

# Argentine Republic (Argentina)

## Positions for Security Council (1976)

---

### 1. Terrorism and Subversion in the Southern Cone

The Argentine Republic has observed with growing concern the rise of politically motivated violence and armed extremist movements throughout Latin America during the past decade.<sup>1</sup> Throughout the early 1970s, the Argentine Republic experienced sustained attacks by insurgent organizations, most notably the Montoneros and the People's Revolutionary Army (ERP). These organizations carried out kidnappings, assassinations, bombings, and direct assaults against civilian and military targets in a strenuous effort to destabilize the Argentine state. Such actions condemned by these groups threatened public safety and undermined the rule of law.<sup>2</sup>

Following escalating instability, the Armed Forces assumed governmental authority in March 1976 under President Jorge Rafael Videla, citing the necessity of restoring order and protecting Argentine citizens from extremist violence.<sup>3</sup> The Argentine Republic maintains that the preservation of national security and civil stability is an inherent right of sovereign states and an essential prerequisite for economic development and regional peace.<sup>4</sup>

Additionally, the Argentine Republic recognizes that subversive violence is not confined to a single nation. Insurgent movements frequently cross borders, seek refuge in neighboring states, and share resources and intelligence regionally.<sup>5</sup> Thereby, ideas of terrorism and ideological extremism pose a threat not only to the Argentine Republic, but to the stability of the broader Southern Cone and the international community.

In light of these concerns, the Argentine Republic offers a two-step approach to safeguard regional stability while respecting national sovereignty. First, the Argentine Republic urges the establishment of a formal framework for cooperation among Southern Cone Member States to facilitate intelligence sharing, border coordination, and the negotiation of extradition agreements to ensure that individuals responsible for acts of terrorism cannot evade prosecution across borders.<sup>6</sup> Second, the Argentine Republic encourages the United Nations to assist member States in strengthening domestic counter-terrorism capacity through technical training and institutional support for law enforcement and judicial authorities.<sup>7</sup> It is urged that all such measures remain consistent with Articles 2(1) and 2(7) of the United Nation Charter by remaining under the authority of sovereign governments and free from external intervention.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The Dirty War: <https://www.britannica.com/event/Dirty-War-Argentina>

<sup>2</sup> Montonero: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Montonero>

<sup>3</sup> Jorge Rafael Videla: <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Jorge-Rafael-Videla>

<sup>4</sup> United Nations Charter, Article 2(1) - Sovereignty Principle: <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter/full-text>

<sup>5</sup> Operation Condo: <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1977-80v24/d12>

<sup>6</sup> Southern Cone: <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1969-76ve11p2>

<sup>7</sup> Inter-American Commission on Human Rights: <https://www.cidh.oas.org/countryrep/Argentina80eng/toc.htm>

<sup>8</sup> UN Charter: <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter>

## 2. Superpower Rivalry and the Sovereignty of Developing States

The Argentine Republic has observed with growing concern that escalating tensions between major powers during the Cold War have increasingly drawn developing nations into ideological and military confrontations not of their own making. Throughout the 1970s, the United States provided both military and economic assistance to anti-communist governments throughout Latin America, including Argentina and neighboring states, as part of a broader effort to contain the influence of the Soviet Union and Cuban-aligned movements. These rivalries risk transforming local disputes into proxy conflicts, leading to destabilizing governments, weakening economies, and the disruption of international peace.<sup>9</sup>

The Argentine Republic firmly believes that every member state reserves the sovereign right to determine their own political and economic systems free from external coercion or intervention.<sup>10</sup> Furthermore, the Argentine Republic emphasizes that in accordance with Article 2(7) of the United Nations Charter, matters which are within the domestic jurisdiction of any state should not be subject to external intervention.<sup>11</sup>

Accordingly, the Argentine Republic proposes that the Security Council encourage formal, non-intervention pledges from major powers while simultaneously refraining from funding, arming, or directing proxy forces within the internal affairs of developing states. The Argentine Republic further proposes the United Nations facilitate voluntary and neutral UN-led forums and mediation teams to assist member states in resolving regional disputes peacefully, ensuring that these measures do not compromise state sovereignty.<sup>12</sup> Finally, Argentina recommends the expansion of voluntary technical and economic assistance programs that strengthen domestic institutions without imposing political conditions.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Cold War: <https://www.britannica.com/event/Cold-War>

<sup>10</sup> UN Charter, Sovereign equality: <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter/full-text>

<sup>11</sup> UN Charter, Non-Intervention: <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter/full-text>

<sup>12</sup> UN Charter, Peaceful Settlements of Disputes: <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter/full-text>

<sup>13</sup> UN Charter, International Cooperation: <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter/full-text>

