Council — Sweden

Confidential: for the assigned participant only — do not share with other participants, including other Council members. Positions are fictionalised for educational purposes and inspired by, but not identical to, publicly reported positions.

Your team: EU Member States (national representatives)

In the real JCPOA talks, France, the United Kingdom, and Germany (the "E3") sat at the table, in close coordination with the EU High Representative; the other member states had to be kept on board and ultimately endorse the lifting of EU sanctions. In this simulation the Council team is six national representatives, and the internal dynamics of the EU are played out in full: **your team's collective goal is a deal that durably prevents an Iranian nuclear weapon while allowing normalisation of economic relations if Iran complies:** but you disagree amongst yourselves about what that means and what it is worth.

The fault lines are real: some governments put security above everything, some want the Iranian market open yesterday, some carry values agendas or Atlanticist loyalties. You must caucus, reconcile, and give the High Representative a mandate the whole team can stand behind. Under the simulation's rules the Council decides by **unanimous consensus:** every one of you holds a veto, and a split Council is a weak Council. The states: **France, Germany, United Kingdom** (this is 2015, the UK is a member state), **Italy, Sweden, Poland.**

Your role

Motivations & constraints: You are the Council's normative conscience: human rights, international law, and the principle that European agreements should reflect European values. You support the nuclear deal. Diplomacy over confrontation is the Swedish way, but you refuse to let it be *only* about centrifuges while political prisoners sit in Evin. You push for a human-rights dimension: a clause, an annexed dialogue, a public commitment. Something. You know the big states find you inconvenient, and you know your leverage is limited; but under the consensus rule, your yes must still be earned. Calibrate: push hard enough to matter, not hard enough to wreck.

Red lines: No blind eye. Silence on human rights in the final package is problematic: you need at minimum a credible commitment (an EU–Iran human-rights dialogue, or language linking egregious violations to a pause in benefits) you can defend at home. Human-rights-based sanctions must not be washed away with the nuclear ones. However, you still recognise that some deal might be better than no deal at all because nobody wanted to insert a human rights sentence.

Style: Principled and vocal, but constructive. Frame values as strength, not obstruction: "an agreement that reflects our values is an agreement that lasts." Coordinate openly with the like-minded MEPs (Greens, S&D): a values coalition across institutions is your force multiplier. Choose your battles, name your price, and when the human-rights line is in the text, deliver your yes graciously.