter-Committee Interactions: One of the key features of a JCC is the interaction between different committees. Diplomatic communications, alliances, and conflicts between the factions are central to the simulation. Committees can send official communiqués, conduct backchannel negotiations, and form alliances or declare hostilities. These interactions are crucial for shaping the direction of the crisis and achieving strategic objectives.

5. Adaptability and Real-Time Strategy: The fast-paced nature of a JCC requires delegates to think on their feet and adapt to new developments swiftly. Strategies must be flexible, and delegates must be prepared to revise their plans based on the latest crisis updates and the actions of other committees. This aspect of the JCC emphasizes the importance of quick decision-making, critical thinking, and effective communication.

HOW A JOINT CRISIS COMMITTEE (JCC) FUNCTIONS

6. Resolution and Outcomes: The ultimate goal of a JCC is to navigate the crisis towards a resolution, whether it be through military victory, diplomatic agreement, or a combination of both. The outcome is determined by the cumulative actions and decisions of all committees, guided by the crisis staff. The resolution phase often involves intense negotiations and final strategic maneuvers, leading to a conclusion that reflects the complexities and unpredictabilities of real-world crises.

INTRODUCTION

The agenda for this year's Joint Crisis Committee at CHIRECMUN 2024 focuses on the Vietnam War, a pivotal conflict that profoundly shaped global politics and international relations during the 20th century. This war not only defined the geopolitical landscape of Southeast Asia but also left an indelible mark on the strategies and policies of superpowers, influencing military tactics, diplomatic approaches, and ideological confrontations that resonated worldwide.

The Vietnam War, which spanned from 1955 to 1975, was a complex and multifaceted conflict involving the United States and its allies, the communist government of North Vietnam, and the Viet Cong. The war was rooted in the broader context of the Cold War, a period characterized by intense rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union, as well as their respective allies. This confrontation was not just a military struggle but also an ideological battle between communism and democracy.

The conflict escalated due to a combination of factors, including colonial legacies, nationalist movements, and the strategic interests of global powers. It saw unprecedented levels of military engagement, technological advancements, and humanitarian impact, leading to significant loss of life and widespread destruction. The Vietnam War also spurred significant anti-war movements and political upheavals, particularly in the United States, influencing domestic and international policies.

Understanding the Vietnam War is crucial for comprehending the dynamics of modern international relations. It serves as a case study in the complexities of warfare, the limits of military power, and the importance of diplomatic resolution. The decisions made during this period continue to inform contemporary military and political strategies, making it an essential topic for any serious student of history and international affairs.

INTRODUCTION

As you engage with this agenda, you will explore the intricate web of political, military, and social factors that defined the Vietnam War. You will be challenged to think critically about the decisions of the past, their outcomes, and the lessons they hold for future generations. Your insights and contributions will not only deepen your understanding of this historical conflict but also enhance your skills as future leaders and diplomats.



PERSPECTIVE OF THE UNITED STATES AND SOUTH VIETNAMESE GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

From the perspective of the United States and the South Vietnamese Government, the Vietnam War represented a critical battleground in the global struggle against the spread of communism. This conflict was perceived as a crucial front in the broader Cold War, a period marked by ideological rivalry between the Western bloc, led by the United States, and the Eastern bloc, dominated by the Soviet Union and its allies.

For the United States, the war was seen as a necessary intervention to contain the spread of communism, in line with the policy of containment that had been adopted in the aftermath of World War II. The Domino Theory, which suggested that the fall of one country to communism would lead to the subsequent fall of neighboring countries, underscored the strategic importance of Vietnam. Protecting South Vietnam from communist takeover was perceived as vital to maintaining regional stability and preventing a shift in the global balance of power.

The United States committed significant military and economic resources to support the South Vietnamese government, viewing the conflict not just as a local issue but as a pivotal element in the global fight for democracy and freedom. American policymakers and military leaders believed that a strong and stable South Vietnam would serve as a bulwark against communist expansion in Southeast Asia. They aimed to build a viable, democratic state capable of withstanding both internal insurgency and external aggression.

For the South Vietnamese government, the war was an existential struggle for national sovereignty and survival.



