

The Commonwealth of Australia Position Paper for the Historical Security Council

I. Strengthening Infrastructure and Industry Redevelopment with Migrant Increase

The Commonwealth of Australia rejoices in the closure of conflict between the Axis and Allied powers. The Commonwealth of Australia has perceived, however, even in the light of the easing of conflict, a great deal of resilience in various respects regarding the stability, innovation, and protection of states amidst this turmoil is needed among many states.

Noticing with sorrow, it has come to the Commonwealth of Australia's attention that crucial redevelopment of infrastructure and industry is vital to evade viable future feebleness and loss. After losing 39,000 service men and 3500 flyers serving in the Royal Australian Air Force (RAAF), just to name a few of our agonizing losses¹, The Commonwealth of Australia is adamant about rebuilding our nation and the nations of many for the enhancement of international welfare, to become stronger in the face of the loss of many who fought valiantly.

As of recently, The Commonwealth of Australia has been afflicted by the recent mayhem inserted by the Axis powers, in the form of much of our labor force and national security lost--we have noticed many other states have similar dilemmas.

From when German forces surrendered, to today, there has been a growing need for assistance in this rebuilding and restoration. The Commonwealth of Australia recognizes our state in addition to many others have been heavily influenced infrastructurally, economically, and structurally with factors such as labor shortages, weakened national security, and damaged infrastructure.

Within our own state, The Commonwealth of Australia has found the immigration of many persons from states such as Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania beneficial² to our national economy, benefitting the common citizen greatly. We believe that a similar tactic may fare well for the international well-being.

It is The Commonwealth of Australia's intentions to promote and sustain prosperity by means of economic stimulation that benefits all participating states. The Commonwealth of Australia believes an initiative to redevelop infrastructure and economic structure would perform well in strengthening states that have been stricken vulnerable by this turbulence.

The Commonwealth of Australia is willing to work alongside other states in order to stimulate international economic growth and create an initiative that will bear innovations and propel the international economy in a forward-facing direction in which all states that participate are benefitted.

¹ Second World War, 1939-1945: <https://www.awm.gov.au/articles/second-world-war>

² Postwar Immigration Drive: <https://www.nma.gov.au/defining-moments/resources/postwar-immigration-drive>

Kingdom of Belgium

Position for Security Council

I. THE NUREMBERG MILITARY TRIBUNAL REFORM

The Second World War was a travesty caused by the mismanagement of reparations and redistribution of lands during the Paris Peace Conference of 1919, which culminated in the Treaty of Versailles. However, the Treaty of Versailles had many benefits, as it allowed those most affected by the Great War to take a direct part in planning the consequences for the aggressors of the conflict. In contrast to the Treaty of Versailles are the Nuremberg Military Tribunal Trials, which began on November 20, 1945, and are the proposed solution to determining appropriate punishment for those responsible for the Second World War. The Nuremberg Military Tribunal is led by American Lawyer Telford Taylor and other judicial representatives from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the French Republic. These states seek to make the Nuremberg Military Tribunal Trials a place to educate and reform the German people rather than bring vital and immediate justice for those who faced the oppression of the Greater German Reich. The nations that faced the most oppression now find themselves unable to face their constituents, while the crimes of their former oppressors go unpunished.

When the Kingdom of Belgium was invaded by the Wehrmacht on May 10, 1940, our defensive forces were quickly defeated by the overwhelming might of the Wehrmacht, leading to our surrender before the end of May 1940. The Kingdom of Belgium faced heavy losses in this conflict; however, unlike other allied powers, our major political & military figures such as King Leopold III were unable to join the retreat at Duinkerke, and countless soldiers were killed or pressed into service in the Wehrmacht. Though these military losses were severe and damaging, the cost to the people of the Kingdom of Belgium was far greater. Anti-Jewish laws were immediately created and during the occupation over twenty thousand Belgian Jews were deported to death camps. Along with this, upwards of four hundred non-Jewish Belgian citizens were forcibly taken to labor works in Germany and Northern France and endured harsh conditions under the German regime. The Kingdom of Belgium feels that it is a great perversion of justice that the states that endured the most severe oppression under the Greater German Reich in invasion and occupation do not have a voice in bringing justice through the Nuremberg Trials.

The Kingdom of Belgium urges that the Security Council take immediate action to change the structure of the Nuremberg Military Tribunal and prosecuting force to include members of the judiciary force of states including: the Kingdom of Belgium, the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, the Czechoslovak Republic, the Republic of Poland, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the Kingdom of Denmark, and other States that were occupied by the Axis Powers. By allowing these states to send delegations to act as members of the tribunal and prosecution, the Kingdom of Belgium feels this would ensure that those most deeply affected by the Nazi rule would be able to bring justice for their citizens. Furthermore, the second action that the Kingdom of Belgium feels the Security Council should take is the addition of Jewish representatives to the tribunal of the Nuremberg Trials. The Holocaust against the Jewish people is the most heinous crime committed by the Greater German Reich thus, the Jewish people deserve a say in sentencing its leadership.

II. LAND REPERATIONS

The Kingdom of Belgium can trace its roots back to the old Belgae, the lords of the Central Rhineland, who were renowned for their bravery in defending the land and its people. The people of the modern Rhineland share these same roots, which extend to the Roman province of Gallia Belgica, Latin for Belgium, which stretched from the Seine River to the Rhineland. These lands were filled with the

Belgae peoples, great warriors for the Roman empire, and expert farmers whose culture dominated the region and whose influence can still be seen today. In more recent times, the link between these regions can be seen through the Walloon people of the Kingdom of Belgium and the Rhineland, with their distinctive French dialects that differ from the French of Paris. These cultural connections hint at the need for uniting the Rhineland to the Kingdom of Belgium to protect their unique culture and peoples from oppression in the future like that was seen under the rule of the Greater German Reich.

The current division of the lands of the former Greater German Reich divides West Germany between the French Republic, the United States of America, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Part of the motivation for this division is to restrict access to natural resources necessary for militarization, and to give mining rights to the nations who currently control the region. The resources of this region allowed for the prosperity and success of the Low Lands and included rich iron and coal deposits, both of which play a key role in the development of military might and economic recovery. In the current system, however, these resources are being taken out of the region and fail to provide the economic boost that the trade and refining of these resources would give to the Kingdom of Belgium and the People of the Rhineland. Though it is very important for limiting the production capabilities of the former German Reich, the Kingdom of Belgium feels that the current system is diminishing the trade capabilities of nations conquered by the Greater German Reich and inhibiting recovery and reconstruction efforts.

When discussing land reparations for nations, it is important to draw attention to the actions of the French Republic in Saarland. Saarland holds a vast amount of the mineral wealth of the region and was the center for German coal and iron extraction, and was a capital of militarization for the former German Reich. The French Republic views this region as a part of itself, as much of the culture, language, and ethnicities are shared between the people of Saarland and Moselle, the neighboring region in the French Republic. As a tactic to gain more extensive control of this region while still allowing it freedom, the French Republic has removed the Saar Protectorate from the jurisdiction of the Allied Control Authority. This will allow the Saarland to choose to unify with the nation it more closely aligns with its population or continue acting as a protectorate, after the Allied Control Authority is resolved. The Kingdom of Belgium strongly supports this system of governance as the ideal system for the recovery of the people of the former German Reich and the nations it conquered.

The Kingdom of Belgium urges that the Security Council provide reparations in the form of land to the nations that faced occupation, war, and decimation for nearly the entirety of the twentieth century and are now having to rebuild. In this system, the Kingdom of Belgium would administer the Rhineland in a similar manner to the French Republic's administration of Saarland and remove it from the Allied Control Authority. This is because the shared cultural practices, language, and ethnicity between the Rhineland and Wallonia, the southern region of the Kingdom of Belgium, is a much stronger link than military might of the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, who currently control the region. Along with these cultural links, the rich resources of the Rhineland, which are currently being used to enrich the aforementioned Allied powers, would be used to rebuild the industry and infrastructure of the Rhineland, the Kingdom of Belgium, and other Lowland regions, whose recovery and rebuilding is severely limited by the current system of resource extraction by the Allied Control Authority.

