

Tufts University: EPIIC of INQUIRY
COLUMBIA PREPARATORY SCHOOL: IRAN DELEGATION
Committee on Sovereignty: Zara Malik
Committee on Security: David Schalop
Committee on Diplomacy: Derrick Ochiaga
Committee on Terrorism: Gleb Kirin/Kennedy Burrows
Committee on Climate and Energy: Oliver Segal/Chloe Hubbe
Committee on Economics: Haley Rosenfarb
Committee on Disaster Preparedness: Nicole Radke
Date: March 15, 2018

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	Page 2
Key Points.....	Page 3
Background on Country.....	Page 4
Committee on Sovereignty.....	Page 6
Committee on Security.....	Page 9
Committee on Diplomacy.....	Page 11
Committee on Terrorism.....	Page 14
Committee on Climate and Energy.....	Page 17
Committee on Economics.....	Page 20
Committee on Disaster Preparedness.....	Page 22

Introduction

Recently, our country’s nuclear program has drawn a lot of attention. The Delegation of The Islamic Republic of Iran, however, can reassure the other delegations we are pursuing a peaceful civilian nuclear energy program. Deputy Foreign Minister Abbas Araqchi has confirmed, “The final International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) report about past dimensions shows there was no sign of a military nuclear program ... and confirms that Iran's program was peaceful.” Additionally, we intend to abide by the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) and have already shown the utmost respect for its terms. Beyond

our country's pursuit of a peaceful civilian nuclear energy program, we want to engage diplomatically with other countries to help counteract terrorism. Overall, the Delegation of The Islamic Republic of Iran aims to collaborate with the other delegations in order to address the global nuclear imperative.

Key Points

- Iran perceives humanitarian interventions as a pretext for national security.
- Iran seeks regional and global security in the interest of preserving its theocratic regime.
- The Islamic Republic of Iran will need to weigh nuclear energy's environmental hazards with its ability to provide substantial military defense.
- Iran recognizes the world's fear about it becoming a nuclear power and is willing to work with other states to combat distrust, if it remains in the interests of the nation.
- An attack on Iran would lead to severe economic consequences, jeopardizing the world's oil and liquid gas natural supplies.
- Iran is willing to participate in multilateral conferences to initiate an effort to counteract terrorism.
- Iran faces a number of impending disasters, including an ability to accommodate potential refugees and provide sufficient water for a growing population.
- The NPT has been used by global hegemonic powers in a politically motivated attempt to deprive states of their rights.
- Having nuclear energy capabilities demonstrates to the world that Iran is an advanced and independent sovereign nation.
- Iran considers itself a diplomatic state that has been forced to endure the unilateral decision making of the international community and, most prominently, the Trump administration.

Background

Ever since the Iranian Revolution, our country's form of government, our officials, population, and key institutions have changed in many ways. After 1979, we officially became an Islamic republic following the Iranian Revolution. As a result of mounting social discontent under the leadership of Mohammad Reza Pahlavi, the Shah fled the country and Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini overthrew the monarchy. Appointed as our political and religious leader for life, Ayatollah Khomeini established our country as the Islamic Republic of Iran and our theocratic system of government—one in which God is recognized as the supreme civil ruler. Our country's transition from a monarchy to a theocracy marked an important shift in our form of governance. For example, Khomeini established the role of the Supreme Leader, a religious scholar who is granted ultimate political authority.

After Khomeini's death in 1989, however, he was replaced by the current Supreme Leader: Ayatollah Ali Khamenei. Today, Khamenei is our most powerful official, who controls the executive, legislative and judicial branches, as well as the media and military. Ayatollah Ali Khamenei's main domestic concern is to ensure the survival of our Islamic theocracy; our government's four core values—justice, independence, self-sufficiency and Islamic piety—constantly dominate Khamenei's political discourse. In terms of his top foreign policy priorities, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei perceives both the United States and Israel as huge threats. Khamenei is concerned that the U.S. will initiate a political and cultural campaign that could undermine our theocracy through a “soft” revolution. Similarly, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei distrusts Israel because of our long-standing historical tensions with the country.

In addition to our government and stature of higher officials, our population has also developed over time. Demographically, we are a different society than 33 years ago. Our population, for example, has grown from 35 million to 80 million people in just under 40 years. Of our 80 million people, roughly 97 percent identify as Muslim — the majority being Shiite Muslim and the minority being Sunni Muslim. While Shiites and Sunnis both draw their faith from the Qur'an and agree on most of the fundamentals of Islam,

ideological differences exist between the two populations. One difference includes the way each group governs; Shiites are governed by hierarchical structures, following living religious leaders, while Sunnis tend to follow texts penned by past religious leaders. Although Sunni and Shiite Muslims typically coexist within our country, the Shiite majority has led surrounding Sunni-majority countries to distrust us. As early as the Iranian Revolution in 1979, for example, we “had a stated desire to export [our] Islamic revolution, and our Supreme Leader styled himself as the leader of the whole Muslim world, making Sunni Arab leaders nervous. This had some negative consequences for Shiite Muslims in the region,” researcher Jane Kinninmont told CNN.

