
MOCRISIS 2025

BACKGROUND GUIDE

WHEN THE WORLD TURNED TO ICE

AWC



THE ARCTIC WAR COUNCIL (JCC)

CRISIS DIRECTOR
Jane Maguire

CRISIS MANAGER (ALLIES)
Biniyam B/Lucas B

CRISIS MANAGER (CENTRAL)
Rahib Arham

MODERATOR (ALLIES)
Maddie O' Rourke

CRISIS ANALYST (ALLIES)
Charlotte Bright

CRISIS ANALYST (ALLIES)
Avinashi Attwala

CRISIS ANALYST (ALLIES)
Cole Ebata

MODERATOR (CENTRAL)
Noveen Roy

CRISIS ANALYST (CENTRAL)
Ryan Trieu

CRISIS ANALYST (CENTRAL)
Zachary Baricaua

CRISIS ANALYST (CENTRAL)
Kavannah Hachey

Table of Contents

● Director's Letter	2
● Equity Statement	3
● Historical Background	4
● Current State of Affairs	9
● Topic 1 - Path towards Sustainable Peace	11
● Topic 2 - Domestic Governance and Stability	15
● Works Cited	20

Directors Letter

Dear Delegates,

Welcome to MOCRISIS 2025. My name is Jane Maguire, and I'm a grade 12 student at Monarch Park. I've created this committee in response to the deteriorating political situation we've all watched unfold over the past few years.

Although it closely follows past trends, I'm interested in seeing where this committee goes—almost like a simulation of the real-life future. I'm excited to see chaos unfold, surprise alliances, last-ditch peace treaties, shocking attacks, the like. This committee was born out of some random crisis arc. I'm sure we've all tried before, 'What should I do in this committee?'

'I don't know, start World War Three!'

As the world descends into impending doom, I'm curious to see how delegates handle their respective situations. You can manipulate politics, twist situations into your favour, and I can't wait to see what delegates do.

Due to the committee's niche nature, many questions may arise about the committee or the conference as a whole. For general conference questions, including payment and the itinerary, contact mpcmodelun@gmail.com, and for committee questions, contact [me directly](#).

Best of luck, delegates, and have fun!

- *Jane Maguire, background guide author and committee head*

Equity Statement

MOCRISIS 2025 has a zero-tolerance policy for equity violations within and outside of the committee. We acknowledge that this committee may touch on controversial issues; however, we implore delegates to maintain a high degree of respect and decorum. As a reminder, instances of racism, sexism, homophobia, transphobia, xenophobia, ableism, or any other form of discrimination will not be tolerated and may lead to disqualification from awards or removal from MOCRISIS 2025, depending on the severity. As a war committee, the dias acknowledges that this committee may touch on sensitive topics; however, we hope delegates can sensitively navigate through these topics. The dias will allow some leeway for talk of violence and warfare; however, there will be no tolerance for talk of violation of the Geneva Convention or war crimes, including, but not limited to, chemical warfare, biological warfare, and mass genocide.

For the Arctic War Council, here are your committee staff:

Director (Allies): Anna Choulova

Director (Central): June Rose

Moderator (Allies): Maddie O'Rourke

Moderator (Central): Noveen Roy

Crisis Director and Committee Head: Jane Maguire

Crisis Manager (Allies): Bini Bogale & Lucas Bezerra

Crisis Analyst: Charlotte Bright

Crisis Analyst: Avinashi Attwala

Crisis Analyst: Cole Ebata

Crisis Manager (Central): Rahib Arham

Crisis Analyst: Ryan Trieu

Crisis Analyst: Zachary Baricaua

Crisis Analyst: Kavannah Hachey

Historical Background

The year is 2030, and many people have started counting their days. The infamous 'Make America Great Again' (MAGA) movement began as a harmless political campaign for Donald Trump's election in 2016, which spiralled into a Nationalist political movement, causing America to follow in some well-trodden footsteps.

While the United States often meddles in international political situations, it's always been for the greater good (*or so they say*). Whether it be the Gulf War, Vietnam War, Grenada, Afghanistan, Panama, or the Drone Campaigns, the blood splatter of the 20th and 21st centuries always seems to follow the trail of breadcrumbs spelling out USA. Recently, however, the past has started to crop up in the most unlikely of ways. It started small. Somalia was in such ruins, perhaps it would've been better for it to become an extension of the United States. The same could be said for Yemen, Myanmar, and Sudan. NATO had analyzed this sudden change in the U.S intervention of such nations; however, it chose not to act to maintain longstanding diplomatic relations.

All that changed, however, with what could only be described as the 'Poland of World War III'. As the tanks of the land of the free rolled across the largest unprotected border in history, the world knew something must be done.