Federative Republic of Brazil

Position Paper for the Historical Security Council 1946

1. Advancing Democratic Stability

The Federative Republic of Brazil notes the importance of democracy within nations and believes that the development of more democratic systems can provide stability and long-term peace. After World War II, Brazil experienced a transition from dictatorship under Getúlio Vargas to a representative democracy under Eurico Gaspar Dutra, following the adoption of a new constitution. Brazil stresses that this transition was crucial to promoting stability and peace by promoting fair elections, representation, and helping ensure the separation of powers within its government¹.

After World War II many nations are facing intense political climates with little to no support. Ranging from population displacement with refugees, economic instability, famine, and the collapse of political institutions have left many nations at risk internally and globally². Brazil would like to acknowledge that its transition to representative democracy can help illustrate a solution to these problems and can help reestablish trust within nations, create the necessary political climate, and promote stability alongside peace.

Now the Federative Republic of Brazil would like to call upon the United Nations to help other member states during post-war reconstruction and political transitions. Brazil stresses that the United Nations should provide assistance, such as economic sanctions from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development³ and international monetary fund⁴ to help promote stability, provide economic support, and to help develop democratic institutions in member states. Also, Brazil would support that the United Nations helps ensure that struggling member states can develop their own political institutions by providing constitutional development, support for public affairs, and upholding human rights in countries that request help. Brazil would like to acknowledge that without economic support, these member states would not be able to develop these democratic institutions and that even when the United Nations isn't involved, other member states help support one another during this time of reconstruction.

Through the cooperation of the United Nations and other nations with economic and political transformation, the Federative Republic of Brazil believes this can help the nations move forward after these hard times. Brazil also believes that by promoting these new developments would help promote stability and peace by allowing equal representation, peaceful resolutions regarding conflict, alliances, and encouraging the protection of citizens.

¹Impacts from government transition: <https://read.uolpress.co.uk/read/brazil/section/7d56f406-acbb-4826-9dd9-ae6c828c508e>

² Consequences from WW2: www.worldhistory.org/article/2660/what-were-the-consequences-of-wwii/

³ International Bank for Reconstruction and Development: https://www.britannica.com/topic/International-Bank-for-Reconstruction-and-Development?utm_source=chatgpt.com

⁴ International monetary fund: https://www.imf.org/external/np/exr/center/mm/eng/cc_sub_4.htm

2. Cooperation With Western Hemisphere Countries

After experiencing World War II, the Federative Republic of Brazil encourages other Western nations to cooperate among one another to promote stability and prevent any extremist views that could lead to another major conflict. Brazil during World War II actively participated in the front lines by sending the Brazilian Expeditionary Force (FEB)⁵ fighting the Atlantic battles which helped aid the Allied Powers, eventually leading to victory in the war. The Federative Republic of Brazil believes these efforts are an example of cooperation among other nations which helped show its commitment to protecting democracy and believes that these types of efforts are essential to keep international order among one another.

The Federative Republic of Brazil would like to highlight the United Nations Charter⁶ and that it fully supports its efforts, emphasizing Article 2. Brazil believes that if these conditions are followed, especially that disputes should be handled with peaceful means, which will allow the continuation of upholding the integrity of maintaining international peace and security among nations.

Reaffirming international cooperation, the Federative Republic of Brazil would like to stress this for the Western hemisphere. Brazil would also want to continue this cooperation following the Act of Chapultepec⁷ which fosters cooperative defense among American nations, strengthening regional partnerships and improving global security efforts.

While fully supporting regional cooperation, the Federal Republic of Brazil would also want to acknowledge and respect other nations sovereignty and national governments. During this time, as Brazil recently transitioned into a democratic government, Brazil would like to emphasize the importance of changes like this and how these efforts can help improve long term stability and peace. Brazil encourages other nations to cooperate and help one another be able to make transitions similar to Brazil to strengthen international cooperation and provide stability.

The Federative Republic of Brazil emphasizes that Western nations should provide support to one another by investing in others' infrastructure, creating fair trade, and providing technical assistance to help countries develop politically and socially. If these cooperations are mutually beneficial and respect the sovereignty of nations, Brazil believes these cooperations among Western countries will support the cooperation around the world and all come together to support the main goal of preventing another war and maintaining international peace while also providing stability and reducing extremist views. .

⁵ Brazil Expeditionary Force: <https://www.armyupress.army.mil/Journals/Military-Review/Online-Exclusive/2025-OLE/Brazilian-Expeditionary-Force/>

⁶ UN Charter: https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/unchart.asp

⁷ Act of Chapultepec: <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/american-journal-of-international-law/article/abs/act-of-chapultepec1/F6EADD708AD720E44E89F72AA99FEA23>

Republic of China Position Paper for the 1946 Security Council

I. The Necessity of Post-War Diplomacy in the Imperial State of Iran

The Republic of China (ROC) has observed the fall of Iranian agency and autonomy with great concern after Article 5 of the Tripartite Treaty of 1942 was disregarded in the months following the Second World War. Having enjoyed over two millennia of contact and over a millennium of strong diplomatic relations between the ROC and the Imperial State of Iran (ISI), the ROC is deeply invested in Iranian social, political, and economic well-being in the post-war era.^{1,2} In addition to diplomatic ties, we are proud to share centuries of respect for assertive culture-creation and emphasis on developing internal cultural knowledge with a minimization of influence of outside states.³ Despite the fact that the processes of Persian and Chinese empire-building occurred contemporaneously and coterminously, especially during the rise of the Tang Dynasty and Sasanian Empire, the ROC is proud to say that the continued coexistence and cooperation is a testament to the strength of diplomatic ties of these great states.⁴ More than two decades ago, in June of 1920, the ROC under President Yuan Shikai signed the Sino-Iranian Treaty of 1920 with Qajar Iran, enshrining the mutual distaste for the principle of extraterritoriality.⁵ These relations were only strengthened through the establishment of formal diplomatic ties in 1944 between the ROC and the ISI.⁶

The extended influence of outside powers in the ISI is a cause of great unsettlement for the ROC given the extended occupation of the Chinese homeland by foreign influences. Since the First Opium War in 1839, the ROC has been coerced into the signing of treaties which are to the detriment of Chinese citizens and policy.⁷ These treaties, including the Treaty of Nanking

¹ Aquil Hasan Abidi, "Iran-China Relations: A Historical Profile," *China Report* 17, no. 3 (1981): 33, <https://doi.org/10.1177/000944558101700303>.

² Yi Fang, "The Influence and Development of Sasanian Culture in the Tang Dynasty (Focusing on the Cultural Materials from the Subsidiary Tombs at Qianling)," *Parseh Journal of Archaeological Studies* 8, no. 31 (2025): 135–36, <https://doi.org/10.61882/PJAS.1239>.

³ Abidi, "Iran-China Relations," 35.

⁴ Hooman Peimani, "China and Iran: Energy Security Cooperation, but Not Much More," *East Asian Policy* 2, no. 4 (Oct/Dec 2010): 126, https://research.nus.edu.sg/eai/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/Vol2No4_HoomanPeimani.pdf.

⁵ Li-Chiao Chen, "The Signing of the Sino-Iranian Treaty of 1920," *Iranian Studies* 52, no. 5-6 (2019): 991, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00210862.2019.1654286>.

⁶ Li-Chiao Chen, "Uncertainty and Instability: Taiwan-Iran Relations in the Early Cold War Period," *Global Taiwan Brief* 6, no. 1, January 13, 2021, <https://globaltaiwan.org/2021/01/uncertainty-and-instability-taiwan-iran-relations-in-the-early-cold-war-period/>.

⁷ Alison A. Kaufman, "The 'Century of Humiliation' and China's National Narratives" (testimony, U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission Hearing on "China's Narratives Regarding National Security Policy," Washington, DC, March 10, 2011), 1, <https://www.uscc.gov/sites/default/files/3.10.11Kaufman.pdf>.