**People's Republic of China**  
**Position Paper for the 1976 Historical Security Council**

---

**I. Transfer in Power for the People's Republic of China**

Established in 1949, the People's Republic of China had been ruled over by Chairman Mao Zedong. Mao was a revolutionary who saw that the only way for communism to ever succeed in China was to utilize the peasants, of whom made up around 80% of the country's population at the time. The Great Cultural Revolution of 1966 further sought to establish this new line of thought and eliminate political opponents who would seek to destroy the social and economic equality that Mao had built.<sup>1</sup> Although highly critical of the United States for their imperialist and capitalist tendencies as well as the nation being structurally unstable, Mao still extended an olive branch towards President Richard Nixon in 1972.<sup>2</sup> During discussions with the Security Council, the People's Republic of China would like to highlight its recent attempts to make peace with former allies and discuss potential allyships. It would also like to condemn the United States' actions in Vietnam as the only way to move forward with peace is to do away with imperialism.

Following Mao's recent decline in health, the People's Republic of China has appointed Hua Guofeng to temporarily assume the role of Chairman until Mao has recovered.<sup>3</sup> The People's Republic of China wishes to dispel any rumors of political instability that may exist during this transition of power. Despite Chairman Mao's health issues, China is more unified than ever as a nation under Hua's steady leadership. Once Mao makes a full recovery, China is predicted to see an even more drastic increase in the economy. The belief that the People's Republic of China is currently facing any sort of turmoil is nothing short of Western propaganda meant to cast doubt upon the efficiency of China. China wishes to issue a warning to the United Nations Security Council against interfering in its own or any other nation's transition of power. The United Nations must learn to respect the sovereignty of nations, especially those that are currently undergoing a transition of power. Instead, new leaders of nations should be given prime speaking spots at the General Assembly and a direct phone line with the United Nations Secretary General so as to be able to properly increase communication. Such a resolution would dispel rumors of instability and prevent ill-intentioned nations from using transitions of power as justification to invade smaller nations. This increase in clarity and communication would also assist in alleviating the tensions between nations that exist due to the Cold War.

---

<sup>1</sup>Mao Tse-Tung: <https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/americanexperience/features/china-mao/>

<sup>2</sup>Why did Mao Shake Hands with Nixon? Good Americans, Bad Americans, and the US-China Rapprochement:

<https://www.wilsoncenter.org/blog-post/why-did-mao-shake-hands-nixon-good-americans-bad-americans-and-us-china-rapprochement>

<sup>3</sup>Death of Mao Zedong Leads to Reforms in China:

<https://www.ebsco.com/research-starters/history/death-mao-zedong-leads-reforms-china>

**1. Easing Cold War Tensions and Addressing the Soviet Threat**

While both the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) and the People's Republic of China are both communist and previously had diplomatic ties, said diplomatic ties were cut in 1966 in what is now known as the Sino Soviet Split. Both nations believed that in order for communism to see international success, one nation must set an example and lead the world forward; however, the USSR was unwilling to back down and allocated that title to the People's Republic of China. Furthermore, the People's Republic of China has historically been one of the defenders of smaller nations, which went directly against the Republic of Albania's heavy reliance on the USSR. Both Albania and China were unsatisfied with the leadership of Nikita Khrushchev and began to ally themselves with each other.<sup>4</sup> The People's Republic of China also recalls that this was not the first nor most egregious time the USSR has exploited its power to take advantage of smaller states. China is calling upon the Security Council to place sanctions upon Russia and hold them accountable for violating the sovereignty of numerous nations.

The People's Republic of China also voices its concerns over the increased militarization along the Russo-Chinese border following the conflict along the Ussuri River. The USSR has also been giving repeated aid to India, Pakistan, and North Vietnam in order to counter Chinese influence. China fears a future conflict with the USSR along with/or more nations joining the USSR. The Security Council should work to open investigations into the USSR's intentions as well as prevent any potential conflicts from outbreaking or increased tensions on the whole. The USSR cannot continue to go unchecked in its power.

Both the USSR and the United States of America have been "fueling the fire" in the South West Asia North Africa region by funding and providing military aid to their various allies. The South West Asia North Africa region (commonly referred to as "the SWANA region" or "the Middle East") has historically been an area plagued by conflict, and the USSR's involvement, as well as the United States', only sees an increase in violence. The difference now is that the warring factions are backed by global superpowers. The People's Republic of China condemns the actions of both nations and urges the Security Council to do the same.

