

MUNMX
MORELIA 2025



COMMITTEE OVERVIEW

A large, faint, light blue watermark of the United Nations Security Council emblem is centered in the background. It features a world map within a circular frame, flanked by two olive branches.

SC

Security Council

MUN

The chair in charge of the direction of the Security Council committee in the United Nations Model MUNMX 2025 welcomes the delegations that will participate in this committee. The members who will preside over the Security Council this year are:



Luna Eliuth Esteban
Beltrán
President



Inés Alcaraz
Baños
Moderator



Juan Pablo Flores
Ávila
Chair officer

As a delegate of the Security Council it is important that you register for the committee's Google Classroom. Make sure you have a Gmail account with your full name so you can be properly identified. Once you have your Gmail account, go to the following link to join the Classroom:

[Google Classroom – Security Council](#)

This guide will help you learn about the Security Council, the topics selected for this edition, and the characteristics of the resolution expected from the committee.

First, you will find an explanation of the origin of the Security Council, its role in preserving peace and security, and the tools it uses to achieve its objectives. Then, you will find an explanation of each topic, including a description of the issue it addresses and the specific problem to be solved.

At the end, you will find a list of basic international treaties that you must study, as well as additional sources to help you prepare for the Model.

I. About Security Council

The Security Council is the main UN body in charge of keeping world peace and security. According to the UN Charter, it has the power to make decisions that all member countries must follow. This makes it unique compared to other UN groups that can only make recommendations.

The Council's power comes from different parts of the UN Charter:

- It investigates and tries to solve conflicts peacefully.
- If peaceful means don't work, it can impose sanctions or authorize military action.
- It works with regional organizations too, like the African Union or NATO, under UN supervision.

How Does the Security Council Work?

The Council has 15 members: 5 permanent (United States, United Kingdom, France, Russia, and China) and 10 others elected for two years. The permanent members have veto power, which means that a resolution can only pass if the permanent members vote in favor. Otherwise, the resolution is not approved.

For important decisions, at least 9 members may vote in favor. Most of the time, permanent states will vote against, even if the topic is about an ongoing conflict.

What Counts as a Threat to Security?

The UN considers a wide variety of scenarios that can be considered security threats. These include conflicts between states, civil wars, or internal disputes that may extend to the regional or subregional level. Furthermore, the Security Council recognizes that more general risks also endanger international peace, such as armed conflicts, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and the illicit trafficking of arms and weapons. (United Nations, n.d.)

Public International Law Role

The Security Council plays a crucial role in the development of public international law. It creates binding resolutions, which are provided for in Articles 25 and 48 of the United Nations Charter, and they oblige all Member States to comply with them and to have the force of international



law, unlike the resolutions made by the other UN organs, which are usually of a guiding nature.

Topic A.

Assessing NATO's threat to Peace and Security

The main objective of this topic is to evaluate whether **NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization)** represents a threat to global peace and security or whether it contributes to stability. Delegates are expected to draft effective resolution that either declares NATO as a threat to international security, limits their influence, regulates their actions, or reinforces cooperation with NATO, depending on their positions.

Regarding **NATO**, we should highlight Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty. It establishes the principle in terms of collective defense such that all consider any attack aimed against one member to be, in fact, an attack against all. Delegates may also consider the possibility of reassessing a country's status regarding NATO, for example, in cases where a member's decisions or actions affect international peace or security. Then, the Council can decide to suspend or remove members based on their actions.

Problem Statement:

NATO, created in 1949, created by the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty, establishes that an attack against one of its members is considered an attack against all. Political changes in influential countries like the United States directly impact the role and credibility of the alliance, generating uncertainty about its commitment and strategy. The considerable economic and military weight of the Western states that conform to NATO contributes to increasing tensions with emerging powers like China, which increases global rivalry and can affect global stability. All these factors mean that, although NATO is designed for collective defense, it can also pose a threat to international peace and security.

Seeking to guarantee security in a collective way, and to retaliate as a collective against any aggressor, but the alliance's military interventions, sometimes without UN authorization, but these military interventions, sometimes without UN authorization, have raised questions about its legitimacy. Such actions not only call into question whether they truly strengthen peace, but can also be seen as a threat to the international order, as they foster distrust and tensions with other global actors.

Theoretical and Conceptual Framework:

Some key concepts for resolving this topic are collective defense, sovereignty, security dilemma, and power politics. Delegates should analyze how military alliances can offer protection, but also how, if not managed carefully, they can generate tensions or even **conflicts**.