Other significant populations within our country include the Kurds—the indigenous people from the Mesopotamian plains and the highlands in what are now Turkey, Syria, Iraq, Iran and Armenia. Historically, Kurds living throughout the Middle East have expressed a desire to secede. Recently in 2017, for example, Kurds living in northern Iraq rallied to demand their independence. Though the Iraqi government dismissed the planned referendum as illegal, the Kurdish protests in Iraq set a precedent that inspired Kurds living in other regions such as the Kurds living in north-western Iran to support their own independence. While we are desperate to halt secessionist aspirations among our own Kurdish population, we also recognize that “a Kurdish-Iranian alignment would provide Tehran with more widespread influence in Iraq and Syria,” as quoted by the scholar Michael Tanchum. Therefore, Kurds living in the north-west region of our country play a significant role.

In addition to our government and population, our key institutions have also evolved over time. After the Iranian Revolution, for example, we set up the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC) in order to defend our Islamic Republic from internal and external threats; while the regular military, known as Artesh, is expected to protect our borders, the Revolutionary Guard is specifically intended to defend our country’s Islamic Republic system. Since its founding, the IRGC has taken a greater role in nearly every aspect of society. A senior official of the IRGC, for example, recently announced that the paramilitary Basji Force—one of the five forces of the IRGC—will soon begin patrolling all

missions in Tehran. Brigadier General Mohammad Reza Yazdi, a commander for the IRGC, remarked, “This plan’s objective is to maintain security for the citizens in the city...Through these patrols, the IRGC seek to maintain a portion of security in the capital.”

Following the Iranian Revolution in 1979, it is evident that our form of government, our officials, population, and key institutions have significantly changed. First, the longstanding monarchy was overthrown and Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini replaced it with a theocracy — our country’s current system. In addition to the shift in our form of government, our population is also different from what it was before the Iranian Revolution; the population grew from 35 million to 80 million people in under 40 years. In turn, there are far more Shiite and Sunni Muslims, with the majority in our country being Shiite. Another significant population includes the Kurds, who have historically expressed a desire for independence but are also fundamental to our country’s influence. Beyond the evolution in our form of government and population, our key institutions have also played an important role. The IRGC, for example, has worked hard to defend our country’s Islamic Republic system.

Issues

Committee on Sovereignty

We believe that norms of sovereignty and non-intervention must be respected by all states. The principle of non-intervention is an international rule that restricts states from interfering in the domestic affairs of other states. Security is achieved when each state is given the authority to rule its territory as it sees best. We perceive The Responsibility to Protect doctrine (in response to cases of genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity) as posing a direct threat to the sovereign rights of states. While it is important that the international community address mass atrocities, doing so under this principle would result in severe consequences. Responsibility to Protect can be manipulated by more powerful states to justify interventions under humanitarian pretexts.

Although in some instances the justifications might be valid, interventions such as these would set a precedent, prompting other countries to interfere in less compelling instances of human rights violations. Principles such as the Responsibility to Protect make it easy for states to apply double standards to other states. As a result, interventions become less about protecting a vulnerable population – their specious intent – and more about fulfilling the strategic interests of a state. For example, the U.S. War on Terror and its corresponding interventionist attacks are driven in the interests of national security rather than human security. Instead of emphasizing doctrines such as the Responsibility to Protect, we believe that the international community should promote *preventing* the underlying causes behind mass atrocities; namely, abject poverty, unemployment, discrimination, humiliation, and injustice. Overall, global security and unity are best achieved only when norms of sovereignty are upheld.

While we are wary about the underlying intentions behind humanitarian interventions, we respect The United Nations Charter and the UN's right to interfere in a state's domestic affairs, if necessary. The charter clearly prohibits states from using force against other states. The only exception is if a state were to act in self-defense against a prior attack. In addition, the United Nations has the permission to intervene at any time if there is a substantial threat to international peace and security. Although we fervently upholds the principle of non-intervention, we believe that when it concerns the United Nations, there are some circumstances (albeit few) in which interference might be justified. For example, individual states or the international community can intervene if a state requests its help or if the United Nations permits it, as outlined in the document.