The USSR's growing stockpile of nuclear weapons, currently holding the largest in the world, only continues to increase the fears held by the People's Republic of China. While China does have its own nuclear arsenal, it is a fraction of what is possessed by the USSR. China fears that if Cold War tensions continue to increase, the result would be total annihilation of the People's Republic of China in a best case scenario and mutually assured destruction on a global level via nuclear weapons in a worst case scenario. It should become the Security Council's top priority to greatly reduce the amount of nuclear weapons in the world and to especially discourage the use of them by nations such as the USSR.<sup>5</sup>

---

4A Messy Divorce: The Sino-Soviet Split:

<https://daily.jstor.org/a-messy-divorce-the-sino-soviet-split/>

5The Brezhnev Era: <https://www.britannica.com/place/Soviet-Union/The-Brezhnev-era>

## **The French Republic**

### **Position Paper for the Historical Security Council 1976**

---

#### **1. Immigration in Regards to Human Rights**

France was one of the many nations that suffered devastating losses during World War II. With total casualties estimated at 567,600<sup>(1)</sup>, the country experienced a serious decline in both its labor force and its sense of national pride. In the years that followed, these losses sparked intense debates about immigration policy that continued long after the war had ended. After the war, France focused on two main immigration goals: rebuilding its workforce and addressing ongoing demographic challenges within the country<sup>(2)</sup>. Over time, these policies came under increasing public scrutiny. As different political administrations took office, enforcement strategies shifted as well. Even so, France has remained a strong advocate and leading voice in the process of European integration<sup>(3)</sup>.

France encourages all member states to fully uphold and enforce the United Nations' Universal Declaration of Human Rights, especially its commitment to family reunification. The UDHR clearly states that the family is a fundamental unit of society and deserves protection from both government and state authorities<sup>(4)</sup>. France views family reunification as more than a humanitarian concern. It is also essential for international security and long term stability. Protecting families is both a moral duty and a political responsibility. When families are reunited, they are better equipped to overcome hardship and build stable, productive lives. France believes it is the responsibility of each state to create conditions that allow families to succeed.

France also recognizes that the international community has developed several frameworks to regulate labor migration and safeguard migrant workers. One of the most significant examples is the International Labour Organization's Migration for Employment Convention of 1949. This agreement established standards for recruitment, equal treatment, and the fair management of migrant labor programs. It even provided a model agreement to help countries implement ethical migration practices<sup>(5)</sup>. However, despite these efforts, Convention No. 97 did not fully eliminate inconsistent recruitment systems or unequal treatment across national borders. Many of its provisions were applied differently depending on domestic laws and bilateral agreements. Ongoing abusive recruitment practices and insufficient worker protections eventually led the ILO to adopt the Migrant Workers (Supplementary Provisions) Convention of 1975<sup>(6)</sup>. This convention openly acknowledges the "negative social and human consequences" caused by unregulated or unsupported migration flows and emphasizes the need for stronger oversight of recruitment and working conditions. Still, even this later agreement showed the limits of existing systems. It relied heavily on earlier conventions from 1948, 1949, and 1955, highlighting that protections for migrant workers remained incomplete and uneven.

France reaffirms its commitment to humane and stable migration policies and calls on all member states to strengthen worker protections while upholding the principles of dignity and family unity.

- 
2. World War II Casualties <https://www.nationalww2museum.org/students-teachers/student-resources/research-starters/research-starters-worldwide-deaths-world-war>
  3. The Challenge of French Diversity <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/challenge-french-diversity>
  4. French Decree of Family Reunification [https://en.nbpublish.com/library\\_read\\_article.php?id=68982](https://en.nbpublish.com/library_read_article.php?id=68982)
  5. Family Reunification <https://www.weldonlegal.com/latest-news/reuniting-loved-ones-the-importance-of-family-reunification-in-immigration-policies/>
  6. Convention 97 [https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/generalassembly/docs/globalcompact/ILO\\_C\\_097.pdf](https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/generalassembly/docs/globalcompact/ILO_C_097.pdf)
  7. Migrant Workers Convention of 1975 [https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/generalassembly/docs/globalcompact/ILO\\_C\\_143.pdf](https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/generalassembly/docs/globalcompact/ILO_C_143.pdf)

## 2. Decolonization of Former Territories

In the years leading up to 1976, France faced difficult challenges as it moved through the process of decolonization in the Comoros archipelago, especially concerning the island of Mayotte. In the 1974 independence referendum, three islands voted in favor of forming a unified Comorian state. However, the people of Mayotte voted overwhelmingly to remain under French administration. This decision reflected deep cultural, economic, and historical ties to France that dated back to 1841<sup>(1)</sup>. In 1975, France recognized the independence of the new Comorian state. At the same time, it upheld the principle of self-determination by allowing Mayotte to determine its own political future. Although the United Nations later criticized this referendum<sup>(2)</sup>, France maintained that respecting the clearly expressed will of the Mahoran people was essential for stability, legitimacy, and the responsible completion of decolonization. Through this approach, France aimed to balance international expectations with its commitment to democratic choice and the protection of Mahoran interests.