PERSPECTIVE OF THE UNITED STATES AND SOUTH VIETNAMESE GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

The leadership in Saigon, led by President Ngô Đình Diệm and later his successors, was determined to resist the communist forces of North Vietnam and the Viet Cong. They saw the support of the United States as essential to their efforts to build a modern, independent state free from communist influence.

The Vietnam War also represented profound challenges and sacrifices for the South Vietnamese people. The government faced the daunting task of maintaining order, managing an economy under siege, and sustaining public morale amidst the devastation of prolonged conflict. The war brought about significant social and political upheaval, influencing the country's future trajectory and shaping its national identity.

In summary, the perspective of the United States and the South Vietnamese government on the Vietnam War was shaped by the broader context of the Cold War, the desire to prevent the spread of communism, and the quest for national sovereignty and stability. Their efforts and experiences during this conflict continue to resonate in contemporary discussions on international relations and military strategy.



PERSPECTIVE OF THE NORTH VIETNAMESE GOVERNMENT AND VIET CONG COMMITTEE

From the perspective of the North Vietnamese Government and the Viet Cong, the Vietnam War was a crucial struggle for national liberation and unification. For the leadership in Hanoi and the communist insurgents in the South, this conflict represented an essential fight to overthrow colonial and imperialist influences and to establish a unified, independent Vietnam under a socialist government.

The roots of this perspective can be traced back to the colonial period, during which Vietnam was under French rule. The desire for independence was a powerful driving force, and the victory against the French at Dien Bien Phu in 1954 was a significant milestone. However, the subsequent Geneva Accords, which temporarily divided Vietnam at the 17th parallel, left the country partitioned and set the stage for further conflict.

For the North Vietnamese government, led by President Ho Chi Minh, the war was seen as a continuation of the struggle against colonialism and imperialism. Ho Chi Minh and his comrades viewed the United States' support for the South Vietnamese government as another form of foreign domination that needed to be resisted. They believed that the Vietnamese people had the right to self-determination and sought to reunify the country under communist rule.

PERSPECTIVE OF THE NORTH VIETNAMESE GOVERNMENT AND VIET CONG COMMITTEE

The Viet Cong, the communist insurgents operating in South Vietnam, shared this vision. They aimed to overthrow the South Vietnamese government and eliminate its collaboration with foreign powers. The Viet Cong were deeply rooted in the local population and conducted guerrilla warfare, leveraging their knowledge of the terrain and the support of the local populace to challenge the better-equipped South Vietnamese and American forces.

The North Vietnamese leadership was also influenced by the broader context of the global communist movement. They received significant support from the Soviet Union and China, who provided military aid, training, and economic assistance. This support was vital to sustaining their war efforts and emboldened their resolve to achieve their goals.

For the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong, the war was not only about military victory but also about winning the hearts and minds of the Vietnamese people. They conducted extensive propaganda campaigns to promote their cause and to undermine the legitimacy of the South Vietnamese government. The struggle was portrayed as a righteous fight for national liberation and social justice, aiming to create a society free from exploitation and oppression.

In summary, the perspective of the North Vietnamese government and the Viet Cong on the Vietnam War was shaped by a fervent desire for national unification, independence from foreign domination, and the establishment of a socialist state. Their determination and resilience in the face of overwhelming odds left a lasting impact on the history of Vietnam and the world.

PERSPECTIVE OF THE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL (UNSC) COMMITTEE

The United Nations Security Council (UNSC) approached the Vietnam War with a focus on maintaining international peace and security, as well as mitigating the humanitarian impact of the conflict. The UNSC, composed of both permanent and non-permanent members, represented a diverse range of perspectives and interests, often leading to complex and multifaceted discussions regarding the war.

The Vietnam War, unfolding during the height of the Cold War, was a significant point of concern for the UNSC. The conflict exemplified the broader ideological struggle between communism and democracy, with the superpowers—the United States and the Soviet Union—deeply involved. The UNSC had to navigate the geopolitical tensions between its members, balancing the need for intervention and conflict resolution with the risk of exacerbating superpower rivalries.