While Iran is frequently perceived as threatening global security with its nuclear program, our intentions are benign. We have been a non-nuclear weapon state as part of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons since 1970. According to this treaty, states are allowed to pursue peaceful nuclear energy processes. We have not breached the treaty because Iran has a civilian nuclear energy program and not a nuclear weapons program. Indeed, our country should have the same rights as other countries such as Germany, Japan, the Netherlands, Argentina, and Brazil, to be part of the NPT but still

allowed to pursue nuclear energy processes such as enriched uranium. In fact, it would not be in our strategic interests to acquire nuclear weapons. By not becoming a nuclear state, our state has a greater flexibility to exert pressure and influence groups in neighboring countries such as Syria without being seen as provoking a nuclear crisis. While we do not want nuclear weapons, we do want nuclear energy. For many Iranians, having this advanced technology is a source of immense national pride. Acquiring the nuclear fuel cycle enables us to demonstrate to the world that we are an independent and highly advanced, sovereign nation. We had originally considered wanting a nuclear bomb during the eight-year war with Iraq, but since then our intentions have been peaceful. Former president, Ayatollah Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani, stated for example, that “When we first began, we were at war and we sought to have that possibility for the day that the enemy might use a nuclear weapon. That was the thinking. But it never became real.” Today, we recognize that having nuclear weapons would actually weaken our country’s stature as an independent sovereign state. When a state obtains nuclear weapons, it is under increasing interference and pressure from the international community. Given the past history of interventions in our domestic affairs (such as the United States coup to bring the deposed Shah back to power in 1953), we would like to remain completely independent in order to preserve our theocratic regime. Having nuclear weapons, however, would make this objective increasingly difficult.

The “liberal world order” influences negotiations of sovereignty and nuclear weapons. The liberal world order encompasses three main categories: the human rights order, the security order, and the economic order. The premise behind the order is that states work with one another to create a more open world, involving the free exchange of goods, ideas, and people. States that focus on the “liberal” (human rights) aspect of the order are willing to give up some of their sovereignty in order to participate in multilateral institutions. On the other hand, we focus more on the security aspect of the order, believing that a state’s independence and its ability to possess nuclear capabilities (as outlined in the NPT) maintains global security.

Overall, we believe that global unity can only be achieved if all states abide by the rules. This means that norms of sovereignty must be upheld and not disregarded by states that seek to satisfy their own strategic interests. The world today has become increasingly globalized and interconnected. According to Mohammad Javad Zarif, the Foreign Affairs Minister of Iran, states can no longer coexist on the international stage with a zero-sum perspective of the world. Crises such as terrorism and environmental degradation are global problems, not regional ones. In order to deal with a changing, globalized world, we are convinced that states will need to engage in dialogue with one another and, most importantly, respect one another's sovereignty. If states fail to do so, the world will become increasingly insecure. And when some states are insecure, all states are insecure. By respecting a state's independence and sovereignty, however, countries could actively create a more prosperous and peaceful world.

Committee on Security

Above all, our number one priority in terms of security is to maintain a theocratic regime. Pertaining to the national security of our nation, one should consider it in two distinct categories: regional security and global security.

Our regional security centers around the state of relations with proximate neighbors and our ability to handle internal turmoil. The primary players that affect our regional security are Iraq, Syria, Saudi Arabia and Israel. Iran-Iraq relations are generally strong and stable currently due to their joint-effort against ISIS, shared Shia doctrines and immense economic interaction. However, despite the fact that its effects are not massively widespread, the current conflict between Iran and Iranian Kurds living in Iraq is growing in prominence. To calm this conflict and prevent other possible problems from arising in Iraq, the IRGC will continue to work as it has in the past to quell unwarranted uprisings from Iranian Kurd groups such as the KDPI—Kurdistan Democratic Party of Iran—as well as any other groups of a similar nature. Similarly, Iran-Syria relations—strictly between the two governments—are very strong. Avid supporters of Assad's rule in Syria, we will not back

down in giving financial aid. Moreover, we are privy to the fact that rebels in Syria are funded by the disdainful governments of the United States and Israel, so there is especially no harm done in funding the fight against Western hegemonic grasp. Iran-Saudi Arabia relations have been extremely tense since our revolution in 1979. This disdain for each other has stemmed primarily from several geopolitical issues across the Middle East as well as our Sunni-Shia divide. Most recently, Saudi Arabia severed political ties with our nation impulsively after our citizens attacked their Embassy in Tehran. Diplomatic relations have been severed between us since. Last, Iran-Israel relations are quiet tense because Israel is a massive threat to Iran. This Iranian discontent with Israel is displayed by the current Iranian-Israeli proxy war taking place in Syria. At the end of the day, we just want to create peace in our region of the world. As Iranian Foreign Minister Javad Zarif says, “security networking” is the most effective way to prevent turmoil in their region. All nations must set aside their differences and work together because turmoil is not conducive to prosperity. Finally, internal conflict is a great challenge that must be overcome. At the end of 2017 and beginning of 2018 there have been protests across our nation challenging the current theocratic regime. Many of the protests were in fact fighting for different causes, but they all had the same end goal of calling into question the legitimacy of the current regime.