As France entered the final stages of decolonization in the Indian Ocean, it stressed the importance of building stable political systems rather than rushing transitions that could leave new states vulnerable. French officials pointed to uneven development within the Comoros archipelago, especially after the colonial capital was moved from Mayotte to Moroni in 1962. This change contributed to administrative inequalities and left many Mahoran communities feeling politically marginalized and economically disadvantaged compared to the other islands<sup>(3)</sup>. France argued that these structural imbalances required careful attention and that the international community underestimated the governance challenges involved in maintaining a unified Comorian state. From France's perspective, decolonization was not only about granting independence. It also required ensuring that each population had the institutions and political conditions necessary for a peaceful and sustainable transition. France believed that this standard had not yet been met in the case of Mayotte.

Although France rejected United Nations claims that its actions violated Comorian sovereignty, it continued to pursue diplomatic engagement and repeatedly expressed its willingness to cooperate with regional partners<sup>(4)</sup>. After recognizing the Comorian government in December 1975<sup>(5)</sup>, France maintained bilateral contact, showing that disagreements over territorial arrangements did not prevent broader collaboration. France presented its position as an effort to balance local democratic will with international expectations. It argued that meaningful progress would come through negotiation rather than condemnation. By encouraging continued dialogue instead of confrontation, France sought to show that its long term goal was regional stability, economic support for the newly independent Comoros, and the peaceful resolution of remaining territorial disputes.

France remains committed to completing decolonization in a responsible manner while respecting the democratic choices of the Mahoran people and promoting stability throughout the Indian Ocean region.

---

3. The people of Mayotte (Translated) <https://www.ina.fr/ina-eclairer-actu/mayotte-france-ile-cyclone-chido>

4. Question of the Comorian island of Mayotte <https://www.refworld.org/legal/resolution/unga/1976/en/6766>

5. The Issue of Mahoré <https://countrystudies.us/comoros/7.htm>

6. French Relations with Comoros [https://www.wikiwand.com/en/articles/Comoros%E2%80%93France\\_relations](https://www.wikiwand.com/en/articles/Comoros%E2%80%93France_relations)

7. France recognizes Comoros

<https://countrystudies.us/comoros/4.htm#:~:text=Four%20days%20earlier%2C%20on%20December.the%20national%20budget%2C%20remained%20suspended.>

# German Democratic Republic

## Position Paper for the 1976 Historical Security Council

---

### I. The Maintenance of International Peace and Security of State Borders

The German Democratic Republic approaches the discussion of state borders and the continuation of détente. Following the successes of the previous year, 1975, the GDR asserts that any enigma regarding territorial integrity constitutes a direct threat to international peace. This paper outlines the GRD's stance regarding the finality of the overall post-war settlement and the necessity of placing a border inviolability as the mandatory norm of international law. The GDR maintains that the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe<sup>1</sup> serves as the legal and political framework for state relations. In the third article of the Helsinki Accords, it declares that the participating States regard all frontiers in Europe as "inviolable". The GDR emphasizes that "inviolability" isn't merely a prohibition against any military force, but that it's a total rejection of any legal or political claims seeking to alter and change borders. These exclusive agreements, particularly the Treaty of Moscow(1970), and the Basic Treaty(1972), have organized and set the example for the status quo. The GDR heavily insists that these are not just provisional arrangements, but permanent recognitions of two separate sovereign German states.

The GDR rejects all forms of Western characterizations of its border security measures. From the point of view of the Socialist Unity Party, the "anti-facist protective rampart" is a necessary defensive mechanism against imperialist subversion and the intense "brain drain"<sup>4</sup> that's been orchestrated by West German agents. Under the UN Charter, Article 2(7)<sup>5</sup> matters of internal security and border management fall strictly within domestic jurisdiction. The GDR views the continued existence of the "Basic Law"<sup>6</sup> of the Federal Republic of Germany, which envisions a true single German citizenship as a provocation that contradicts the spirit of a whole of the UN Membership.

The GDR extends the principle of the border inviolability of the global struggle against neo-colonism as a whole. We observe with great concern the destabilization of borders within Southern Africa and the Middle East.<sup>7</sup> We support the integrity of the territory of newly independent states like the People's Republic of Angola against incursions from the South African apartheid regime, as such violations are a full part of a broader imperialist strategy to undermine the great socialist development.<sup>8</sup>

The GDR reiterates that the respect for state borders is an obligation that bypasses the sovereignty of existing states. We additionally condemn all forms of state-sponsored border subversion, including the use of media and economic pressure to encourage the illegal migration that's currently ongoing. The GDR encourages all member states to align their national legislation with the principles of the Helsinki Final Act to prevent all future territorial disputes. The GDR remains fully committed to the social path and the great maintenance of a secure, and bifurcated Europe as the only true alternative to the horrors that past conflict as shown in the world.

---

<sup>1</sup>Helsinki Final Act, 1975: <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1969-1976/helsinki>.

<sup>2</sup>Treaty of Moscow:

<https://germanhistorydocs.org/en/two-germanies-1961-1989/the-moscow-treaty-august-12-1970>.

<sup>3</sup>Basic Treaty: [https://ghdi.ghi-dc.org/sub\\_document.cfm?document\\_id=172](https://ghdi.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=172).