Collective defense: It is defined as *"a security arrangement where nations or entities agree that an attack on one is an attack on all, requiring mutual defense and support, rather than each entity defending itself individually"* (NATO, 2023).

Sovereignty: According to Cornell Law school, sovereignty means *"a political concept that refers to a dominant power or supreme authority. The sovereign is the entity that exercises power without limitation"* (Cornell Law school, s.f.).

Security dilemma: It is *"a situation in International Relations where a state's efforts to increase its own security, such as building up its military, are perceived as a threat by other states, causing them to also increase their own military strength"* (Richter, s.f.).

Power politics: According to Cambridge Dictionary, it means *"the threat or use of military force to end an international disagreement"* (Cambridge Dictionary, s.f.).

NATO:

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). It is a political and military alliance created in 1949, originally by 12 countries from North America and Western Europe, in the aftermath of World War II. NATO, created for collective defense, now faces these new challenges that transcend traditional warfare, as non-state actors and irregular forces use propaganda, terrorism, and unconventional strategies to undermine stronger states. This shift underscores how warfare in the 21st century is less about open battlefields and more about multifaceted strategies that blur the line between war and peace, requiring international alliances to adapt to increasingly complex and non-traditional threats.

In the Legality of Use of Force (Yugoslavia v. United States of America) case, the International Court of Justice (ICJ) rejected Yugoslavia's request for provisional measures on the grounds that it lacked jurisdiction: the United States had not accepted the Court's authority under the Genocide Convention. Although the Court expressed concern about the humanitarian situation and the use of force during the NATO bombing of Kosovo, the judges emphasized the need to urge the parties to respect international law and avoid aggravating the conflict. Some emphasized that humanitarian grounds could justify intervention, given that the bombing posed a real risk to the survival of the population. Ultimately, the Court removed the case from its docket, highlighting the tension between legal limitations and the obligation to protect human life in conflict situations.

Justification:

This topic is important because NATO plays a big role in global security, but it also raises concerns about militarization and power imbalance. With the current political changes and rising military budgets, it is necessary to discuss whether NATO promotes stability or generates tensions. Understanding NATO's impact today helps find balanced solutions that either limit risks or support cooperation.

- Guiding Questions

1. To what extent does NATO's principle of collective defense contribute to maintaining global stability, and under what circumstances might it increase tensions or conflicts with non-member states?
2. How do NATO's military interventions affect its legitimacy within international law and perceptions of its role in preserving or threatening peace and security?
3. What mechanisms or reforms could ensure that NATO's actions align with international law, respect state sovereignty, and promote cooperative rather than competitive security?

- Suggested Resources for Research

The North Atlantic Treaty (1949) – Full text outlining NATO's founding principles, including *Article 5 on collective defense*.

Source: https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_17120.htm

NATO Strategic Concept (2022) – Describes NATO’s modern security priorities, global partnerships, and evolving defense policies.

Source: <https://www.nato.int/strategic-concept>

United Nations Charter (1945) – Regarding collective security and the use of force.

Source: <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter>

International Court of Justice (ICJ) Case Files – Particularly the Legality of the Use of Force (Yugoslavia) for reference on NATO interventions and international law.

Source: <https://www.icj-cij.org/en/case/114>

Topic B.

Breach of International Humanitarian Law during Genocides

This topic addresses how international law deals with genocides and violations of humanitarian law during armed conflicts. The objective is to draft a resolution that strengthens accountability mechanisms (international processes with the aim of forming investigations, commissions and/or sanctions against those who inflict them), protects civilians, and ensures compliance with existing treaties.

The Gaza conflict since October 2023 has become one of the most significant crises of the 21st century, combining large-scale armed hostilities with profound humanitarian consequences. The escalation began on 7 October 2023, when Hamas and allied groups launched an unprecedented attack on southern Israel, killing and abducting civilians and soldiers. Israel responded with extensive airstrikes and a ground invasion of Gaza, initiating a prolonged military campaign aimed at ceasing future life-threatening scenarios and securing hostage cases in the area.

The consequences for the civilian population of Gaza have been catastrophic. Entire neighborhoods were destroyed, critical infrastructure such as hospitals, schools, and shelters were repeatedly struck, and mass displacement left hundreds of thousands without stable refuge. Humanitarian agencies consistently warned of famine, disease, and the collapse of essential services, while international organizations highlighted the disproportionate impact on women and children.