Our global security revolves mainly around our nuclear program. On the global stage, our national security is primarily affected by prominent western nations. The two most notable countries in considering our global security are the United States and Israel. Israel is an interesting case because it is both a regional security hazard to Iran and a global security hazard. Yes, the JCPOA has been signed, but many nations worldwide and most importantly the dominant western nations still pose a great threat to us. They are threatening because their actions have been detrimental to our nation in the past when they were suspect of our nuclear program. One does not have to search very far to see examples—like Stuxnet—of where the United States and Israel undertook sinister tasks to compromise our security. If countries are committing acts of that nature to physically destroy our nuclear program, one can only guess what else they will do when their not

pleased with us in the future. In addition, we have to be weary of both conventional forms of warfare as well as a possible escalation into nuclear war. Unfairly, we are barred from producing a nuclear weapon itself, so we are at a significant disadvantage in global power struggles. Last, our interaction with western nations and other nations across the globe centers mainly around economic security. The sanctions imposed were a great threat to economic national security not necessarily a threat in the conventional sense of warfare.

Committee on Diplomacy

While the harsh rhetoric of the U.S. president might suggest otherwise, we are a diplomatic state. We recognize the need for diplomacy in protecting our country and developing the global balance of power. We encourage consistent dialogue between our country and the P5+1 (the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council plus Germany). Before serious talks began, the relationship between our country and the P5+1 was defined by a lack of communication and threats, both of which perpetuated a dangerous cycle: as the P5+1 inflicted greater economic/political sanctions on us, we were, in turn, spurred to enhance our nuclear capabilities. Recent diplomatic efforts, particularly between U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry and our Foreign Minister Javad Zarif, have proved that dialogue, engagement, and successful diplomacy build the trust needed to serve a state's international interests, and have demonstrated our willingness to engage in these practices.

Such dialogues have already bore fruit for the United States. In January of 2016, for example, ten American sailors who accidentally crossed into the sensitive waters of the Persian Gulf were detained by our country. They were, however, released within just 16 hours later due to direct U.S.-Iran communication lines. Within the era of distrust that prevailed between Tehran and Washington before the opening of these direct lines, this minor incident might have been used as a political bargaining chip. Instead, the American sailors were released with considerable haste. The subsequent emancipation of five

American prisoners from our country similarly bares testament; January 2016 also saw us free five imprisoned Americans, among which was Washington Post reporter Jason Rezaian, in exchange for the U.S. release/pre-trial pardon of seven people of Iranian descent. We champion the idea that continued diplomacy between states is mutually beneficial.

To that end, we have shown a willingness to relinquish our nuclear pursuits in order to develop stronger foreign ties and aid our domestic economy. Our extensive nuclear program could be used to produce highly enriched uranium for a nuclear weapon, and, at our 2015 peak, comprised nearly 20,000 gas centrifuges at 3 major facilities. The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and the P5+1 began negotiating terms for us to halt our nuclear program back in 2002, ultimately yielding the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) in July of 2015. A substantial majority of our people favor the JCPOA, with only one in six opposing it, and about a quarter being undecided or equivocal. The support for the deal rests on the removal of crippling sanctions that have been devastating our country. Our economy is facing several challenges, many of which were exacerbated by the sanctions. The main challenges are unemployment (especially amongst youth) and inflation, a problem only bound to get worse because of the depreciation of our currency and the abolition of subsidies since 2010. On the whole, we recognized the need to strengthen our diplomatic relations with foreign powers if we wanted to keep our country afloat, even if it meant accepting restrictions on our nuclear program.

But this is not to say that we felt we were not losing a great deal in this agreement. An overwhelming majority of our people continue to say that it is “very important” for us to have a nuclear program, as it is “one of [our] greatest achievements.” About 80% of our population continues to see the program as driven purely by peaceful goals and claims that it serves as a symbolic and economic pillar for the country. In addition, despite widespread fear from the West, a large and growing majority of Iranians express opposition to nuclear weaponry. Two thirds now say that producing nuclear weapons is contrary to Islam, and eight in ten approve of the goal of the Non-Proliferation Treaty to eliminate nuclear weapons and establish a nuclear weapons-free zone in the Middle East. Consistent with

these views, our people have expressed opposition to chemical weapons, with nine in ten approving of our decision to not use chemical weapons during the Iran-Iraq War of the 1980s.

It is especially frustrating to many of us that the West has chosen to focus near exclusively on our nuclear capabilities even though nuclear tensions continue to rise in South Asia. The time, attention, and effort devoted to reaching a deal with our country over our nuclear ambitions have obscured the growing dangers of this volatile and unstable region. South Asia is quickly becoming a race for nuclear supremacy between three powers: India, Pakistan and China (note: China is not technically classified as part of South Asia, but shares borders with both India and Pakistan). Pakistan, in particular, is plagued by political and economic insecurity but is locked in a fight for military supremacy with India. Their rivalry, which has included outright warfare in 1947, 1965 and 1971, underscores the current political hostility between the two nations. Pakistan is believed to have one of the world's fastest growing nuclear arsenals and continues to develop short-range tactical nuclear weapons, all of which leave India well within range of nuclear devastation. The mutual suspicion and historical animosity between the countries of this region make it the perfect breeding ground for nuclear war, a fact largely being overlooked by Western states.