<sup>4</sup>"Brain Drain" : <https://www.bbc.co.uk/bitesize/articles/z23y9ty>.

<sup>5</sup>UN Charter, Article 2(7): [https://legal.un.org/repertory/art2\\_7.shtml](https://legal.un.org/repertory/art2_7.shtml).

<sup>6</sup>"Basic Law" (Grundgesetz, translation done through website): [www.gesetze-im-internet.de/englisch\\_gg/](http://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/englisch_gg/).

<sup>7</sup>Destabilization in Africa and the Middle East: <https://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/other/bluebook/1972/1972-1-13.htm>.

<sup>8</sup>UN Resolution 387: <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/93717?ln=en>.

**Republic of Guatemala**  
**Position Paper for the 1976 Historical Security Council**

---

**8. Destruction from 1976 Guatemalan Earthquake**

The Republic of Guatemala was left devastated by a magnitude 7.5 earthquake on February 4, 1976, that occurred along the Motagua Fault zone.<sup>1</sup> The earthquake brought destruction across both urban and rural regions, resulting in roughly 23,000 deaths, injuring over 76,000 individuals, and displacing millions of civilians.<sup>1</sup> Critical infrastructure such as hospitals, schools, transportation networks, and water systems suffered severe damage.<sup>2</sup> The vast amount of destruction overwhelmed emergency services and was an immediate threat to public health, safety, and stability. In response to the disaster, the Government of The Republic of Guatemala declared a national state of emergency and engaged all available resources, including military units, medical personnel, and civil defense forces, to attempt rescue and relief operations.<sup>2</sup> Despite these efforts, The Republic of Guatemala's limited resources and underdeveloped infrastructure greatly delayed its ability to respond effectively to the crisis. Remote rural areas, particularly in the highlands, were rendered inaccessible due to collapsed roads and communication failures, leaving thousands without shelter, food, or medical assistance.<sup>3</sup>

Recognizing the severity of the situation, The Republic of Guatemala would like to make an appeal to the United Nations for emergency humanitarian assistance.<sup>3</sup> This appeal is made in accordance with international principles of cooperation and humanitarian responsibility and is, obviously, strictly non-political. The Republic of Guatemala is asking for immediate aid in the form of medical supplies, emergency shelter, and food assistance. The involvement of United Nations agencies, including the World Health Organization and UNICEF, would play a pivotal role in stabilizing both architectural and governmental conditions, preventing outbreaks of disease, and assisting the needs of displaced civilians.<sup>4</sup>

The Republic of Guatemala maintains that the needed international support to the 1976 earthquake demonstrates the essential role of the United Nations in coordinating humanitarian assistance during large-scale disasters and strife.<sup>4</sup> Effective coordination can allow member states to contribute aid and prevent duplication of efforts during the time-sensitive emergency of the earthquake. The Republic of Guatemala emphasizes that such assistance must respect national sovereignty and operate in cooperation with domestic authorities, ensuring that relief efforts support The Republic of Guatemala's own national recovery, rather than replace it.

Within the framework of the Historical Security Council, The Republic of Guatemala asserts that humanitarian crises resulting from natural disasters pose serious risks to regional stability and human security. Delayed or insufficient responses can continue unnecessary suffering, lead to long-term displacement, and disrupt public order. The Republic of Guatemala therefore calls upon the Security Council to recognize the importance of timely humanitarian assistance and to encourage continued international cooperation in responding to natural disasters, particularly in developing nations with limited response capabilities.<sup>3</sup> The Republic of Guatemala would like to thank the Security Council for its consideration.

## **Italian Republic Position Paper for Historical Security Council 1976**

---

### **8. Far-Left Extremist Terrorism in the Italian Republic**

On December 12, 1969 16:37, Central European Time<sup>1</sup>, a bomb exploded in the public hall of the Banca Nazionale dell'Agricoltura at Piazza Fontana, Milan.<sup>2</sup> This killed 17 and injured 88.<sup>3</sup> In the hour after the explosion three other explosions happened in Rome and a minimum of 14 other people were injured from it. A couple of hours later, another bomb was found in a bank close to the La Scala opera house in Milan. Fortunately, the officers were able to explode the bomb in the courtyard of the Banca Commercial Italiana<sup>4</sup> limiting the damage. Investigations have named several anarchist groups as the culprits.<sup>3</sup> Yet, this tragic example is not a limited example of violence from the far-left in the Italian Republic over the past decade. Other such examples are the murder of the innocent messenger boy Alessandro Floris on March 26, 1971 by far-left group October XXII Circle<sup>5</sup>, a group of Potere Operaio, a far-left organization, militants murdering Virgilio and Stefano by arson in the night between April 15-16, 1973<sup>6</sup>, and the injuring of 45 people and death of a woman on May, 17 1973 by an anarchist throwing a hand grenade into a crowd in front of the police headquarters in Milan.<sup>7</sup>