For such an action to be taken, there must be both means and motive. At this point, NATO has permanently dissolved due to Europe's decision to become autonomous from the alliance. While a NATO country attacking another NATO country doesn't officially trigger **Article 5**, it creates internal disarray. NATO's dissolution was neither clean nor simple; it ended because the budget was distributed back to countries roughly according to how much each member state initially contributed. Resources and weaponry stayed within the country where it was initially set up.

It had become clear, former NATO member states (Germany, UK, France, etc) have more than enough means, but not nearly enough motivation to deter the U.S's sudden power trip. They've collectively been an unstoppable force of power throughout the last century. Why destroy such beneficial diplomatic relations? Besides that, who would want to take on the all-powerful United States of America? They have the economic resources and the military power to blast through hell itself. But, similar to the Cold War, a 'phony war' had started with political & international relations becoming intense amongst ex-NATO states & The U.S.

However, while plenty of countries overflowed with means, only lacking motives, one country had the opposite. After the United States became an extremist nationalist 'MAGA' country, funding was pulled from Ukraine, and Russia had shockingly little trouble annexing the unsupported country. Russia, seeing an opportunity, seized it, being the first to bombard the United States. While it was mostly ceremonial, with no

mortal casualties caused by the bombing, as only a small bomb landed in the desert of Arizona, **an act of war is an act of war.**

Throughout history, Russia has been known for being brutal, with no sympathy for the lives of its soldiers, sacrificing millions to eliminate their enemies, **no matter what it takes.** Sometimes, even sending out soldiers—unarmed for battle. If anything is significant about authoritarianism, your leaders may see you as nothing more than a flesh shield. While the Russians may have all the motive, they lack appropriate economic resources and weaponry. So was born a surprising partnership, a war headed by Russia, funded entirely by the former NATO states.

There are two primary sides, the USA and the co. Versus. former NATO countries + Russia. The USA is the main power house of the **Central Powers**, with the former NATO countries + plus Russia making up the **Allied Powers**. The Central Power countries support the United States for various reasons. The Central Powers are made up of:

- USA
- Hungary
- Israel
- Philippines
- Serbia
- Brazil
- Saudi Arabia
- UAE
- South Korea
- Taiwan
- Pakistan

- Japan
- Egypt
- Georgia
- Ukraine
- Moldova
- Kosovo
- India

On the other side, we have the Anti-USA bloc, AKA the Allied Powers. This bloc consists primarily of former NATO countries, but also Russia and China. China has been directly opposing the United States for a long time, and saw this war as the perfect opportunity for the situation to begin in its favour. China's primary support comes in the form of economic aid, military, and weapons. The army opposing the United States is made up primarily of Chinese and Russian soldiers.

The list of USA opposing countries includes:

- UK
- Germany
- France
- Spain
- Australia
- New Zealand
- China

- Russia
- Iran
- Norway
- Denmark
- Sweden
- Finland
- Portugal
- Ireland
- Netherlands
- Mexico
- Argentina
- Kenya
- Nigeria
- Vietnam
- Indonesia

These countries directly oppose the United States for many reasons. While they don't all get along with each other, ***all is fair in love and war.***

It's been 3 months since WWII was officially declared, and so far, the global economy is almost as messed up as the diplomatic situation. Each country is tasked with focusing on establishing military, social, and economic agency.

Current State of Affairs

This war is happening on two main fronts currently. Taiwan and the Arctic, with the Arctic being the main battleground. Delegates are tasked with determining where the main fight will take place, as the primary powers in this battle are the U.S. and Russia. As of now, the Arctic has been the center of conflict, and initiation with troops entering from left and right. These two countries are separated by vast oceans and land, and consistently sending troops this distance is expensive. Luckily for them, there's a strip of land up north connecting the two nations. 50 years ago, fighting on this landscape would have been virtually laughable. However, with the rise of climate change, the land has become partially habitable. Still, a strip of land is merely a strip of land. Much of the fighting in this conflict takes place on the Arctic Ocean, meaning the strongest navy, may well be the strongest player in this all encompassing game.

The United States launches its attack through the North of what was once Canada; however, another enemy lurks even farther out: China.

The tensions between Taiwan and China have been ever-growing, and the USA has consistently been trying to profit based off of this proxy war. Regularly sailing USA ships through the Taiwan Strait, demonstrating its military presence in this region. And so, what may have once been a thriving nation becomes reduced to little more than a military base for the USA, regularly launching missiles into China, and housing soldiers there between battles.

So, fighting takes place on the small island of Taiwan, wreaking havoc on the small nation, as well as in China, bringing a host of new issues.

This battle is different for the USA, as they have fought on home turf only a few times since becoming independent. The war of independence, the civil war, and 1812. Both World Wars were fought overseas. Can America handle the action being so close to home?