And it is the failure of Western countries to evolve in their views on our country that maintains the divide between Iran and the several Western powers. Since at least 1994, we have been classified as a "rogue state", a country bent on breaking international law that poses a serious threat to the security of other nations. And despite our efforts to accommodate Western powers in the name of diplomacy, U.S. President Donald Trump has continued to demonize the country, characterizing us as a "rogue regime" and constantly threatening to decertify the JCPOA. We are not a rogue state. We are a promoter of diplomatic practices both internally and abroad, and seek to create a just and mutually beneficial balance of power across the globe in spite of the selfish, unilateral decision making of the United States.

Committee on Terrorism

Deeply concerned about the increasing power of terrorist organizations and threats they pose to the stability of the states, the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran calls upon all countries to combine their efforts against this common enemy and stop both open and covert support of radical militant groups. We consider the multilateral negotiations and joint military operations as the only viable solutions to the problem and is ready to offer its assistance to combat terrorism in the Middle East.

We must emphasize that terrorism is a key threat to the stability of the Middle East and an increasing concern for the rest of the world. Similarly to Iraq and Afghanistan—where radical terrorist organizations have attempted to overturn the government—our national security and territorial integrity have been consistently threatened by Sunni militant groups. Funded by foreign powers, these groups seek to spread chaos and advance the interests of their supporters both in and out of Iran. Among the most concerning and prominent non-state actors are the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIS) and Al-Qaeda, that has recently experienced a new revival. Although these two groups differ in their ideologies, both are involved in similar activities: actively spreading propaganda to recruit Iranian people and committing terrorist acts like the attack on Iranian Parliament building. Along with them, we note the existence of dozens of small militant Sunni groups as well as anti-Iranian nationalist groups, in particular the so-called Kurdistan Free Life Party (PJAK) and the Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK), which operate mostly in the Iranian regions bordering Iraq and Turkey. Although we consider the Kurdish people an integral part of our population, we are strongly opposed to these radical nationalist groups that, inspired by the illegal 2017 Kurdish independence referendum in Iraq, strive to achieve independence from Iran and thus threaten our territorial integrity.

Realizing the intentions of the terrorist organizations and the serious challenges they have already brought to the Middle East and the rest of the world, the delegation of

the Islamic Republic of Iran is deeply concerned about their prospects of getting the nuclear weapons. As a nuclear power, we are ready to offer our cooperation. We believe that Iran must be a part of the multilateral processes to solve the problem of nuclear terrorism. However, the fact that the United States—a proclaimed fighter with nuclear terrorism—is opposed to inviting Iran to the joint conferences shows that the U.S. hypocritically exaggerates the imminence of nuclear terrorism just to advance some of its regional interests such as curbing our peaceful nuclear program and maintaining Israel's nuclear hegemony in the Middle East. Since Iran is left out of the US-dominated nuclear-security summits, we want to discuss the possibility of establishing a new independent nuclear monitoring agency that will create an opportunity for collaboration for all countries. We view nuclear terrorism as a transnational issue that requires active cooperation of the world's intelligence community and joint military operations if necessary. However, if no independent nuclear monitoring agency is created, we will oppose any U.S. attempts to stop Iran's peaceful nuclear program in the name of averting nuclear terrorism, and will consider this issue domestic.

An essential part of preventing nuclear terrorism is the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). Although the treaty has been signed by most of the world's countries, we consider it ineffective as it lacks a clearly defined plan of disarmament for nuclear powers and experiences problems with the enforcement, which is impeded by unrelated political issues. Although the NPT gives nations an inalienable right to enrich uranium for peaceful purposes, certain Western powers and their allies have been pursuing their side geopolitical interests and have repeatedly sanctioned Iran despite our peaceful nuclear program. Therefore, we think that there should be certain enforcement mechanisms not only for states that attempt to develop nuclear weapons, but also for those that, being in the position of power, manipulate the results of nuclear inspections and thus violate the current rules. We are convinced that the current enforcement mechanisms such as the UN sanctions are already effective in terms of influencing the country's economy but need to be applied only to the real violators of the treaty. Another problem we see in the NPT is that such states as Israel and India are not the signatories of the treaty and don't have to follow

its strict regulations. This creates a double standard, which hinders the legitimacy and effectiveness of the agreement.