(1842)⁸, the Treaty of Tianjin (1958)⁹, and the Treaty of Shimonoseki (1895)¹⁰ decimated the morale, health, and well-being of China. Currently, the ISI is being subjected to the disregard of occupation termination deadlines from foreign powers; if occupation is extended, the ISI could also experience societal decimation from serving as a puppet for imperialistic agendas.

According to the Anglo-Soviet-Iranian Treaty of January 29, 1942,¹¹ foreign troops were required to have exited Iranian soil no later than March 2, 1946. The end of March approaches, and Soviet troops remain to be withdrawn. This lack of action directly opposes the principle of “sovereign equality” outlined in the United Nations Charter, Article 2(1),¹² to which the Soviet Union pledged. Although the Soviet Union has pledged to remove all troops within 6 weeks, the ROC believes it is necessary that this action is enforced to ensure peaceful transition for all parties involved. Due to the rise in economic imperialism, the ROC is concerned about hidden transactionary measures that have been or could be taken to influence geopolitical power.

The ROC recommends a two-fold approach to the resolution of present tensions in the ISI. Firstly, the ROC believes that the deployment of a peace-keeping force is necessary to facilitate the removal of Soviet troops and to ensure that no abuses of power. Due to the sheer number of Soviet troops, which currently number over 30,000,¹³ the ROC believes that a peacekeeping force would mitigate the seizure of power vacuums which typically accompanies major shifts in geopolitical forces. The ROC also advises that this peacekeeping force is also composed of independent individuals skilled in data acquisition to ensure that no human rights violations occurred during the Soviet occupation. These individuals would take record of military actions and cultural impact of the Soviet occupation. Secondly, the ROC also believes that economic sanctions should be utilized if Soviet forces remain in the ISI for an extended period of time or if unusual and unnecessary conditions are placed on troop removal. These sanctions would facilitate the Soviet extraction of troops from the ISI to ensure lasting peace.

Yet China will no longer be mired in the “Century of Humiliation”¹⁴—we will step forward into the future with a dedication to promoting self-sufficiency for all nations. To this end, we hope to facilitate the peaceful removal of international forces from within the borders of the ISI to promote peace and prosperity for all.

⁸ Great Britain and China, "Treaty of Peace, Friendship, Commerce, Indemnity, etc., between Great Britain and China" [Treaty of Nanking], August 29, 1842, *Historical Laws of Hong Kong Online*, item 1025, <https://oelawhk.lib.hku.hk/items/show/1025>.

⁹ "Treaty of Tianjin (Tien-tsin), 1858," June 18, 1858, USC US-China Institute, accessed May 22, 2024, <https://china.usc.edu/node/20102>.

¹⁰ Charles Denby to Walter Q. Gresham, April 29, 1895, in *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, With the Annual Message of the President, Transmitted to Congress December 2, 1895*, part 1 (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1896), doc. 203, <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1895p1/d203>.

¹¹ "Treaty of Alliance between the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union and Iran," January 29, 1942, *United Nations Treaty Series*, vol. 97, no. 271, 10 July 1951, <https://treaties.un.org/Pages/showDetails.aspx?objid=0800000280155f52>.

¹² UN Charter, art. 1, para. 3.

¹³ Justin W. Roberts, "From Alliance to Adversaries: The Influence of the 1946 Iranian Crisis on Early US Cold War Strategies" (master's thesis, Marine Corps University, 2020), 10, Defense Technical Information Center (AD1177838), <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/citations/AD1177838>.

¹⁴ Kaufman, "The 'Century of Humiliation'," 2.

Ethiopian Empire Position Paper for the 1946 Security Council

I. Security Guarantees and Peacekeeping Forces

Prior to World War Two, the League of Nations completely failed to “promote international cooperation and to achieve international peace and security”¹ largely because of the practices of appeasement by the former victors of World War One and the lack of a strong international peacekeeping force. In response to the Walwal Incident,² the League of Nations, after the Ethiopian Empire had requested arbitration, formed a special committee, which recognized that Italy had disturbed the peace and taken aggressive action against Ethiopia. The League took no firm action in response, dismissing it as accidental.³ Because of this, Italy was further emboldened and began its unprovoked invasion of Ethiopia, the Second Italo-Ethiopian War.⁴

Again, the League of Nations had failed to uphold its covenant, and it would still exercise restraint in utilizing sanctions or force against the Italians, though these actions were well within the bounds of the covenant.¹ The League did adopt extremely weak sanctions aimed at Italy, which notably did not include the sale of iron, coal, or oil, all of which were absolutely essential to the Italian war effort. Furthermore, these sanctions would be removed after only eight months, even though the League had agreed that Italy had violated the covenant by “conducting unlawful war”.⁴ These actions even further weakened the legitimacy of the League of Nations.

During the Second Italo-Ethiopian War, the people of Ethiopia suffered greatly. Numerous war crimes were committed by the Italians, such as the use of mustard gas on not only soldiers, but also women and children.⁵ The dire situation drove the Emperor of Ethiopia, Haile Selassie, to speak in front of the League of Nations, of which there was no precedent.⁶ He spoke of the gas attacks and urged the League of Nations to take action against Italy and to protect a sovereign member, but it was to no avail.

After the war, the League of Nations had significantly decreased authority and legitimacy. It continued to be ineffective, and took no action against the Nazi Anschluss of Austria. Therefore, it is safe to conclude that the lack of strong unity, security guarantees, and peacekeeping forces to combat Axis expansion emboldened the nationalist dictatorships and contributed to the beginning of World War Two. In order to prevent such a calamity from occurring again, the Ethiopian Empire urges for the strengthening of the Military Staff Committee,⁷ the broadening of the Security Council’s authority to encompass the preventive deployment of troops in order to enforce Article 2(4)⁸ of the United Nations Charter, and the clarification of peacekeeping forces’ rules of engagement and definition of “aggression”. All of these measures should be taken in order to bring a world in which there will never be another World War.

¹ The Covenant of the League of Nations: <https://www.ungeneva.org/en/about/league-of-nations/covenant>

² The Walwal Incident: <https://www.thesecondworldwar.org/interbellum-1918-1936/1935/second-italo-ethiopian-war/walwal-incident>

³ The Abyssinia Crisis: <https://navalinstitute.com.au/the-abyssinia-crisis-a-lesson-for-today/>

⁴ The Second Italo-Ethiopian War: <https://www.thecollector.com/second-italo-ethiopian-war/>

⁵ The Use of Chemical Weapons in the 1935-86 Italo-Ethiopian War: <https://www.sipri.org/sites/default/files/Italo-Ethiopian-war.pdf>

⁶ Appeal to the League of Nations: <https://msuweb.montclair.edu/~lebelp/haileselassie1936appealtotheleague2009wikipedia.pdf>

⁷ United Nations Charter, Chapter VII: <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter/chapter-7>

⁸ United Nations Charter, Chapter I: <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter/chapter-1>

Kingdom Of Egypt
Position Paper for historical Security Council

1 Soviet Influence in Eastern Europe.

The Kingdom of Egypt is appalled by the extreme political control exerted by the USSR across eastern Europe termed as the "Iron Curtain". The governments of eastern Europe do not adequately represent the interests of their people but instead represent the interests of the USSR and Stalin forcing them to adopt communist government, and subordinate themselves to the USSR and not allow them to be independent states. Stalin's oppressive control over these nations is contrasted with the way the UK and US have conducted themselves after occupying Europe by spreading stable governance and giving the people of the nations the ability to divide for themselves the government they desire.

This state is unacceptable and must be resolved immediately as a member of the UN who is committed to universal justice and self determination must allow the people they have occupied to choose their own government not have a communist one forced on them. This formation of puppet governments must be resolved by the USSR giving up its eastern European ambitions and letting the Iron Curtain fall and allow eastern Europe to interact with the rest of the world again. It is against the UN charter to force nations to not cooperate with other nations and only rely on their puppet master. The iron curtain must be torn down and the UN should exert pressure on the USSR to free the peoples of eastern Europe by way of tariffs and resolutions to make the USSR act on the principles it agreed to in the UN charter.