Recently, due to the loss of Chinese and Russian soldiers, some NATO countries have begun sending troops. Germany and France are the first. The army is still primarily Chinese and Russian; however, that's expected to begin changing soon.

The United Nations is slowly falling apart. They have established this UN committee as their last-ditch effort to prevent an apocalyptic war from breaking out. By bringing representatives, world leaders, and so on and so forth into one committee room, they hope to achieve peace. 'The Arctic War Council', as it's been nicknamed, may be humanity's last hope. While the primary goal of the United Nations is to achieve peace, members aren't too confident.

So delegates, the fate of the world as we know it rests in your hands. Forge secret alliances, continue this feud for the sake of your people? Or choose peace, diplomacy. Lay down the pistol, or pick up a machine gun? The choice is yours, choose wisely.

There are many valid reasons to support both sides. The United States has offered protection and support to dozens of countries throughout the last century, and the countries they've gained control over have actually been doing fantastic

economically and socially. The goal of the Central Powers is to create a world where the United Nations sustainability goals are fulfilled and the world is more connected. Some may argue that this is not compromising anything at all.

On the other hand, the Allied Powers believe every country deserves its own autonomy. How can countries ruled by force ever really be free? Fearing this justification sounds all too familiar, the Allied Powers believe this must be stopped before it goes too far.

Topic I - Path Towards Sustainable Peace

Central Powers

Considering this is a primary goal of this committee, diplomacy should be a main focus for delegates. Everyone can agree that this war has been a long time coming; the pressure has been heating up for decades, finally reaching a boiling point. Returning to the status quo is in no one's best interest; there must be a long-term change. Many of the countries making up the Central powers are not democratic, and as much as the USA still proclaims democracy, even that has been fading out in favour of harsher control measures and centralization. Remember, alliances are an invaluable asset, but when utilized incorrectly, they can create intense diplomatic tension. NATO was created as a way to maintain long-term peace by creating a transatlantic alliance; however, when the opposing alliance, 'WARSAW', fell, the scales became unbalanced and put incredible amounts of tension between NATO and non-NATO countries, leading to increased conflicts. It's

important to remember that the countries making up the Central Powers are very geographically spread out, and many are involved in different regional conflicts.

Certainly, diplomatic relations between many of these countries and their surrounding countries will change drastically after this war, and it's important to factor this in when discussing peace talks and diplomatic attempts. Throughout history, the lingering effects of a peace deal have impacted Nations for decades, creating more conflicts.

For example, after the Treaty of Versailles, Germany was torn down which led to nationalist resentment and ultimately led to the rise of Pro-Nazi movements and the start of World War II. In the Korean War, instead of ending with an *armistice*, it ended with a peace deal, meaning that according to the legislature drafted North and South Korea are still at war. This led to a militarized border, causing frequent escalations and ongoing tensions. After the Iraqi war in 2003, civil war and power vacuums ensued, destroying the nation internally, post-U.S. invasion.

Delegates must look towards the future while remembering the past, and plan for a peace deal that will be amicable to all countries within the alliance. Delegates in the Central Power are aiming to lose as little territory as possible in the case of a peace deal. The countries that the United States occupies are a valuable resource, and as little of it as possible should be lost. Balancing long-term and short-term peace deals is a vital component of this committee; when balanced

properly, they can be an efficient way of making sure the people stop dying, whilst ensuring the peace deal stands the test of time.

Questions to consider:

1. Should democracy rule, or should another form of government become dominant?
2. Should long-term diplomacy have an element of control, like the USA had begun implementing before this war broke out?
3. What will the world look like after this war?
4. Should the alliance stay together long term?
5. How much is your country willing to sacrifice to end this conflict?

Allied Powers:

On the side of the Allied powers, a peace deal is the ultimate goal, and the focus of the delegates in this committee room.

Throughout history, the world has been generally controlled via supply chain by a few major powers, and the 21st century has been no different. The United States, China, and various European countries having the vast majority of the power on the global stage is what initially led to this global conflict. While bodies such as the United Nations have done what they can to keep the peace, ultimately, a return

to the way things were will only begin the cyclical pattern of short-term peace followed by more warfare. Alliances are the first reaction of most; it's vital to keep historical patterns in mind. It was originally the Allied Forces and Axis Powers that set into motion the diplomatic tensions resulting in both World Wars and countless proxy wars. It was NATO expansionism that led to the invasion of Ukraine. While a vital resource, alliances can cause international tensions.

Delegates must also consider how countries can be held accountable for their actions, as treaties are easily violated. They must also consider both how to end the fighting as soon as possible and how to prevent this situation from cropping up ever again. If delegates are interested in planning a long-term peace deal, they should consider plans for reconstruction, open talks, and humanitarian aid post-war.