One of the main causes of the nuclear terrorism is a wide availability of highly enriched uranium (HEU) and growing stockpiles of plutonium that can be used to make atomic bombs and can be all purchased on the nuclear black markets. The insiders in the nuclear programs of countries like Pakistan, the Russian Federation, and other former Soviet states often illegally obtain fissile material and other secret technology and, driven by the prospects of high monetary gains and little security, sell it to the criminal groups mainly in the Black Sea area - a region with low levels of law enforcement. According to the reports of the International Atomic Energy Agency, more and more organized criminal groups have become involved in the nuclear trafficking. We view it as a dangerous sign since these groups' smuggling techniques allow them to circumvent the law and easily sell the nuclear material to the terrorist organizations they are related to. Although Iran is blamed for obtaining the equipment for its peaceful nuclear program from the black markets, our country has never been implicated in the black market and only officially cooperated with states like Pakistan and Russia. As is often the case, these countries shared some of their nuclear development with Iran, realizing that this nuclear technology will be used for peaceful purposes such as obtaining the energy and will ensure the future economic cooperation with Iran.

The Islamic Republic of Iran defines the current world order as dominated by the United States. As the issue of nuclear terrorism highlights, this order does not pursue the policies that are beneficial for the international community since it often sacrifices the necessary cooperation with such countries as Iran in order to advance its own interests. Therefore, we argue that the current order is not adaptable to contending with international challenges such as terrorism and non-state actors. The delegation of Iran is strongly in favor of a multi-polar world that would halt the U.S. hegemony and deal with international security threats better and systematically. With Iran as a part of this new order, the world would benefit from cooperation with Iran because of our pursuit of

Islamic moderation and our systematic approach to the problem of terrorism, which has proved to be very effective in Iraq in the past.

It is known that democracies experience more terrorism than autocratic societies since they allow more destabilizing political competition and have increased limitations on surveillance and investigation. Meanwhile, autocratic states are able to avoid the bureaucratic problems and take more decisive measures that ensure the security of its citizens. The delegation of Iran thinks, regardless of the system of government, there is no acceptable risk of terrorism. It's essential to eradicate all terrorist groups, and we are ready to take all necessary steps in collaboration with other states to achieve this goal.

We are aware of how the increase in terrorist organizations' power has a destabilizing effect in both the Middle East and other parts of the world. We believe that cooperation is the best way to combat terrorism and set the world on a path to lasting stability.

Committee on Climate and Energy

Iran, like all other nations of the world, is a nation that operates on self-interest. While we have given up our supreme rights to the highest form of protection—nuclear weaponry—in the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), or the Iran Nuclear Deal, we remain resolute in showing the world that we are an independent, sovereign nation free to defend its peoples and ideals. Nowhere is this more evident than in how our nation addresses issues pertaining to climate and energy. As a global issue, Iran views climate change as a problem requiring attention and urgency. This is reflected in our participation in the Paris Accord, in which we have agreed to reduce overall emissions by 12% in the coming years. We see the problem of climate change within our own borders. Currently, the Iran Drought and Crisis Management Center concluded that 96% of the state is currently facing extended drought conditions, and by the end of the Iranian year—March 20, 2018—rainfall in border provinces will be upwards of 80% below the long term average. In response, the Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei has called upon the government to manage climate change and environmental threats that go along with it. President Hassan

Rouhani has put considerable funds into restoring the depleted Lake Urmia as it experiences drought. In May 2017, Iran launched the “National Strategic Plan on Climate Change,” in accordance with Iran’s membership with the Kyoto Protocol and Paris Agreement. We seek to reform our energy sector, which is responsible for over 90% of its greenhouse gas emissions. We also plan to reduce carbon emissions by 4-8% by 2030.

The Supreme Leader has called upon the government to explore options to expand its green economy. Currently, Iran is dependent upon its oil and gas reserves as means of energy. We are home to the world’s fourth largest oil reserves and the world’s largest natural gas reserves and are objectively a superpower with respect to energy. Consumption of both oil and natural gas comprise half of Iran’s domestic energy consumption. While we would like to diversify the types of energy produced throughout the country—specifically through the development of nuclear energy resources—the limits imposed by the Iran Nuclear Deal greatly handicap us from utilising nuclear energy as a sufficiently viable energy source. The declared nuclear development site at Natanz is the only permitted location to develop nuclear energy due to the limitations of the JCPOA. We are limited to installing 5,060 of the oldest and least efficient centrifuges here, and this will persist for 8 years under the guidelines of the JCPOA. In addition, uranium can only be enriched at the level of 3.67%, barely over the threshold required to be used for nuclear energy and far below that required for a nuclear weapon or warhead. Along with the JCPOA, our state had to reduce its stockpile of uranium by 98%. We see these established guidelines as an open signal from the international community that it may continue a non-military nuclear energy program, intended to benefit the civilian populations. This nuclear energy development will fall under the supervision of the International Atomic Energy Agency, or the IAEA. As a sovereign state, we believe we are fully entitled to use nuclear energy how we see fit within the paradigms established by the Iran Deal. With that in mind, we look to produce 23,000 MWh of electricity by means of nuclear technology by the year 2025 in order to fulfill our demand for energy in the hopes of diversifying beyond oil and gas reserves and protecting our economic interests.