The permanent members of the UNSC, particularly the United States, the Soviet Union, China, the United Kingdom, and France, had varying stakes in the conflict. The United States sought to garner support for its efforts to contain communism in Vietnam, while the Soviet Union and China provided aid and support to North Vietnam. The UK and France, with their colonial histories and interests in maintaining global stability, were often caught in the middle, advocating for diplomatic solutions.

Despite these differences, the UNSC was united in its concern for the humanitarian consequences of the war. The conflict resulted in significant civilian casualties, displacement, and widespread destruction. The UNSC focused on addressing these humanitarian issues, facilitating the delivery of aid, and supporting initiatives aimed at protecting civilians.

PERSPECTIVE OF THE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL (UNSC) COMMITTEE

Organizations such as UNICEF and the International Red Cross played crucial roles in these efforts, working under the aegis of the UN to alleviate suffering.

The UNSC also engaged in various diplomatic efforts to mediate the conflict. Resolutions and peace talks were proposed, aiming to bring the warring parties to the negotiating table. However, these efforts were often hindered by the entrenched positions of the combatants and the geopolitical stakes involved. The Geneva Conference and subsequent negotiations highlighted the challenges faced by the international community in resolving the conflict.

In summary, the perspective of the United Nations Security Council on the Vietnam War was characterized by a commitment to international peace and security, a focus on humanitarian relief, and ongoing diplomatic efforts to mediate the conflict. The UNSC's involvement underscored the complexities of international diplomacy during the Cold War era and the enduring importance of multilateral cooperation in addressing global conflicts.

TIMELINE OF EVENTS LEADING TO AUGUST 11, 1964

1945: End of World War II

- **August 15:** Japan surrenders, ending World War II.
- **September 2:** Ho Chi Minh declares the independence of Vietnam, forming the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. French forces reoccupy Vietnam later in the year, leading to conflict.

1950: Recognition and Support

- **January:** The People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union officially recognize the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.
- **February:** The United States and the United Kingdom recognize the French-backed State of Vietnam, led by Emperor Bao Dai.

1954: The Geneva Accords

- **May 7:** The French are defeated at the Battle of Dien Bien Phu.
- **July 21:** The Geneva Accords are signed, temporarily dividing Vietnam at the 17th parallel. National elections are planned for 1956 to unify the country.

1955: Establishment of Governments

- **October 26:** Ngo Dinh Diem declares the formation of the Republic of Vietnam (South Vietnam) and becomes its president after a controversial referendum.

1959: Beginning of the Insurgency

- **May 19:** North Vietnam forms Group 559 to create an infiltration route through Laos and Cambodia, known as the Ho Chi Minh Trail, to support the Viet Cong insurgency in South Vietnam.

1960: Formation of the National Liberation Front (NLF)

- **December 20:** The National Liberation Front (NLF), also known as the Viet Cong, is established in South Vietnam, aiming to overthrow the South Vietnamese government and reunify Vietnam under communist rule.

TIMELINE OF EVENTS LEADING TO AUGUST 11, 1964

1961–1963: Escalation of the Conflict

- **1961:** President John F. Kennedy increases the number of U.S. military advisors in South Vietnam and authorizes covert operations against North Vietnam.
- **1962:** The Strategic Hamlet Program is implemented to isolate rural populations from the Viet Cong influence, but it faces significant challenges and resistance.
- **November 1, 1963:** President Ngo Dinh Diem is overthrown and assassinated in a coup supported by the CIA.
- **November 22, 1963:** President Kennedy is assassinated; Lyndon B. Johnson becomes President of the United States.

1964: Increasing Tensions and Direct U.S. Involvement

- **March:** U.S. military involvement in Vietnam increases, with additional advisors and support personnel arriving in South Vietnam.
- **July:** The number of U.S. military personnel in Vietnam reaches 21,000.
- **August 2:** The Gulf of Tonkin Incident occurs, where U.S. destroyer USS Maddox engages with North Vietnamese torpedo boats in the Gulf of Tonkin.
- **August 4:** A second alleged attack on U.S. ships in the Gulf of Tonkin is reported, though later investigations cast doubt on whether this attack occurred.
- **August 5:** President Johnson orders retaliatory air strikes against North Vietnamese naval bases and oil storage facilities.
- **August 7:** The U.S. Congress passes the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, granting President Johnson broad authority to conduct military operations in Vietnam without a formal declaration of war.