Kingdom Of Egypt
Position Paper for historical Security Council

Against the overzealous removal of United kingdom influence from africa

After the end of the war many have clamored for the reduction in western influence in Africa to free the people there from oppression, but this misses the fact that the people in Africa are benefiting from western influence especially by powers like the United kingdom. The United Kingdom provides for stable defense against invaders, trade relationships, economic investment, institutional modernizing, stable governance, and cooperative relationships with neighboring peoples. To ignore these myriad benefits and decry the nonexistent lack of self determination and individual rights is absurd. British rule has brought peace and prosperity to parts of the world that have struggled with acquiring it for so long and seeking to overthrow that to increase self determination is nonsensical as the british do no infringe upon the rights of its subject peoples and instead have elevated them far beyond what they have experienced in the past.

We the Kingdom Of Egypt have benefited from British influence especially concerning protecting and helping us, make, maintain and protect the vital Suez Canal. They protected us from invasion from the Ottomans and later the Nazis, and if not for them a key piece in global trade infrastructure contributing to the economic prosperity of all could have been captured or destroyed, hurting everyone . They have helped our economy due to the Trade passing through the canal allowing our economy to thrive due to their presence in our nation. They have also contributed to effective governance by acting as advisors for our monarchy and helping us to reform our backwards institutions.

The French Republic

Position Paper for the Historical Security Council

I. Expanding the Jurisdiction of the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg

The liberation of Stutthof concentration camp on May 9th, 1945,¹ the final camp to be freed by Allied forces, marked the end of oppressive persecution that had dominated Europe for over a decade and claimed millions of lives. As the horrific human rights violations that took place at the hands of the Nazi regime continue to come to light, the French Republic stresses the importance of continuing legal prosecution against the perpetrators who are responsible for such devastation. The Declaration of Atrocities,² signed during the 1943 Moscow Trials, affirms Allied determination to hold Axis war criminals accountable, and the French Republic remains committed to these principles. France wishes to strengthen the gravity of proceedings continued by the International Military Tribunal,³ which began its criminal prosecution process in October 1945 in Nuremberg, Germany. Established under the London Charter⁴ of August 8th, 1945, the International Military Tribunal consists of Allied representatives from the United States of America, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the French Republic. Until March 1946, over twenty-one Nazi leaders have stood trial for crimes against peace, war crimes, crimes against humanity, and conspiracy to commit such crimes. Many more are set to testify in the coming months, willing to unearth years' worth of critical evidence. The legality of these proceedings must stand in order to set a lasting precedent that prevents such atrocities from ever occurring again.

The French Republic hopes to expand the jurisdiction of the International Military Tribunal to all perpetrators who took part in Nazi Germany's agenda, including medical scientists, jurists, judges, industrialists, and conglomerates. This position is grounded in the London Charter, whose Article 6⁵ makes clear that responsibility extends to the "leaders, organizers, instigators, and accomplices" involved in the execution of Nazi crimes. France asserts that the Tribunal's directive must be open to broad interpretation to ensure that those who enabled genocide through administrative, scientific, or economic means are held accountable. The French Prosecution⁶, led by Auguste Champetier de Ribes, has emphasized in official statements that the Nazi party functioned through a vast network of collaborators. Their contributions, including but not limited to the drafting of racial laws, conducting inhumane experiments, and exploiting forced labor, were imperative to the regime's criminal enterprise.

France further stresses that the International Military Tribunal must not limit its focus to political and military leaders, highlighting the fact that the bureaucratic and industrial infrastructure of the Third Reich was essential to the execution of its policies. Allied investigators have already submitted documentation on the role of major industrial firms⁷, such as IG Farben, Flick Concern, and the Krupp Firm, in supplying armaments, chemicals, and logistical support to the Schutzstaffel (SS) and the Wehrmacht. Evidence collected by the French Ministry of Justice⁸ and passed on to the International Military Tribunal demonstrates the coordination of forced labor camps by both Nazi-sponsored organizations and corporate executives. The Tribunal must pursue harsh cases against these actors, whose profit-driven avarice and neglect for basic humanity sustained the Nazi war machine.

In addition to complicity within industrial sectors, France draws attention to the crucial role legal and academic institutions played in legitimizing ultranationalistic Nazi ideologies. Corrupted jurists with Nazi sympathies drafted the Nuremberg Race Laws⁹ in September 1935, committed to codifying their aspirations for the Final Solution¹⁰. Medical researchers and physicians conducted lethal experiments on prisoners under the guise of scientific advancement, nearly all of whom understood the meaning of "do no harm." University professors and scholars provided pseudo-scientific justifications for racial persecution using concepts of eugenics and Social Darwinism.¹⁰ These individuals operated under the guise of proficiency and expertise, but their work enabled the destruction of entire populations. Holding these accomplices accountable under the International Military Tribunal is essential to both provide justice to victims and restore the integrity of professions.

Furthermore, the French Republic supports the use of Control Council Law No. 10,¹¹ enacted in December 1945, to authorize additional trials within occupied territories. This would allow the prosecution of thousands of lower-ranking officials and civilian collaborators whose cases fall outside the scope of the initial Nuremberg trials. In addition to the four Allied zones of Germany¹², these proceedings may take place in territories where crimes were committed, including Poland, Czechoslovakia, the Netherlands, Belgium, and France. These locations possess a multitude of evidence and surviving witnesses who offer direct jurisdiction over crimes committed on their soil. The French Republic is prepared to share documentation gathered by resistance and investigative bodies to guarantee

that perpetrators do not evade prosecution under the pretense of distance. To ensure that justice is administered consistently across all proceedings, the French Republic encourages close coordination among Allied powers to standardize legal procedure under the paradigm set by the International Military Tribunal.

Legal precedents emerging from Nuremberg must form the cornerstone for durable international order. The classification of “crimes against humanity”¹³ represents a significant advance in human rights law, establishing that systematic persecution and extermination are offenses against *all* nations and subject to universal condemnation. The International Military Tribunal’s revised interpretation of Article 8⁴ of the London Charter, rejecting the notion that “superior orders” could absolve a defendant of responsibility, asserted that moral and legal accountability cannot be excused using hierarchy. This is essential to dismantle the defense that allowed totalitarian regimes to operate without proper consequence.

Outside of Nuremberg, these ideas must be preserved and expanded upon in future agreements. As the world begins to consider new standards for human rights protections, the international community must use the lessons set by the Nuremberg trials as a guide, making sure the principles established in 1946 and onwards shape following legislation. For the French Republic, this is what gives the upcoming Nuremberg proceedings their urgency and importance: the crimes of Nazi Germany demand a pure and total accountability that reaches every participant, no matter how significant the contribution. These precedents must serve as the foundation for a future in which such acts of inhumanity cannot be repeated.