The state of Iran acknowledges the climate risks that go along with our development of nuclear energy resources. Due to the fact that we are a tectonically active state, nuclear power plants are constructed in accordance with seismic criteria. However, evidenced through the establishment and important work of the Atomic Energy Organization of Iran (AEOI), we feel equipped to balance the environmental difficulties and the maintenance of nuclear energy. We have also established other oversight agencies such as the NPPD, INRA, and NSTRI, and feel they are solely equipped to face our country's need to balance civilian and military uses of nuclear energy. In recent memory, there have been no environmental problems as a result of nuclear development or use of nuclear energy. We are acutely aware of the dire drought situation and take great care to ensure that consequences from the development of nuclear energy don't affect water supplies. Additional international oversight isn't necessary beyond what is agreed upon in the JCPOA, and any further imposition of international agencies will be perceived as a threat to the sovereignty of Iran.

Due to the guidelines set forth by the JCPOA, we are not in possession of nuclear weapons, nor are we currently working on developing a nuclear arsenal at declared sites throughout the nation. In addition, through this deal, we permit IAEA inspectors to access any declared or non-declared facility if certain locations are deemed sufficiently suspicious to warrant any such investigation. The supply and supply chain of uranium in Iran will also be scrutinized by the IAEA for 25 years from the start of the deal. While we will respect and honor the deal we have agreed upon with the P5+1 countries, we also must acknowledge the hypocrisy of nuclear possession in the context of the current world order. We believe that only countries belonging to or allied with the West are permitted to have nuclear weapons in order to maintain the hegemony established by the United States and other like-minded countries over the rest of the world. The only non-Western or non-Western allied countries that have been permitted by the international community to continue to possess nuclear capabilities are those that belong to the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty and tested nuclear devices prior to the start of 1967. The U.S. position in the world does not give it supreme authority to determine what other countries can and cannot do. Since the birth of the Islamic Republic of Iran in 1979, the United States have been devoted to its

overthrow. Iran's support for the JCPOA largely boils down to the economic benefits it provides us through the lifting of sanctions, leading both the Supreme Leader Khamenei and President Rouhani to support the deal. At this juncture, we believe there is no specific country who would be able to fill the void of hegemon in place of the United States in its current role. However, we do appreciate China's respect for the sovereignty of independent nations.

Committee on Economics

Despite being hit hard by economic sanctions imposed by the United States, United Nations, and European Union for decades, we are the world's fifth-largest oil producer, pumping four million barrels per day. Last year, we exported 1.3 million barrels per day, and expect to double this number once the necessary infrastructure has been built. Oil makes up 80 percent of our nation's exports. Our gross domestic product was \$1.631 trillion in 2017, making it the 19th largest in the world. Our economy grew 3.5 percent in 2017, and 12.3 percent as a direct result of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), which has recently been placed in jeopardy in the foreseeable future.

Under the JCPOA, sanctions imposed by the UN, US, and EU are lifted under the condition that our nation's compliance is verified every 90 days by its participants and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). In October, Donald Trump declined to certify our compliance, in spite of all other negotiators' pronouncements that we remains in compliance with the deal. Although he did not discard the deal, he issued an ultimatum that if its terms are not modified, the United States will no longer waive sanctions. This is deeply troubling, as the deal has seen our country make billions of dollars in deals for airplanes and begin widely selling its oil. Trump's issues with the deal include what he perceives as its failure to address our ballistic missile program, the terms under which inspectors can visit nuclear sites, and "sunset" clauses under which the terms of our nuclear program begins to expire after 10 years. In reality, there is no sunset clause in the JCPOA; Iran's

commitment not to pursue a nuclear weapons industry is permanent. In addition, the JCPOA is strictly a non-proliferation treaty and cannot be linked to other issues.

If the nuclear deal becomes associated with our ballistic missile program or its regional activities, the JCPOA will be lost, and other issues will become more difficult to resolve. Our intentions for maintaining nuclear energy are peaceful and will not lead to the development of nuclear weapons. Ballistic missiles can be used to launch conventional warheads, and we retain the right to defend our nation and its citizens, especially in reminiscence of the Iran-Iraq war, which began in 1980 with Saddam Hussein's invasion of Iran. Furthermore, five of the world's nine nuclear powers are nearby or on our borders, which warrants an inclination to maintain means of defense for the possibility of a future attack.