August 11: Committees Commence

UNDERSTANDING DIRECTIVES

The following part of the BG is the standard explanation used by the EB members to explain Directives and International Law. Please read with the intention to understand the above-mentioned concepts and not to replicate or reuse any ideas referred to below.

Directives are your way of influencing committee using your country's resources. There are a few types of directives you can write, here are some of them below.

Military Operations:

Logically there would be military operations on the table. The usage of troops carelessly or needlessly however, is frowned upon. We hope the delegates understand that in the current situation, judicious use of ALL resources is the need of the hour, after taking a firm cognizance of the plausibility of any course of action

Intelligence or Covert Operations:

Quite literally these will be your way of gathering information and setting the playing field. These are usually covert operations to take actions that will be "Publicly frowned upon". Open to interpretation on what these entail. Again these operations are primarily to get an edge in the committee or for your committee. Again the EB strongly recommends the delegates to proofread these directives twice or thrice over to ensure there is no loopholes that the enemy might exploit. In an ideal scenario, a war can be won by judicious utilisation of such operations and acting upon the intel gained from them.

Internal Actions:

Any and all actions within your country be it economic, political, social or must also be done via directives. These could be something simple as giving food to a region to reallocation of funds or even internal security measures. We also would like to remind you just because these are within the country doesn't mean they will pass. It is still under EB discretion to pass these directives.

Directives will be accepted only during this window and not at any other times, unless deemed fit by the Executive Board.



DIRECTIVES – EXPLANATION OF TYPES

What is a directive?

In a generic scenario, each country has

The directives can be broadly classified into

1. Covert operations (Covert directive)
2. Joint ops (Joint Directive)
3. Portfolio Request
4. Understandings signed between factions/ nations (Treaties, MoUs etc.)
5. Presidential Statements
6. Overt directives

All the above-mentioned types are self-explanatory. It is completely fine if Joint operations intended to be of Covert nature.

The Executive Board believes however that one of the types require clarification and that would be the usage of Portfolio Requests. Portfolio requests are sent in when delegates require specific information that is crucial for their next course of action. This ideally works with them requesting their intelligence/ Government agencies to feed them the required information, by carrying out certain actions. Only such covert directives can be termed as Portfolio requests. The EB will not entertain portfolio requests requesting random pieces of information that would not be viable to present as a response.

Next, the operations themselves can be divided into intel ops and military or strategic ops, broadly. Sufficient understanding of the situation on ground is necessary to implement the right type at appropriate times.

DIRECTIVES – EXPLANATION OF FORMAT

The Format for directives is as given below.

To: Head of State/Relevant Dept

From: Delegate of (Country)

Covert/Overt Operation (can only be either one)

Primary Objective: The primary goal of this operation.

Secondary Objective A secondary goal that is not as important as the primary goal.

Mission Brief: 4-5 line summary of the plan of action.

Plan of Actions: Complete detailed plan of actions

Additional Info: Maps, diagrams or any info you think the EB should know before considering your directive.

Delegates need to note that updates will largely be based on the directives received, but not all directives will be converted into updates and displayed to committee. Having said that, we'd like to clarify on one extremely important concept for crisis committees: Fog of War.

DIRECTIVES – EXPLANATION OF TYPES AND FORMAT

Fog of War, simply put, means that it is impossible to know the results of all action undertaken by a particular group/cabinet/country immediately, as the success or failure will depend on a lot of factors, most importantly, the timing of these actions and the time that would be taken up for the actions to unfold. Therefore it is only practical that the delegates don't expect **ALL** their directives' statuses to be known throughout the course of committee. There will definitely be instances where your directives would pass, but won't be reflected as updates due to practical difficulties, and vice versa, where failed directives will make it to updates to let the people who have drafted it know about the consequences of their actions.

In JCCs, the directives sent by one cabinet may end up as updates for the other cabinet and vice versa.