¹January 31: The Last Camp Liberated: <https://jewishcurrents.org/january-31-the-last-camp-liberated>

²The Moscow Declaration on Atrocities:

<https://jewishvirtuallibrary.org/the-moscow-declaration-on-atrocities>

³International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg:

<https://encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/international-military-tribunal-at-nuremberg>

⁴Agreement for the prosecution and punishment of the major war criminals of the European Axis:

https://www.un.org/en/genocideprevention/documents/atrocities-crimes/Doc.2_Charter%20of%20IMT%201945.pdf

⁵Who Tried the Case? - Photograph:

<https://encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/gallery/who-trying-the-case-photographs#:~:text=General%20R.A.%20Rudenko.-,The%20chief%20Soviet%20prosecutor%2C%20General%20R.A.%20Rudenko.,An%20American%20prosecutor%20at%20Nuremberg>

⁶The Other Nuremberg Trials, Seventy-Five Years On:

<https://www.bostonreview.net/articles/erica-x-eisen-nuremberg/>

⁷Transcript for IMT:

https://nuremberg.law.harvard.edu/transcripts/7-transcript-for-imt-trial-of-major-war-criminals?s_eq=3366

⁸Nuremberg Race Laws: <https://www.nationalww2museum.org/war/articles/nuremberg-laws>

⁹The Final Solution: <https://encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/final-solution-overview>

¹⁰Nazism, Fascism, and Social Darwinism:

<https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/abs/social-darwinism-in-european-and-american-thought-18601945/nazism-fascism-and-social-darwinism/467C6A8A8FE509A8EB5ECE5F1AD5CD43>

¹¹Control Council Law No. 10: <https://avalon.law.yale.edu/imt/imt10.asp>

¹²Germany’s Post WWII Occupation:

<https://www.ebsco.com/research-starters/history/germanys-post-wwii-occupation>

¹³Crimes Against Humanity: <https://trialinternational.org/topics-post/crimes-against-humanity/>

Empire of Japan (Japan)
Position Paper for the 1946 Historical Security Council

Topic I: Preventing the Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and Regulating Atomic Energy

The conclusion of the Second World War has introduced atomic weaponry as a new and severe threat to international security. Japan is the only nation to have suffered direct nuclear attack, following the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August 1945, which resulted in unprecedented civilian casualties, long-term medical consequences, and the near-total destruction of both cities.¹ These events demonstrated that atomic weapons possess destructive power far beyond that of conventional armaments.

Japan holds that the continued development and potential spread of atomic weapons pose a grave danger to global peace. If left unregulated, such weapons may encourage arms races among states and increase the likelihood of future conflicts of catastrophic scale. As a nation profoundly affected by atomic warfare, Japan believes it has a responsibility to inform the international community of the human and security consequences of nuclear weapons use.

Japan urges the Security Council to take active measures to prevent nuclear proliferation. These measures may include encouraging transparency among states currently possessing atomic technology, supporting international investigations into atomic energy use, and establishing cooperative frameworks under the authority of the United Nations to regulate atomic materials. Japan further supports the consideration of international agreements restricting the military use of atomic energy while permitting peaceful scientific research under international supervision. Through such actions, the Security Council can reduce the risk of future nuclear conflict and uphold its mandate to maintain international peace and security.

United States Strategic Bombing Survey, *Summary Report (Pacific War)*, 1946; “The Effects of the Atomic Bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki,” Manhattan Engineer District, 1946.

Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers (SCAP), *Initial Post-Surrender Policy for Japan*, 1945; John W. Dower, *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War II* (contextual background based on early occupation reports).

Topic II: Post-War Recovery and Stabilization of States Most Affected by the Second World War

The aftermath of the Second World War has left many states facing widespread economic devastation, humanitarian crises, and political instability. Japan itself has experienced extensive destruction of infrastructure, industrial collapse, food shortages, and large displaced civilian populations following its surrender in September 1945.² These conditions threaten internal stability and, if unresolved, may contribute to broader regional insecurity.

Japan maintains that long-term international peace cannot be achieved without addressing the recovery needs of states most severely affected by the war. Economic desperation and social instability may foster unrest, impede democratic development, or encourage renewed conflict. As such, post-war recovery should be treated as a collective security concern rather than a purely domestic matter.

Japan calls upon the Security Council to coordinate international recovery efforts by supporting reconstruction programs, facilitating the flow of humanitarian aid, and encouraging economic cooperation among member states. The Council may authorize investigations into post-war humanitarian conditions, promote the lifting or adjustment of wartime restrictions that hinder recovery, and encourage collaboration with existing international relief organizations. By addressing the root causes of post-war instability, the Security Council can help prevent future conflicts and contribute to a more secure and stable international order.

United States Strategic Bombing Survey, *Summary Report (Pacific War)*, 1946; “The Effects of the Atomic Bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki,” Manhattan Engineer District, 1946.

Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers (SCAP), *Initial Post-Surrender Policy for Japan*, 1945; John W. Dower, *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War II* (contextual background based on early occupation reports).

The United Mexican States

Positions for 1946 Historical Security Council

I. An End to the British Raj

The United Mexican States is very honored to be included as a member of the first United Nations Security Council. We feel obligated to do our part to maintain peace and serve as a mediator in world conflicts. A current conflict that concerns our country is the situation in British-controlled India because of its ever-increasing violence. Though it is important not to infringe upon the sovereignty of Britain, it is also our obligation to ensure that the human rights of those involved are protected.

Since the first meeting of this council on January 17th, 1946, Hindu-Muslim tensions erupted. When it looked likely that India would get independence from Britain, many Muslim Indians became worried about living in a country ruled by a Hindu majority thinking they would be overwhelmed. They are now supporting political leaders who are campaigning for a separate Muslim homeland.

With the stakes rising, Mohammad Ali Jinnah, leader of the Muslims called for a “direct action day” on August 16, 1946, to create a Muslim state, which spiraled into communal rioting that left thousands of people dead in Calcutta. The violence continues to spread to other provinces. This makes the Mexican States very anxious and concerned.¹⁵

Muhammad Ali Jinnah is currently supporting a *Two-Nation Theory*. This theory proposes that Hindus and Muslims are distinct nations that *cannot* coexist in one country, leading to the demand for a separate homeland: **Pakistan**. Muslims believe that if India is partitioned into one state, there will be no place for them within a democratic system because they will be a permanent numerical minority. Indian National Congress leaders like Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru are supporting a *One-Nation Plan* to maintain a unified, secular India, opposing the partition along religious lines. They believe in a diverse, democratic nation that represents all faiths and fears that a divided country will spark communal violence, weaken national strength, and hinder economic progress.¹⁶

Being a former Spanish colony for 300 years, The Mexican states support the independence of India. Because of what resulted in India under the British "divide and rule" policy, we also believe the Two-Nation Theory to be the best solution. This strategy was used to maintain colonial control by exacerbating religious, caste, and regional divisions, particularly between Hindus and Muslims. The political divisions created along religious lines have made it nearly impossible to restore a single nation and maintain peace.¹⁷

II. UN Security Council Reform

The United Mexican States, as a founding member of the United Nations and a nation deeply committed to international peace, collective security, and the sovereign equality of states, welcomes the creation of the United Nations as a decisive step away from the failures of the League of Nations. We are also very honored to be selected as a member of the first Security Council. Mexico recognizes the central role assigned to the Security Council in maintaining international peace and security. However, the effectiveness and legitimacy of this body will depend upon its ability to represent the interests of the international community, rather than those of a limited number of

¹⁵ *Partition of India: South Asian History [1947]*. <https://www.britannica.com/event/Partition-of-India>

¹⁶ *Two Nation Theory*. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Two-nation_theory

¹⁷ *Story of The Two Nation Theory: The Long Dispute Between India and Pakistan*.

<https://www.thegeostrata.com/post/story-of-the-2-nation-theory-the-long-dispute-between-india-and-pakistan>

powerful states. It is evident in just the first year of its existence that it is not achieving equality. For this reason, Mexico believes that immediate reform of the Security Council is both necessary and urgent.¹⁸

The Charter of the United Nations is founded upon the principle of sovereign equality of all its Members; however, the Security Council, as currently constituted, grants disproportionate authority to a small group of permanent members. Such an arrangement risks undermining confidence in the United Nations and may give rise to perceptions that international peace is being administered by a select few rather than collectively upheld.

Mexico advocates for the expansion of the Security Council's membership to include additional non-permanent seats, allocated in a manner that ensures equitable geographic distribution. Such reform will strengthen the Council's legitimacy and enhance its capacity to address conflicts arising in diverse political, social, and cultural contexts.¹⁹

The current Security Council membership consists of eleven States, five being permanent members. African and Asian countries are not currently included in Security Council membership. If this body's goal is to unite the world to ensure peace, all regions need representation.

As for permanent membership, Latin America, despite its consistent support for collective security and its contribution to the Allied victory in World War II, lacks permanent representation of the Council. This absence weakens the Council's claim to universal equality and risks alienating entire regions from meaningful participation in decisions affecting global peace. Mexico recommends an additional permanent member from Latin America.²⁰

Mexico expresses grave concern regarding the veto power accorded to the permanent members of the Security Council. While the veto was conceived as a mechanism to ensure the continued participation of the great powers in the United Nations, its unrestricted use poses a serious threat to collective security. During the first year of the Council, the Soviet Union has already utilized the veto four times on issues, despite the almost unanimous support of the other Members.