Diplomatically and legally, the conflict generated major international scrutiny. In January 2024, the International Court of Justice ordered provisional measures in a case signaling genocide against Palestinians, while the International Criminal Court advanced investigations that later resulted in arrest warrants for figures on both sides. The United Nations and humanitarian bodies condemned widespread civilian harm, emphasizing potential violations of international humanitarian law.

Despite temporary pauses in late 2023 and subsequent prisoner-hostage exchanges, no sustainable ceasefire was reached. Major Israeli offensives continued throughout 2024, including the controversial

Rafah operation, and into 2025 with intensified strikes in Gaza City. Hostage diplomacy remained central, shaping military and political decisions in Israel and complicating mediation efforts.

Regionally, the conflict provoked spillover tensions and reshaped international diplomacy, with some states moving toward recognition of a Palestinian state. Globally, debates over accountability, proportionality, and humanitarian access underscored the central dilemma of modern warfare: the tension between military objectives and the protection of civilian life.

Today, nearly two years after the initial escalation, Gaza remains a symbol of the human cost of protracted conflict. The war has redefined the conversation about international humanitarian law, state responsibility, and the limits of warfare in densely populated urban environments, leaving urgent questions about justice, reconstruction, and peace still unresolved.

Problem Statement:

Genocide, prohibited under international law and addressed in the 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, represents one of the gravest breaches of International Humanitarian Law. The principle seeks to protect civilian populations and ensure accountability for crimes against humanity, but repeated cases of genocide and mass atrocities despite legal frameworks have raised questions about whether international mechanisms are truly effective in prevention or if they fail to act until after irreparable harm is done. Political interests and lack of consensus within influential states, can directly affect the enforcement of humanitarian law and the credibility of international justice. Furthermore, the limited reach of institutions like the International Criminal Court fuels the debate about global responsibility, especially in relation to powerful states that reject or ignore its authority.

Theoretical and Conceptual Framework:

To resolve this topic properly, the delegates must understand certain concepts, such as: the four Geneva conventions, the additional protocols to the Geneva Conventions, the rights of civilians in times of war, The Statute of Rome, Gaza's current situation.

The **four Geneva conventions**, established in 1949, have taken place in the protection of those who are categorized as victims.

- **First Geneva Convention:** Protection and attendance of wounded troops on land.
- **Second Geneva Convention:** Protection and attendance of wounded troops at sea, prioritization of naval rescues.
- **Third Geneva Convention:** Priorities humane treatment to prisoners of war (POWs).
- **Fourth Geneva Convention:** Prohibition of violence against the wellbeing of civilian populations during and after armed conflicts.

Basically, these were initially established to attend wounded troops, naval rescues, prisoners of war and later the protection of civilians.

As later established protocols:

- Protocol I (1997): Prohibition of use of hostility against civilians wellbeing.
- Protocol II (1997): Humanitarian treatment to hostages/prisoners of war.
- Protocol III (2007): Recognition of the Red Cross emblem as the identification of those who are entitled with aiding and life preserving.

International Humanitarian Law

Is the law of war or the law of armed conflict, is a body of rules designed to limit the effects of armed conflict for humanitarian reasons. Its main purpose is to protect people who are not, or are no longer, directly participating in hostilities, such as civilians, the wounded, and prisoners of war, while also restricting the means and methods of warfare. Unlike public international law, which addresses whether states may lawfully resort to armed force, IHL focuses on regulating the conduct of hostilities once an armed conflict has already begun.

The legal framework of IHL is primarily based on treaties, with the **four Geneva Conventions** of 1949 serving as its core. These conventions universally ratified, establish protections for the wounded and sick on land and at sea, for prisoners of war, and for civilians in times of conflict and

occupation. They were later added the **Additional Protocols of 1977**, which expanded protections to victims of both international and non-international armed conflicts, and by the 2005 Additional Protocol III, which introduced the Red Crystal as a new protective emblem alongside the Red Cross and Red Crescent.

Beyond the Geneva Conventions, a series of treaties further strengthen IHL by prohibiting specific weapons and methods of warfare. These include the 1925 Protocol banning the use of chemical and biological weapons, the 1954 Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property, the 1972 Biological Weapons Convention, the 1976 Environmental Modification Techniques Convention, the 1980 Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons and its protocols, as well as later agreements like the 1993 Chemical Weapons Convention, the 1997 Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention, and the 2008 Convention on Cluster Munitions. Together, these instruments reflect the balance IHL seeks to maintain between humanitarian concerns and the military requirements of states and armed groups.