The Italian Republic is greatly saddened that these acts of violence are taken against the innocent citizens of the Italian Republic to ignite a worker's revolution<sup>8&9</sup> of their own design, violating and manipulating the democratic rights and safety of the virtuous citizens of the Italian Republic. Despite how dreadful the actions and reason of these attacks, the Italian Republic understands that proactive actions from the government need to be taken to stop it. As a result, the Italian Republic has taken new and improved anti-terroism measures such as decree number 99 of 1974, law number 497, and law number 152 of 1975, all of which make it easier to find and punish the people committing such violent actions.<sup>10</sup>

Yet, violent actions from the far-left continue in the Italian Republic. Therefore, the Italian Republic requests the UN to lead further investigation teams into suspected domestic violent far-left extremists and share the information gathered with the domestic government. It also recommends that the international community take further anti-terroism actions against violent groups from the far-left and to curb far-left influence in their government.

---

<sup>1</sup>Time Zone of Italian Republic: <https://www.timeanddate.com/time/zone/italy>

<sup>2</sup>Time of Piazza Fontana Massacre: <https://www.wantedinmilan.com/news/italy-piazza-fontana-bombing-milan.html>

<sup>3</sup>Death Count and Immediate Suspects:

<https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/can-europe-make-it/50-years-since-the-piazza-fontana-bombing-and-italy-is-still-facing-up-to-its-years-of-lead/>

<sup>4</sup>Bombing Surrounding Piazza Fontana Massacre:

[http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/december/12/newsid\\_3953000/3953999.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/december/12/newsid_3953000/3953999.stm)

<sup>5</sup>Murder of Alessandro Floris: <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/tr/pdf/ADA080099.pdf>

<sup>6</sup>Arson Attack by October XXII Circle:

<https://www.unionesarda.it/en/italy/primavalle-stake-50-years-later-meloni-quot-dark-page-of-italian-historyquot-c6xw2w7c>

<sup>7</sup>Attack in Front of Police Headquarters:

<https://www.nytimes.com/1973/05/18/archives/anarchist-seized-in-blast-in-milan-hand-grenade-kills-woman-outside.html>

<sup>8</sup> For Revolutionary Ideas:

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/14773708211008441#:~:text=The%20increasing%20militarization%20and%20the,Sommier%2C%201998%2C%202008>

<sup>9</sup> For Worker's Revolution:

<https://adst.org/2016/03/years-of-lead-domestic-terrorism-and-italys-red-brigades/#:~:text=Boasting%20up%20to%20a%20thousand,wass%20murdered%20on%20May%209>

<sup>10</sup> Anti-Terrorism Laws:

[https://www.transcrime.it/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/14\\_Terrorism\\_and\\_Counterterrorism\\_in\\_Italy1.pdf](https://www.transcrime.it/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/14_Terrorism_and_Counterterrorism_in_Italy1.pdf)

## **9. Economic Consequences of Decolonization and Revolution in the Portuguese Republic**

The Italian Republic observed the overthrow of Portugal's dictatorship in 1974 with great hope in the formation of a democracy. Yet this hope turned to great worry when the revolution that followed allowed the Portuguese Communist Party (PCP), a party aligned with the repressive actions of the USSR, to gain much power in Portugal. Luckily this worry vanished when the PCP started to fall out of favor and the favorable Socialist Party took its place.<sup>11</sup>

While the Italian Republic is delighted in this turn of events, it also is also worried about economic consequences of decolonization and massive expansion of the public sector during the revolution in the Portuguese Republic that might result in future political instability. Primarily, the Italian Republic is worried that Portugal's former colonies accounted for 18 percent of its exports which significantly helped counterbalance its trade deficit<sup>12</sup> and the disorder of its financial and production systems.<sup>13</sup>

To counterbalance the economic repercussions of the Portuguese Republic, the Italian Republic recommends that the UN extends monetary economic support to the Portuguese Republic through the European Commission (EC) and recommends that the EC uses this support to help the Portuguese Republic to increase trade and to organize the financial and production systems. Also as a result of the Portuguese Republic showing its own willingness to fix its economic situation, as seen in the reopening of the Stock Exchange in January, 1976<sup>12</sup>, the Italian Republic also recommends that Portugal will be allowed to join the Council of Europe and to start renegotiations of the 1972 Portugal–EEC Free Trade Agreement.