The veto has already prevented the Council from acting in situations where peace was endangered, not because action was unjustified, but because it conflicted with the interests of a *single* permanent member. This contradicts the spirit of cooperation upon which the United Nations was founded.²¹

Mexico calls for serious consideration of limitations on the use of the veto, particularly in cases involving *peaceful settlement of disputes, humanitarian crises, or clear acts of aggression*. At a minimum, the veto should not be employed to block discussion or investigation of threats to peace. By reforming the Security Council to better reflect the diversity and equality of its Members, the United Nations will be better equipped to fulfill its historic mission.

The United Mexican States affirms its unwavering commitment to the United Nations and to the peaceful resolution of international disputes. Mexico does not seek to diminish the role of any nation, but rather to strengthen the Organization by ensuring that its principal organs operate in accordance with the principles enshrined in the Charter.

Security Council reform—through expanded representation, regional balance, and responsible use of the veto—is essential to preserving the credibility, legitimacy, and effectiveness of the United Nations. Mexico stands ready to work with all Member States in a spirit of cooperation and mutual respect to achieve these goals.

¹⁸ *Mexico and the UN Security Council*. <http://www.revistascisan.unam.mx/voices/pdfs/8516.pdf>

¹⁹ *Expanding Permanent Membership in the Security Council*. <https://insight.dickinsonlaw.psu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1331&context=psilr>

²⁰ *Expanding the United Nations Security Council. A Necessity for Global Representation*. <https://medium.com/@riazleghari/expanding-the-united-nations-security-council-a-necessity-for-global-representati-on-d6c1f8c521d6>

²¹ *UN Security Council Working Methods-The Veto*. <https://www.securitycouncilreport.org/un-security-council-working-methods/the-veto.php>

Kingdom of the Netherlands Position Paper for the Historical Security Council 1946

1. The Situation in the Dutch East Indies and the Restoration of Stability in Southeast Asia

Following the Japanese surrender in 1945, the Kingdom of the Netherlands has observed the rapid deterioration of stability in the Dutch East Indies. The sudden absence of Japanese authority has created a power vacuum, causing Indonesian nationalist leaders to issue a unilateral proclamation of independence on 17 August 1945.²² In the following months, the Netherlands Indies Civil Administration (NICA) began returning to reestablish lawful Dutch governance,²³ while British forces under the South East Asia Command (SEAC) assumed temporary responsibility for maintaining order in the region.²⁴ Despite these efforts, a period of armed clashes in the region have developed between Indonesian nationalist groups, local militias, and Allied personnel, particularly in Java and Sumatra, where civilians, infrastructure, and essential supply routes have been repeatedly under attack.²⁵ These developments pose a direct threat not only to the security of the region but also to the broader stability of Southeast Asia in the immediate post-war period.

The Kingdom of the Netherlands maintains that its legal sovereignty over the Dutch East Indies is based in internationally recognized pre-war agreements, therefore cannot be superseded by an unauthorized proclamation of independence.²⁶ While the Netherlands acknowledges the desire for political reform within the East Indies, it holds the importance of a stable transition under Dutch administrative oversight to rebuild, restore civil order, and protect vulnerable minority communities.²⁷ The Netherlands supports a long-term development of a representative and inclusive government for the New Indies, but does not believe in immediate independence, due to the presence of instability and irregular militias. Consistent with its commitment to international cooperation, the Netherlands prefers to pursue a negotiated political settlement over prolonged bloodshed.²⁸

In light of these challenges, the Kingdom of the Netherlands urges the Security Council to adopt more concrete measures to restore stability in the Dutch East Indies. The Netherlands proposes the creation of a United Nations supported mediation framework led by representatives of the Security Council, tasked with facilitating structured negotiations between Dutch authorities and Indonesian independence leaders. This framework would establish formal channels for discussion, set terms for ceasefires, and assure that both parties operate under international law. The Netherlands further calls for initiatives to disarm irregular militias, encourage continued Allied cooperation, and assert the importance of lawful governance to prevent any

²² Indonesian Proclamation of Independence: <https://library.oapen.org/handle/20.500.12657/35075>.

²³ Netherlands Indies Civil Administration (NICA): <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1944v05/d1226>.

²⁴ British South East Asia Command (SEAC): <https://www.britishmilitaryhistory.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/124/2020/08/South-East-Asia-Command-SEAC.pdf>.

²⁵ Violence in Java and Sumatra (Bersiap Period): <https://theindoproject.org/the-bersiap-period/>.

²⁶ Linggadjati Agreement: https://www.cia.gov/readingroom/docs/DOC_0000256979.pdf.

²⁷ Protection of Minorities in East Indies: https://brill.com/view/journals/jmh/11/3/article-p379_06.xml?language=en.

²⁸ East Indies Under International Law: [https://www.concernedhistorians.org/content_files/file/va/antoon_de_baets-applicability_of_international_law_in_indonesia_in_1945-1949\(2022\).pdf](https://www.concernedhistorians.org/content_files/file/va/antoon_de_baets-applicability_of_international_law_in_indonesia_in_1945-1949(2022).pdf).

unilateral changes to territorial sovereignty. Together, these actions would help stabilize the region and uphold the principles upon which the United Nations was founded.

2. The Demilitarization of Germany and Post War European Security

In the aftermath of Germany's unconditional surrender on 8 May 1945,²⁹ The Kingdom of the Netherlands followed the efforts of the Allied powers to disarm the military apparatus that enabled years of aggression and devastation across Europe. With the establishment of the Allied Control Council,³⁰ the United States, United Kingdom, Soviet Union, and France assumed joint authority over German territory, initiating disarmament measures including the dissolution of the military and seizure of military industries. As the Nuremberg Trials³¹ proceeded to hold major war criminals accountable, the Netherlands remains aware that Germany's infrastructure, economy, and political institutions lie in ruin.³² These conditions, if left unaddressed, risk fostering instability, extremism, and unregulated behaviors. These concerns are particularly urgent for the Netherlands, which shares a direct border with the British occupation zone and continues to confront the consequences of wartime destruction.

The Kingdom of the Netherlands firmly supports the strict and complete demilitarization of Germany as an essential safeguard against any possible future resurgence of militarism. The Netherlands maintains that Germany must not be permitted to rebuild its military industries or armed forces under any circumstances. Dutch security is tied to the effectiveness of the Allied oversight of German borders, industry, and political development.³³ Therefore, the Netherlands endorses continued Allied supervision to ensure that extremist ideologies cannot regain influence. Stable, democratic governance in Germany is indispensable to prevent the reemergence of the conditions that cultivated conflict in the first half of the century.

To preserve long term peace in Europe, the Kingdom of the Netherlands urges the Security Council to affirm the necessity of Germany's complete demilitarization and to support ongoing allied efforts to oversee German territory, borders, and industrial capacity. The Netherlands recommends that the Security Council monitor compliance with disarmament measures and encourage cooperation between occupying measures to prevent unilateral decisions that could destabilize the region. Furthermore, the Netherlands supports the development of democratic stability and the prevention of extremist movements from returning to power. Through these measures, the Security Council can help secure a peaceful and stable post war Europe.

²⁹ German Unconditional Surrender: <https://www.archives.gov/milestone-documents/surrender-of-germany>

³⁰ Allied Control Council: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Allied-Control-Council>

³¹ Nuremberg Trials: <https://www.nationalww2museum.org/war/topics/nuremberg-trials>

³² German Reconstruction: <https://adst.org/2021/04/post-wwii-german-reconstruction-rehabilitation-and-food-availability/>

³³ Dutch Border Reliance: <https://www.usni.org/magazines/proceedings/1953/november/strategic-importance-netherlands>

Philippine Islands, Las Islas Filipinas
Position Paper for the 1946 Historical Security Council

I. Subjection to World Power Dependence: U.S. Undermining of Philippine Sovereignty Despite Independence Contract

In accordance with history, continued dependence on world powers and colonizers following independence gain is ubiquitous. The strategic, military, and economic presence of world powers in lesser developed nations, although it attempts to disguise itself as help to these nations in the form of reconstruction and government assistance, exposes itself as neocolonial¹ expansionism which creates a parental situation towards the lesser developed nations that prevents them from maturing.