The Rome Statute, which established the International Criminal Court (ICC) in 1998, defines genocide as one of the most serious crimes against humanity. According to the Statute, **genocide** refers to specific acts committed with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group. These acts include killing members of the group, causing them serious bodily or mental harm, or deliberately creating living conditions intended to bring about the group's physical destruction. It also includes imposing measures designed to prevent births within the group and forcibly transferring children from the targeted group to another. What distinguishes genocide from other crimes under international law is the special intent to eliminate a protected group, making it a direct attack not only on individual victims but also on the existence and identity of entire communities.

The situation in Gaza was established in May 2021 to investigate violations of international humanitarian and human rights law. Since October 2023, the Commission has documented crimes against humanity, war crimes, and acts that may amount to genocide committed in Gaza, such as extermination, torture, sexual violence, forcible transfer, persecution, and starvation as a method of warfare. It found evidence of

underlying genocidal acts, including the deliberate destruction of Palestinians' reproductive capacity and the imposition of conditions of life intended to bring about their physical destruction.

Under international law, genocide is prohibited as a *jus cogens* norm, and states have both the duty to prevent and punish it. The Commission applies the legal framework of the Genocide Convention and the Rome Statute, which define genocide as acts like killing, causing serious harm, imposing destructive living conditions, preventing births, or forcibly transferring children, when carried out with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group. While focused on Gaza from October 2023 to July 2025, its findings contribute to the broader question of state responsibility under international law, in parallel with ongoing proceedings at the International Court of Justice regarding Israel's actions.

Rules for voting in the SC. According to the United Nations Charter, the Security Council holds the primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security, and its decisions on substantive matters require an affirmative vote of nine members, including the concurring votes of all five permanent members. However, Article 27(3) establishes a key limitation: when the Council is dealing with disputes under Chapter VI (Pacific Settlement of Disputes) or Article 52(3) concerning regional arrangements, any member state that is a party to the conflict must abstain from voting. This duty to abstain is intended to ensure impartiality and fairness, preventing states directly involved in a dispute from influencing the outcome in their own favor. While procedural matters are exempt from this rule, the abstention principle reinforces the broader purposes and principles of the Charter, including the peaceful settlement of disputes (Article 33) and the prohibition of the use of force against the sovereignty or political independence of any state (Article 2).

Justification

This topic is important because breaches of International Humanitarian Law during genocides highlight the failure to protect vulnerable populations and uphold basic human rights. Despite existing treaties and legal frameworks, political interests and weak enforcement often allow atrocities to continue unchecked. With ongoing global conflicts

and risks of mass violence, it is necessary to discuss whether current mechanisms truly prevent genocide or simply respond after the damage is done. Understanding these breaches today helps delegates explore solutions that strengthen accountability, improve international cooperation, and protect civilian lives.

Guiding Questions

1. How effective are current international legal instruments in preventing and responding to genocides, and what reforms could strengthen their enforcement and applicability in ongoing conflicts?
2. What mechanisms can be developed or reinforced to ensure accountability for breaches of International Humanitarian Law during genocides, particularly when there exists political influence or limited jurisdiction that weakens the capacity of international courts and institutions to act impartially?
3. In the context of modern conflicts like Gaza, how can states and international organizations balance military objectives with the humanitarian obligation to protect civilians and uphold International Humanitarian Law?

Suggested Resources for Research

The Four Geneva Conventions (1949) and Additional Protocols (1977, 2005)
Framework of International Humanitarian Law protecting civilians, prisoners of war, and the wounded during conflicts.

Source: <https://ihl-databases.icrc.org/en/ihl-treaties>

UN Charter (1945) – Concerning peace, security, and enforcement actions.

Source: International Court of Justice. Bosnia and Herzegovina v. Serbia and Montenegro (2007).

Landmark judgment clarifying state responsibility for genocide under international law.

Source: <https://www.icj-cij.org/en/case/91>

Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948): foundational treaty defining genocide and obligating states to prevent and punish it.

Source: https://www.un.org/en/genocideprevention/documents/atrocities-crimes/Doc.1_Convention%20on%20the%20Prevention%20and%20Punishment%20of%20the%20Crime%20of%20Genocide.pdf

Prohibition of Use of AI

The Chair reserves the right to sanction if it believes a paper or proposal was created using artificial intelligence (AI); if detected, delegates will be granted a warning and penalized. For Tec students, the maximum grade may be 69, and the case may even be escalated to FIA/DA. If the Chair believes a document was created using AI, the delegate will automatically lose their prize in case of winning one.