<sup>11</sup> Portugal Revolution: <https://jacobin.com/2024/04/portugal-revolution-military-coup-anti-colonialism>

<sup>12</sup> OECD Economic Surveys: Portugal 1976:

[https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/1976/01/oecd-economic-surveys-portugal-1976\\_glg16f4b/eco\\_surveys-prt-1976-en.pdf](https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/1976/01/oecd-economic-surveys-portugal-1976_glg16f4b/eco_surveys-prt-1976-en.pdf)

<sup>13</sup> Portugal Democracy and European Integration:

<https://www.cvce.eu/en/recherche/unit-content/-/unit/a7b75b14-91dc-48dd-9df0-a0d51a9edfef/8c8ba528-be43-4e44-b694-8768c6642171>

Libya: Security Council 1976

### **Historical Context of Libya in 1976**

Before 1976, Libya existed as a monarchy. That was until a man named Muammar Gaddafi overthrew the royal family. He then replaced it with a dictatorship that valued democracy. He placed himself as a dictator under the disguise of a democracy and nationalized Libya's economy. This nationalization can be found through the OPEC oil crisis, which will be discussed in the next section. He ruled with an iron fist, killing any opponents to his methods. He created a persona of himself that allowed the people to see him as a mere commoner, meeting with people in a tent. This illusion of power given to the masses allowed him to last for a couple of decades as the supreme ruler of Libya. He placed the streets of Libya under strict rule by the police. Gaddafi also sought to eliminate freedom of speech. This rulership summarized Libya's views on foreign conflicts, inner industries, and the political nightmares that occurred from 1976 to the past. Other things worth noting about Libya's affairs are its relationships with other countries. Although the country opposed communism, Libya purchased about 800 million dollars' worth of weapons from the USSR. Libya relied on US oil companies within the state to supply its oil, even with open hostility towards the US. They saw US capitalism as evil and wished to eradicate it by nationalising the economy. Libya also viewed Israel as an imperialist move of the West.

### **The OPEC Oil Crisis of 1973**

The OPEC oil embargo is a relevant topic to the council because it concerns recent events within the Middle East that should be addressed to avoid future conflicts that hurt Libya as well as foreign countries such as the United States. The OPEC oil crisis of 1973 began during the Arab-Israeli war, in which Arab countries imposed an embargo on the United States. The United States had been supplying the Israeli army with weapons, angering OPEC countries like Libya. Muammar, enraged at the situation, forced US oil companies within the country to give more oil and money to the Libyan government, nationalizing the industry in favor of Libya. At that point, the US was dependent on foreign oil, crushing the US economy. Being an OPEC country, as well as an Arab country, Libya's viewpoint on this conflict against Israel led them to the conclusion that they needed to hurt the US economy to gain what they believed in. Libya's solution was to hurt the United States enough to refuse to supply Israel anymore. As a delegate of Libya, I believe it is in all our interests for the United States to back out of the conflict in Israel and keep their minds in domestic interests rather than foreign. Removing the state of Israel would be a great solution, dissolving all conflict within the region. But, for a less radical response, we would like the United States to remove all support for Israel. One final, and very drastic solution, would be allowing us to take full control of all the areas the US oil companies control by selling them back to us.

### **The Cambodian Massacre of 1975-76**

Although not concerning Libya in any way, the Cambodian massacre that has been occurring, starting in 1975, is a crucial event that should be covered in the council. The situation started with a civil war. One side was supported by the communist party in Vietnam, and the other side rejected communism. The killings began after the mass persecution of people like Christians. But what we are particularly concerned with are the Muslims who have been affected by the crisis. As a country that openly rejects communism, viewing it as an imperial system

where the people suffer, we believe it is best to remove the party conducting these actions. The disgusting habits that are upheld by the communist ideology, such as the killings of millions, are an open example that communism is an evil system. On top of that, replacing the party with a socialist leader with an anti-imperialist mentality would maintain the stability of the country, as well as the other countries surrounding it.

### Resources

ime.com/archive/6705970/gaddafi-obsessed-by-a-ruthless-messianic-vision/

<https://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-12532929#:~:text=Muammar%20Gaddafi%20came%20to%20power,in%20an%20ambitious%20infrastructure%20programme.>

<https://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-13755445>

<https://www.nytimes.com/1975/05/24/archives/libyans-confirm-soviet-arms-deal-but-embassy-terms-cairos-report.html>

<https://cla.umn.edu/chgs/holocaust-genocide-education/resource-guides/cambodia>

## Islamic Republic of Pakistan Positions for the 1976 Historical Security Council

---

### I. Nuclear Disarmament

The Islamic Republic of Pakistan approaches the issue of nuclear disarmament with a firm commitment to global peace, sovereign equality, and strategic stability. In 1976, the international community stands at a decisive moment. The spread of nuclear weapons threatens not only regional balances of power, but the very survival of humanity.