In complete ignorance of the newly declared Philippine independence, the U.S. claimed authority² of the Philippines via the 1898 Treaty of Paris³. It is unmistakable that, in many ways, the U.S. has provided meaningful support to the Philippines; however, this is not without the present quality and sentiment of debt and subservience to the U.S., perpetuated by the U.S. itself. Because of this, it becomes clear that the *forced* U.S. offer of support to the Philippines is a disguise to its interest of molding the Philippines into an undisclosed colony with the intent of this sentiment following the Philippines past independence. Furthermore, given that the U.S. has authority over the contract, the Tydings McDuffie Act⁴ of U.S. law, which binds the Philippines to the nation before independence, it becomes even more obscure⁵ whether or not the Philippines indeed will be offered the chance to become independent. Even so, the Philippines does not intend to hold any ill will against the United States of America unless justifiable reason is permitted, and an equal alliance is sought to be held with neither nation holding superiority. If terms hereinafter are equal, any previous grievances shall be relinquished with haste in trade for a cooperative partnership between nations. Let it be understood that the Philippines would not be what it currently is if history were different, but that moving forward, morals of equity should guide the Philippines continuing self-development.

The Philippine Islands intends to behave as a sovereign nation without the authority of the United States of America, and will henceforth request to be referred to as the Republic of the Philippines. The contract in which the Philippines has been subject to is inherently a subjection to U.S. jurisdiction which intends to cause continued and prolonged socioeconomic dependence following a scheduled gain of independence – that of which appears consistently one-sided and gives the U.S. supremacy to any Philippine efforts for self-establishment apart from its neocolonizer. The Philippines looks positively towards extending itself toward constructive allies who will provide aid in establishing independence and protect the Philippines from extended U.S. encroachment to sovereignty; this is provided without directly challenging the U.S. in order to maintain peace and order.

The caustic touch of oppressive World Powers – a generalization, not counting for every world power – is dangerous to worldwide democracy and personal liberty, and the international community has a duty under the UN Charter⁶ to promote social progress and better standards of life in greater freedom.

It is the duty of developed nations to protect the independence of developing nations, and it is in the best interest of developing nations to support one another. Therefore, the Republic of the Philippines urges and proposes a plan to solidify that all Member States, and especially newly independent States, have the right to formulate their own economic, trade, and development policies free from coercive external conditions. It is requested that the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC)⁷ establish a committee to study unequal economic structures that perpetuate dependency, and to recommend measures ensuring fair terms of trade, technology transfer, capital flows, and investment policies. It is also put forth that an amendment to the UN Charter is agreed upon which condemns economic practices by advanced World Powers that effectively undermine the political independence of developing nations, and that nations judged by a supermajority vote by the United Nations member nations be punished accordingly, yet not excessively or cruelly, as precedent⁸ follows. This also stands for developed member nations which intend to invade any other nation for the sake of expanding political or economic power. It is recommended that a permanent body entitled the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) is established to ensure that trade, more specifically for developing nations, is fair and equitable, providing that established World Powers are unable to form monopolies across nations and their labor, a stance which will prevent the creation of neither colonies nor neocolonies.

Genuine sovereignty⁹ is not satiated alone by a simple statement of political independence. Rather, political sovereignty without economic autonomy leaves developing nations completely vulnerable, and it is in the best interest of member nations to make an effort to halt this unfair practice immediately. It shall be stressed with the utmost importance that colonized and neocolonized nations along with nations previously trapped in inequitable agreements between nations are not and will not be indebted to any forceful authority for the protection of worldwide liberty.

¹ Colonial Legacy and Continuations:

<https://www.qil-qdi.org/europe-and-the-colonial-legacy-continuity-in-a-history-to-be-told/>

² U.S. Acquisition of the Philippines, Suspicion of Independence Postponement:

<https://www.pbs.org/frontlineworld/stories/philippines/tl01.html>

³ 1898 Treaty of Paris: <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1866-1898/spanish-american-war>

⁴ Tydings McDuffie Act: <https://immigrationhistory.org/item/tydings-mcduffie-act/>

⁵ Philippine Morality, 1898 Treaty of Paris Considerations in Law:

chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://philippinelawjournal.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/02/75PLJ159_MAGALLONA.pdf

⁶ United Nations Charter, 1945: <https://www.archives.gov/milestone-documents/united-nations-charter>

⁷ United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC):

chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://ecosoc.un.org/sites/default/files/2025-10/background_note%5B1%5D.pdf

⁸ Precedent Punishment of Major War Crimes:

chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://www.un.org/en/genocideprevention/documents/atrocious-crimes/Doc.2_Charter%20of%20IMT%201945.pdf

⁹ Sovereignty Versus Independence:

<https://hawaiiankingdom.org/blog/settling-the-confusion-of-sovereignty-and-independence-2/>

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics Position Paper for Historical Security Council (1946)

I. Course of Action for the Control of Atomic Weaponry

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) understands the growing threat that atomic weaponry plays on the preservation of global peace. We are not ignorant to the fact that something must be done before it is too late. However, the USSR feels that the Baruch Plan, proposed by the United States, is not the course of action that the United Nations should take. The Baruch plan proposes that nuclear materials and related facilities fall under international control. Doing so would not only allow the United States to maintain a monopoly over nuclear weapons, but also provide insight into the actions of other nations in an infringement on their sovereignty. Instead, the USSR proposes the Gromyko Plan. In which atomic weapons are to be banned and destroyed for the protection of all global citizens. It is only after this is done that arrangements can then be made to establish clear guidelines for the safe and productive usage of these technologies. Upon the ratification of these plans all nuclear weapon production must be stopped and stockpiles destroyed within three months. Those who do not comply should be met with severe punishment. It should be up to the discretion of the United Nations Security Council to then determine the guidelines that should follow for the safe usage of this technology. To approach this delicate situation in any other matter would certainly be a mistake. Seeing as the United States is the only nation in possession of these weapons, it is quite obviously a matter of self interest for them to head the charge in the regulations of them and anyone who ignores that fact is sorely mistaken. The USSR implores this delegation to consider and install the plans our nation has for the regulation of these monstrous weapons.

1 A forerunner of the NPT? The Soviet proposals of 1947:

<https://www.iaea.org/sites/default/files/publications/magazines/bulletin/bull28-1/28103595864.pdf>

2 Address by the Soviet Representative (Andrei Gromyko) to the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission June 19, 1946: <https://fissilematerials.org/library/un46.pdf>

3 LOOKING BACK: Going for Baruch: The Nuclear Plan That Refused to Go Away

: <https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2006-06/looking-back-going-baruch-nuclear-plan-refused-go-away>

II. Iranian Aggression towards the people of Azerbaijan

The USSR wishes to call to the attention of this delegation the unjust behavior of Iran. Despite claims that the USSR has troops wrongfully located within Azerbaijan by Iran, the USSR wishes to set the record straight. We have the right to station troops within this region and are not only permitted to do so under the Soviet-Iranian Treaty of 26 February 1921, but also the Soviet-British-Iranian Treaty of 1942. Not only has Iran unjustly accused the USSR of infringing on their sovereignty, but they have committed crimes against the people of the Azerbaijan region. The USSR is not responsible for the enlightenment of the citizens of this region to the benefits of

socialist governments, and should not be blamed for corrupting them as Iran tries to claim that it is. In addition, Iran has invaded Azerbaijan with its own troops that have caused violence against the people of Azerbaijan, leading to injuries and casualties of innocent people. The USSR strongly encourages this delegation to force Iran to remove its troops from Azerbaijan and pay reparations for the crimes committed against its people. To not address these heinous actions would be a truly horrendous oversight on the part of this committee.