Remember that your proposals **MUST** include full references (properly cited sources).

Please consult the AI Policy:  [ANEXO 1: POLÍTICAS DE IA.pdf](#)

References

- Cambridge Dictionary. (s. f.). *Power politics*. In *Cambridge English Dictionary*. Cambridge University Press.
<https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/power-politics>
- European Parliament. (2022). *NATO and the war in Ukraine (Briefing)*. European Parliamentary Research Service.
[https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/ATAG/2022/729350/EPRS_ATA\(2022\)729350_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/ATAG/2022/729350/EPRS_ATA(2022)729350_EN.pdf)
- Hofmann, S. C. (2009). NATO and the European Union's common security and defense policy: Institutions at the crossroad. *Security Studies*, 18(3), 445–478. JSTOR. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26323362>
- International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC). (n.d.). *¿Qué es el derecho internacional humanitario?* ICRC.
https://www.icrc.org/sites/default/files/document/file_list/dih.es_.pdf
- International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC). (n.d.). *Treaties, States parties and commentaries*. ICRC.
<https://ihl-databases.icrc.org/en/ihl-treaties/treaties-and-states-parties>
- International Court of Justice (ICJ). (n.d.). *The Court*. ICJ.
<https://www.icj-cij.org/court>
- International Committee of the Red Cross. (n.d.). *The Geneva Conventions and their Commentaries*. Retrieved [date you accessed it], from <https://www.icrc.org/en/law-and-policy/geneva-conventions-and-their-commentaries>

Independent Investigative Mechanism for Myanmar (IIMM). (n.d.). *ICJ – The Gambia v. Myanmar*. IIMM.

<https://iimm.un.org/en/icj-gambia-v-myanmar>

Martínez, J. (2021). *La OTAN y el nuevo orden mundial*. VLex. <http://vlex.ec/vid/otan-nuevo-orden-mundial-1072839978>

North Atlantic Treaty Organization. (2023). *Collective defence*. NATO. https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_110496.htm#:~:text=Collective%20defence

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). (n.d.). *What is NATO?* NATO. <https://www.nato.int/nato-welcome/index.html>

Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR). (n.d.). *Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide*. United Nations. <https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/convention-prevention-and-punishment-crime-genocide>

Reuters. (2025, January 15). *Key events in the Israel-Gaza war*. <https://www.reuters.com/world/middle-east/major-moments-israel-gaza-war-2025-01-15/>

Reuters. (2025, January 15). *Israel, Hamas reach ceasefire deal designed to end 15-month Gaza war*. <https://www.reuters.com/world/middle-east/israel-hamas-reach-ceasefire-agreement-designed-end-15-month-gaza-war-official-2025-01-15/>

Ringsmose, J. (2010). NATO burden-sharing redux: Continuity and change after the Cold War. *Contemporary Security Policy*, 31(3), 319–338. JSTOR. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4137565>

Rynning, S. (2005). NATO renewed: The power and purpose of transatlantic cooperation. *Contemporary Security Policy*, 26(3), 482–485. JSTOR.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep05770.9>

Richter, T. (2020, julio 31). *The security dilemma and the causes of World War I. Fresh Writing*, University of Notre Dame.
<https://freshwriting.nd.edu/essays/the-security-dilemma-and-the-causes-of-world-war-i/>

Swiss Confederation. (n.d.). *The Geneva Conventions and their additional protocols*. Federal Department of Foreign Affairs (FDFA).
<https://www.eda.admin.ch/eda/en/fdfa/foreign-policy/international-law/international-humanitarian-law/geneva-conventions.html>

United Nations. (n.d.). Actions with Respect to Threats to the Peace, Breaches of the Peace, and Acts of Aggression | Security Council. Main.un.org.
<https://main.un.org/securitycouncil/en/content/repertoire/actions>

United Nations. (1945). *Charter of the United Nations*.
<https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter>

United Nations Security Council. (n.d.). *What is the Security Council?* United Nations.
<https://www.un.org/securitycouncil/content/what-security-council>

Wex Definitions Team. (2024, junio). *Sovereignty*. In *Wex: Legal Information Institute*. Cornell Law School.
<https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/sovereignty>