Ominous potential for an attack on our soil lies in the shared interests and motivations of Donald Trump and Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. At the Munich Security Conference in February, Netanyahu warned that he is prepared to go to war if Tehran does not cease its involvement in Syria and, similar to Trump, is a longtime opponent of the 2015 nuclear deal. This increasingly aggressive rhetoric is dangerous, as an attack on Iran would be an immense economic sacrifice and would compromise the world's oil and natural gas supplies. Initial attacks coupled with Iranian counterattacks would jeopardize countries throughout the region. The initial air strike would require a large force allocation, and could lead to blockages of the Strait of Hormuz, through which flows 20 percent of the world's oil and natural gas supplies. Such actions that would endanger the world's economy are certainly not worth the cost, as, despite Western accusations, we do not even intend to pursue construction of a nuclear bomb. We believe international pressure to suspend its uranium enrichment is a politically motivated attempt to keep our country scientifically backward and to deprive our rights under the Nuclear Non Proliferation Treaty (NPT). Even if suspicions of our plan to construct a bomb were true, it would not be feasible, as we have already lost \$100 billion in foreign investment and oil sales due to sanctions placed on our innocuous uranium enrichment program.

Not only does our government have peaceful intentions within our own borders, but its involvement in curtailing ISIS has drawn international attention. We have arguably assumed more of a leadership role in the fight against terrorism than the U.S., and have doubts about the will and ability of the U.S. to engage in an effective manner. While the U.S. and allied nations carry out airstrikes, our forces are on the ground in Iraq, providing support to the Iraqi government and pushing back against ISIS. Tehran targets the Islamic State directly to disrupt its operations, sending advisers, military personnel and supplies, and money to tackle the group in Syria and Iraq to avoid conflict within its borders. These actions derive from our nation's strong and stable state, with notoriously effective implementations of counterterrorism services and measures.

As President Hassan Rouhani articulated in 2014, "terrorism germinates in poverty, unemployment, discrimination, humiliation and injustice. And it grows in the culture of violence." This highlights the conditions that lead to radicalisation rather than what can be done to fight terrorism once it has already arisen. The diligence we have exhibited in preventing terrorism within our borders showcases the stability of our population and economy. Our economy has continued to grow despite remaining U.S. sanctions, and contributed great measures to combat terrorism. We have also abided by the terms of the JCPOA, proving we are disposed to cooperate with other world powers to achieve a more peaceful world order.

Committee on Disaster Preparedness

We believe that exploration in space technology is a helpful and crucial step in attempting to prepare for a disaster; furthering space exploration will enable Iran to lead nations in being able to locate threats in a new way. In 2015, our country launched the *Dawn*, a spacecraft that was designed with the purpose of being able to observe Earth. These advances in technology will seemingly be incredibly useful going into the future. By embracing new technology in this respect, we will be able to find ways to protect their land territory on a rather fair playing field.

Beyond space exploration, there are immediate threats to Iran's security that need to be addressed. The biggest threat to our defense-based nuclear research is Israel. Our already limited nuclear facilities and research centers are closely inspected and regulated on the basis of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA)". Attempts by the Iranian government to expand their research could potentially trigger an attack from Israel. If we were attacked by Israel, under the United Nations Charter, Iran's national sovereignty would be directly infringed upon. This would lead to a potential complaint filed via the United Nations, to show Iran's diplomatic nature. In the event of this occurring, it is likely we will react with a counter-strike, thereby taking a defensive position in the event of a disaster.

In addition to the threat of an outside nation, such as Israel, the delegation of Iran fears we face extensive internal struggles. Currently, water crises are a major issues facing the Iranian population, like many other Middle Eastern nations. There are numerous sources of water, including the Lar River which supplies water to the Iranian city of Tehran. Yet, it is still difficult for these sources to sustain the Iranian population. In 2013, the head of the Iranian Water Sector stated that the water resources have reached "critical levels." Reports like such mean that the water our people have access to is precious. In the event of a nuclear disaster, these resources would most likely be threatened. If these resources were to be contaminated as a result of nuclear material the Iranian population would be directly impacted in a negative way.

In the event that Iran's neighbor nations are under attack, the Iranian government will do what is necessary to both provide aid, while still focussing on the interest of the Iranian people in mind. Due to the contentious nature of the relationship between Iran and Iraq and the differences between the populations of the two nations much consideration would be required to determine how to proceed. When it comes to borders in a disaster time, our current borders are important to maintain in order for the Iranian population and Iranian industries to have access to essential resources.

In the past, our government has worked to accommodate refugees. Throughout and after the Afghan-Soviet War, we took in around 1 million documented Afghan refugees, as

well as a significant amount of undocumented refugees. The Iranian government, since this time, has put forth extensive efforts to find places for these incoming people within Iranian society. Currently, we have the fourth largest refugee population. In the event of a nuclear disaster in which a refugee crisis emerges, we will work to find ways to aid these displaced persons, yet this may not mean taking in refugees. It is crucial to keep in mind not only the somewhat limited resources Iran has, but also the culture of Iran that refugees may not initially fit into. Iran's pre-existing strain on resources will make it difficult to accept large droves of refugees, especially in a time of crisis when our resources are already threatened.