Balancing long-term and short-term peace deals is a vital component of this committee; when balanced properly, they can be an efficient way of making sure the people stop dying now, whilst ensuring the peace deal stands the test of time.

1. Can anything be done to prevent countries with large economies from dominating the economic stage?
2. What alliances would benefit your country? (Remember, alliances don't have to stay within your committee room; relations between delegates of the Central Powers and Allied Powers are **heavily encouraged**)

3. Does your country have anything to gain from this war? What do you have to lose?
4. How can you guarantee a place for your country in the aftermath?

Topic 2 - Domestic Governance and Stability

Central Powers:

It won't surprise many to discover that the United States has borne the brunt of the cost of this conflict. So, it is the understanding that the USA will reap most of the benefits. At least that's what some think.

Many developing countries involved on the Central Powers side are risking just as much, if not more, for their cause, so why should they not reap just as many benefits? **High risk, high reward.** What should everyone contribute? Who should make economic, political, and military decisions? Should the USA be responsible for aiding its allies in this war? The United States is by far the most powerful country in the Central Powers both economically and militarily, so it makes sense for the United States to bear the brunt of the cost of the war. Should that mean the United States should also reap most of the benefits? Smaller countries involved may not be able to shoulder much of the economic burden; however, they're risking just as much, if not more than countries like the USA, which have much stronger economies and military power.

A central base should be established for all parties involved to be able to converge and plan strategically. The United States may be interested in being militarily dominant; however, it would be a mistake to overlook the contributions of allied countries, either culturally or militarily.

Another thing to keep in mind is what happens to the territory once it's been occupied. This may be controversial among members of this alliance. Historically, once a territory has been claimed, it's either liberated or falls under the control of whichever country occupies it at the moment. Lastly, in many of the countries that are a part of this alliance, the economic and humanitarian situation is beginning to worsen. Should it be the responsibility of the members of the Central Powers to aid their allies?

Questions to consider:

1. What can your country gain from larger countries in this alliance, such as the United States?
2. Does your country have the resources to maintain the war you're fighting?
3. What does the humanitarian situation look like in your country? How could it be improved?
4. What's the internal reaction from the people of your country, what are they calling for?

Allied Powers:

The allied powers are generally made up of members who know how to get along for their own benefit. That said, there are major ideological differences between many of the Allied powers, particularly between China/Russia and the former NATO countries. If delegates in this committee room are interested in putting up a proper effort against the formidable Central Powers, they must learn to put aside their differences and get along for the sake of military strategy.

They also must consider the public reaction to this particular allyship. During WW2, when the USA sided with Russia, they had to execute a propaganda campaign to curb public pushback. After all the strained tensions between China, Russia, and former NATO countries, the public reaction is something every member of this alliance must take into careful consideration.

Additionally, a central base should be established between these nations to strategize military and the timing of invasions. Another thing to consider is recruiting members of the Central Powers. Many of the smaller countries within the central powers are following the United States out of economic dependency or similar factors; however, they're in geographically strong positions. Would it be useful to the Allied Powers to attempt to persuade some of the smaller countries following the USA to switch sides?

Lastly, another thing to keep in mind is what happens to the territory once it's been occupied. This may be controversial among members of this alliance.

Historically, once a territory has been claimed, it's either liberated or falls under the control of whichever country occupies it at the moment. The members of this alliance may have different ideas of what should happen, something which must be discussed between members.

1. How is the public reacting to this alliance? What can you do to lessen that resistance?
2. Would it be beneficial for your country to attempt to recruit smaller countries from the Central Powers?
3. How do the military ideologies and territorial ambitions of your country differ from those of the other members of the Allied Powers?
4. How will the ideological differences between your country and the rest of the countries in the alliance impact the progression of this war? What can you do to overcome them?

Works Cited

Council on Foreign Relations. (n.d.). *Why China-Taiwan relations are so tense*.

Council on Foreign Relations.

<https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/china-taiwan-relations-tension-us-policy-trump>

Watson, B., Chertorivski, B., & Trudolyubov, B. (n.d.). *Critical minerals in the Arctic: Forging the path forward*. Wilson Center.

<https://www.wilsoncenter.org/article/critical-minerals-arctic-forging-path-forward>

Author	Margaret Williams	Request Interview
More From This Expert	U.S.-Russian Cooperation on Science and Conservation in the Bering Strait Region: Past Achievements and Cu, More From This Expert	
	U.S.-Russian Cooperation on Science and Conservation in the Bering Strait Region: Past Achievements and Current StatusPreserving U.S.-Russian Cooperation in Science and Marine Stewardship: Opportunities for Civil Society in, & Expert, M. F. T. (2024, March 4). <i>The environmental impacts of the war in Ukraine in the Arctic</i> . The Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs.	
	https://www.belfercenter.org/publication/environmental-impacts-war-ukraine-arctic	