



Model Arab League: Three Days

The full version: a quarrel inside the coalition, and two tracks to reconcile.

College and high school.

Days one and two below are the one-day and two-day designs, unchanged. The third day is where the outcome is genuinely allowed to fail, and you should say so in advance.

The teaching problem

Students treat it as Model UN with different countries. The institution is genuinely different in a way that is teachable in one session, and the difference is the whole reason to run this format.

The rule that makes this format worth running

Under the Pact of the League of Arab States, a **decision taken by majority binds only those states that voted for it**. Unanimity binds everyone. That one rule converts the vote from a formality into the most interesting moment of the day, because a delegation has to choose between shaping a text it will be bound by and standing outside one it will not.

The session

A single session of the Council of the League on regional food and water security following a sustained disruption to Red Sea shipping. The file crosses economics, agriculture and defense, and it divides Gulf states from non-Gulf states on who pays, which is a real line rather than an invented one.

The element that does the teaching

Read the binding rule aloud again immediately before the vote, then give the room ninety seconds of silence to decide. Take the vote by name. A delegation that votes yes is bound and must say so. A delegation that abstains says out loud what it is declining to be bound by. The tally on the board at the end shows a text that binds seven of eleven, which is what a regional organization without supranational authority actually produces.

Speaking turns

Every delegation speaks in the opening, in at least one of the three items by assigned exposure, and in the vote. **Give the two or three largest funders a question in all three items**, because they will be asked to pay in each.

The running order

0–10	Opening, including the binding rule stated plainly and once.
10–35	Item 1, who pays, with the largest funders answering by name.
35–45	Break. Ten minutes, standing, finding allies.
45–75	Items 2 and 3, agriculture and security, with funders answering again.
75–78	The binding rule read aloud again. Ninety seconds of silence.
78–90	The vote, by name , each delegation saying what it is or is not bound by. Tally written on the board.
90–100	Debrief , starting from the tally.

Day two

Day one ends after item two with no vote. Between the days, delegations that found each other during the break submit a joint draft resolution, and any delegation may submit a competing one.

Day two opens with **two or three rival texts on the table rather than one**, which is closer to how the League actually works, and the session has to choose among them before it can amend one.

Day three

The development on day two is a bilateral incident between two member states seated in the room. It forces the League to decide whether it is a forum for collective action or for dispute settlement, and it tests whether the day-one coalition survives a quarrel inside it.

Day three adds a specialized ministerial council meeting in parallel for part of the period, so that the economic and the security tracks produce recommendations that have to be reconciled at the end.

This is the one format in the set where splitting the room into parallel sessions earns its keep, and only at three days. At one day it costs more than it buys.

The trap in this format

Thin sourcing. Students find far less accessible material on these states than on EU members, and they fill the gap with assumption. Hand out two or three real documents per delegation with the briefs, and make the one-sourced-fact requirement non-negotiable.

Before you publish the agenda

1. Can you say in one sentence what the session is for, without using the word coverage?
2. Does the question genuinely divide the room, and can the body actually decide it?
3. Is every role down for at least two scheduled turns?
4. Have the demanding roles been spread deliberately rather than claimed?
5. Does someone know they are chairing, and have they been briefed?
6. Have the real questions gone out, with a line saying they are the real ones?
7. Is anything artificial about the setup named in the student document?
8. Is there a ten-minute break in the middle for students to find allies, and is the room arranged so they can stand up and move?
9. Is the closing act something the room can watch fail?
10. Is the debrief in the running order, with time of its own?

The three floor rules to read aloud, and a minute-by-minute template, are in Running Order, Floor Rules, and the Day-Of Check on the Class-Based Simulations page. The topics below are defaults. Replace them with whatever is live when you run the session; what should not be replaced is the one structural element in each design that does the teaching.