Miscellaneous:

Apart from this, all basic provisions given to delegates, like the powers to raise points or motions are in order unless stated otherwise by the Executive Board at any given point in Committee. The Executive Board hopes that this document is understood in its entirety by the delegates, and this would eventually lead to easier and smoother functioning of both committees. Please feel absolutely free to contact any of the members of the Executive Board in case of queries. Good luck, and Godspeed to all of you!

INTERNATIONAL LAW

First and foremost: To clarify, this part of the document is NOT working of the assumption that the committee has a set time frame. It is to guide the delegates in “International Law” and the various types it exists in. Sensible usage of the knowledge below keeping in mind the status of the laws in the existing timeline of the committee is requested by the Executive Board.

Where does international law come from and how is it made?

These are some difficult questions than one might expect and require careful inspection. National law and similar application cannot be bought into an international legal system. Thus the question of “Code of International Law”. International law has no Parliament and nothing that can really be described as legislation. While there is an International Court of Justice and a range of specialized international courts and tribunals, jurisdiction of the abovementioned is simply voluntary and not in any way compelling or enforceable. To clarify, the following is the general assumption of what International law is, there is no fixed category of any kind that lists what is and what is not international law.

INTERNATIONAL LAW

Article 38 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice states

“Article 38

1. The Court, whose function is to decide in accordance with international law such disputes as are submitted to it, shall apply:

1. international conventions, whether general or particular, establishing rules expressly recognized by the contesting states;
2. international custom, as evidence of a general practice accepted as law;
3. the general principles of law recognized by civilized nations;
4. subject to the provisions of Article 59, judicial decisions and the teachings of the most highly qualified publicists of the various nations, as subsidiary means for the determination of rules of law.

2. This provision shall not prejudice the power of the Court to decide a case *ex aequo et bono*, if the parties agree thereto.”

Let's look at all four in a simpler way.

To be noted: The assumption is that the contesting states will be all UN members as this is to serve as an equal stepping platform for all delegates. Please do note whether your country's conformity to the law is ensured before going ahead with quoting the convention or law. (Example: DPRK and the Non-Proliferation treaty in 2018). Also we feel no need to illustrate or explain the 4th sub clause mentioned above as it deems to be rather self-explanatory.

1) International agreements, conventions and treaties: The Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Geneva Conventions, the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties so on and so forth. Documents internationally recognized and ratified by nations involved in the conflict. These are subjective to signature and ratification, the difference of which is rather important.

INTERNATIONAL LAW

- **The signature to a treaty** indicates that the country accepts the treaty. It commits not to take any actions that would undermine the treaty's purposes. A treaty is signed by a senior representative of a country such as the president or the foreign minister.
- **The ratification** symbolizes the official sanction of a treaty to make it legally binding for the government of a country. This process involves the treaty's adoption by the legislature of a country such as the parliament.

2) Customary International Law or Customary Law: These are laws that have come to be due to practice and norm. This law is, although not on paper or signed, considered the most binding of its kind due to the scale of practice. Some examples would include the following:

- **The principle of non-refoulement** is the cornerstone of asylum and of international refugee law. Following from the right to seek and to enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution, as set forth in Article 14 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, this principle reflects the commitment of the international community to ensure to all persons the enjoyment of human rights, including the rights to life, to freedom from torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, and to liberty and security of person. These and other rights are threatened when a refugee is returned to persecution or danger.
- **Diplomatic immunity, in international law**, the immunities enjoyed by foreign states or international organizations and their official representatives from the jurisdiction of the country in which they are present. The inviolability of diplomatic envoys has been recognized by most civilizations and states throughout history. To ensure exchanges of information and to maintain contact, most societies—even preliterate ones—granted messengers safe-conduct.



INTERNATIONAL LAW

3) Traditional mechanisms of protecting diplomats included religious-based codes of hospitality and the frequent use of priests as emissaries. Just as religion buttressed this inviolability, custom sanctified it and reciprocity fortified it, and over time these sanctions became codified in national laws and international treaties.

- **The general principles of law recognized by civilized nations:** General principles of law are used primarily as "lexicon fillers" when treaties or customary international law do not provide a rule of decision. It has been suggested by scholars that as new treaties and customary law develop to address areas of international concern not previously covered, the significance of general principles will fade as these gaps in international law are filled.