4 The Head of the Delegation of the Soviet Union at the United Nations (Vyshinsky) to the President of the Security Council (Makin): <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1946v07/d224>

5 The British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Eden) to the Secretary of State: <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1943v01/d665>

6 Treaty of Friendship between Persia and the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic: <https://www.cia.gov/readingroom/docs/CIA-RDP84B00049R000701920007-1.pdf>

United States of America
Position Paper for the Historical Security Council (1946)

I. The Future of Germany

The United States of America recognizes that Germany's future is central to Europe's political and economic recovery. The Allied Powers are determined to eliminate Nazism and prevent future aggression, as evidenced by the Casablanca Conference and the principle of unconditional surrender. have created a severe humanitarian crisis that is likely to contribute to fear and resentment³⁴ among the German population if left unaddressed.

Historical precedent reinforces these concerns. After the First World War and the implementation of the Treaty of Versailles³⁵, Germany experienced profound social unrest and economic hardship, as well as disillusionment with democratic governance. The US is concerned that punitive economic methods will once again encourage political extremism. While we believe in accountability for past aggression, policies that leave a population with a basic standard of living threaten stability.

Currently, major German cities lie in ruins, and the country is without a central government. Immediate occupation policy must prioritize food distribution, public health measures, and the restoration of essential services such as housing and transport. These measures are prerequisites for preventing further social collapse. Eventually, we must turn our attention to reestablishing economic stability and governance under Allied Supervision.

The United States, therefore, supports a rehabilitative³⁶ approach to determining Germany's role in Europe. This would involve maintaining strict constraints on military production, but allowing the resurgence of industries essential to food and housing production. The US supports the creation of administrative bodies to supervise reconstruction, and affirms that economic assistance should be contingent on compliance with occupation policy. With gradual implementation, beginning by addressing humanitarian concerns, Germany can be reintegrated into Europe to ensure a lasting peace.

³⁴ Fears of Retribution in Post-War Germany: <https://www.nationalww2museum.org/war/articles/fears-of-retribution-in-post-war-germany>

³⁵ The aftermath of the First World War: <https://www.theholocaustexplained.org/the-nazi-rise-to-power/the-effects-of-the-first-world-war-on-germany/>

³⁶ Recovery and reconstruction: Europe after WWII: <https://cepr.org/voxeu/columns/recovery-and-reconstruction-europe-after-wwii>

II. Strengthening the United Nations

The United States of America believes that ensuring the United Nations can operate independently across sovereign states is essential to sustaining international peace³⁷ and preventing another world war. Representatives of fifty nations met at the San Francisco Conference on International Organization³⁸ in 1945 to complete the UN Charter, establishing a framework for peace and cooperation among states.

The Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations³⁹ recognizes the United Nations as an entity capable of performing its own functions. By assigning the United Nations a juridical personality, with the capacity to contract, acquire property, and initiate legal proceedings, the Convention ensures that the Organization can act as a credible international institution not impeded by local political pressures.

The United States supports a set of clear commitments by Member States. First, we United States advocates full adherence to and implementation of the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, ensuring that UN personnel and operations can function without obstruction within national jurisdictions. Second, the United States supports sustained financial contributions and cooperation to enable the Organization to carry out its responsibilities effectively. Third, the United States emphasizes active participation in UN bodies, as the Organization's credibility depends on consistent involvement by powerful nations. Finally, the United States encourages Member States to utilize the United Nations as the primary forum for post-conflict stabilization, reinforcing the principle that collective peace is best preserved through multilateral collaboration.

³⁷ The United Nations — Its Challenge to America:

<https://providencemag.com/2021/03/united-nations-its-challenge-america-john-foster-dulles/#:~:text=In%20hindsight%2C%20an%20American%20conservative,Western%20message%20dominated%20the%20body>

³⁸ The Formation of the United Nations, 1945: <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1937-1945/un>

³⁹ CONVENTION ON THE PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES

OF THE UNITED NATIONS: <https://www.un.org/en/ethics/assets/pdfs/Convention%20of%20Privileges-Immunities%20of%20the%20UN.pdf>

The United Kingdom

Positions for the Gathered Security Council of 1946

Topic I: Addressing the Iranian Issue

On January 29th of 1942, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union entered into a binding treaty with the state of Iran. The Tripartite Treaty of 1942¹ officially represented the good faith of the parties involved in the Allied occupation of the Persian region and signaled their intent to vacate the region by a deadline of six months following the cessation of hostilities associated with The War. While American troops in the region left in January of this year and British troops were recalled just over a month later, the agreed upon March 2nd deadline has come and gone with Soviet forces still clearly entrenched in several regions of Iran.

The state of Iran came before the Security Council on January 19th to formally complain about this incursion, and this body passed United Nations Security Council Resolution 2 on January 30th in response. In this resolution, the Security Council urged both parties to work toward a peaceful negotiation and keep the body apprised of any progress made. Since that date, there has been no official Soviet announcement of a withdrawal, and talks appear to be going nowhere.

The United Kingdom feels it apt now to call attention back to the United Nations Charter and reiterate that among the Security Council's purposes as articulated in Chapter I, Article I of the Charter is, "To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace."² To allow infringement upon an established state's sovereignty with the presence of military force is to render these articles meaningless, and this Security Council cannot allow such a standard to be set. In the spirit of international cooperation, the Soviet Union must play its part in securing the sovereignty of its neighbors to ensure that the rest of these United Nations can safely do the same. There can be no solution without discourse, and no discourse without honesty, and it is this Security Council's responsibility to take action to hold its members to that standard.

The United Kingdom proposes that this Security Council unanimously agree to request the full departure of Soviet troops from Iran as quickly as can be managed, with evidence of such a departure sent expediently to this body. The United Kingdom also

¹ Treaty of Alliance between the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union and Iran, UK-USSR-Iran, Jan. 29, 1942, 169 L.N.T.S. 271.

² Charter of the United Nations (signed 26 June 1945, entered into force 24 October 1945) 1 UNTS XVI.

proposes for the states in question to inform the body of any urgent developments that may impact the Soviet withdrawal between the passage of such a resolution and its enactment. The United Kingdom proposes that the Security Council reexamine the issue again within a month to determine whether the request of this body has been met by the Soviet Union. If not, the United Kingdom proposes this Security Council reopen the topic to discuss necessary actions by this body to further manage the Persian encroachment.

Topic II: Addressing the Emerging Refugee Crisis in Europe

The United Kingdom, recognizing the displacement and danger for European citizens across the continent caused by the aftermath of The War, proposes that the Security Council make provisions for the safe travel and enforcement of humanitarian law in Europe in order to protect these displaced persons. Seeing the need for these refugees to find purposeful residence away from destroyed regions, the United Kingdom suggests that the actions taken by this body guide displaced persons to areas which have maintained means of production and enable Europeans to find work and residence across the continent until such time as they can return to their originating lands. This measure would greatly contribute to the reinvigoration of European economic activity and would aid the continent's progress toward war reconstruction.

While displaced persons fleeing the German region have been a notable movement for some years now, it is the return of these refugees and the resettlement of others that should be of concern to the Security Council. To prevent disorganized and dangerous movement of millions of individuals across Europe, it would be advantageous for this body's member states to provide clear channels and endpoints for the displaced to ensure that the safety and sovereignty of European states is not threatened at this time. An unregulated movement of immigrants could present extreme danger to this effect, as has been observed in the pilgrimage of Jewish radicals to British Palestine in the past decade or so. Recognizing the severity of the dangers of this immigration, the United Kingdom proposes an international system of identification and clearance that would allow European member states to cooperatively investigate and provide clearance for refugees designated as "safe for travel". This system would better allow the United Nations to coordinate the movement of specific refugee groups and better organize the resettlement effort. The United Kingdom proposes that this body move on this issue with a level of expediency appropriate for the issue, and work to ensure its hasty enactment so that as many refugees as can be aided and organized are able to benefit from this system.