Pakistan urges all Member States to confront this danger with honesty and resolve. The fear of nuclear proliferation is not Pakistan's alone - it is shared by nations across every region. The world is deeply concerned about the unchecked spread of weaponized nuclear technology, and this Council must act decisively to restore confidence in the global non-proliferation regime. Pakistan maintains that nuclear governance must be based on a balanced and enforceable framework that prevents destabilizing proliferation. The Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) grants the P5 the responsibility of maintaining nuclear stability, yet it fails to restrain states outside the treaty who pursue nuclear capabilities without oversight. This loophole has placed global security at risk and weakened trust in the treaty itself.<sup>14</sup>

The Atoms for Peace program, though well-intentioned, inadvertently enabled some states to acquire sensitive materials and technology under the guise of civilian use.<sup>15</sup> India's 1974 nuclear test is a clear example. This event fundamentally altered the strategic landscape of South Asia and demonstrated the urgent need for international mechanisms that apply equally to signatories and non-signatories alike. The absence of meaningful consequences revealed a dangerous gap in the global system.<sup>16</sup> Pakistan has consistently supported the peaceful use of nuclear energy under strict international safeguards. However, we cannot ignore developments that threaten our sovereignty and regional stability. Pakistan did not initiate nuclear competition in South Asia. Instead, we have repeatedly called for a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region - provided that all states participate through comprehensive and reciprocal commitments.<sup>17</sup> To strengthen global security and prevent further proliferation, the Islamic Republic of Pakistan proposes the following measures:

1. **NPT Revision**: Amend the treaty to ensure that **all** states - including non-signatories - are bound by prohibitions on developing or researching weaponized nuclear technology. Only the P5 may retain existing arsenals under strict regulation.

2. **Regional Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones**: Establish zones that prevent nuclearization in volatile regions, including South Asia.

3. **Strengthened IAEA Safeguards**: Expand verification authority to ensure no state can exploit civilian programs for military purposes.

4. **Security Assurances**: Provide credible guarantees to non-nuclear states to reduce incentives for pursuing nuclear weapons.

Pakistan affirms that lasting peace cannot be achieved through selective enforcement or unequal accountability. Stability requires a system in which no state outside the P5 can pursue nuclear weapons, and all states - large or small, signatory or non-signatory - are held to the same non-proliferation obligations.

Pakistan remains committed to working constructively within the United Nations to promote a universal, enforceable, and verifiable non-proliferation framework. Only through collective responsibility and equitable commitments can the world move out of the shadow of nuclear destruction and toward a safer, more peaceful future.

---

<sup>14</sup> *Pakistan's Positions & Policies on Arms Control, Non-Proliferation & Disarmament Related Issues.*  
<https://mofa.gov.pk/arms-control-and-disarmament>

<sup>15</sup> *The Legacy of India's Nuclear Weapons Test.*  
<https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2024-11/features/legacy-indias-nuclear-weapons-test>

<sup>16</sup> *Atoms for Peace.* <https://www.eisenhowerlibrary.gov/research/online-documents/atoms-peace>

<sup>17</sup> *Pakistan Urging an Atom-Free Zone.*  
<https://www.nytimes.com/1974/10/29/archives/pakistan-urging-atomfree-zone-asks-un-to-declare-south-asia-a.html>

## II. Apartheid in South Africa

The Islamic Republic of Pakistan remains steadfast in its condemnation of the despised system of apartheid, which we regard not merely as a localized injustice but as a "crime against the conscience and dignity of humanity". As the international community witnesses the escalating brutality in South Africa, most notably the tragic events in Soweto, Pakistan reaffirms its unwavering solidarity with the oppressed African majority in their legitimate struggle for self-determination.<sup>18</sup>

The recent "cold-hearted shooting" of unarmed schoolchildren in **Soweto on June 16, 1976**, has exposed the true, violent nature of the Pretoria regime. Pakistan views the imposition of the Afrikaans language as a tool of cultural subjugation and a further manifestation of the "Bantu Education" policy, designed to institutionalize racial inferiority. We demand an immediate cessation of all violence against the African population and the prompt abolition of racial discrimination.<sup>19</sup>

Consistent with our historical foreign policy, Pakistan continues to enforce a total diplomatic and economic embargo against the apartheid regime. Pakistan refuses to establish official relations with the racist government in Pretoria. We also remain a loyal supporter of the **African National Congress (ANC)** and other liberation movements, providing both moral and material assistance to those fighting for a non-racial democracy. Pakistan actively participated in the adoption of **UNSC Resolution 392 (1976)**, which recognizes the legitimacy of the struggle against apartheid and classifies the situation as a threat to international peace and security. However, this resolution primarily focused on immediate cessation of violence rather than imposing the necessary broad economic sanctions and restrictions needed to gain the cooperation of the South African government.<sup>20</sup>

Pakistan urges the Security Council to move beyond condemnation and take decisive action. We propose:

1. **Mandatory Arms Embargo:** The Council must immediately impose a mandatory arms embargo under Chapter VII of the UN Charter to prevent further militarization of racial oppression.
2. **Increased Support for Victims:** Member states should bolster contributions to the **UN Centre Against Apartheid**, established earlier this year (January 1976), to aid victims of racial violence.<sup>21</sup>
3. **Comprehensive Sanctions:** We call for universal adherence to economic sanctions to isolate the Pretoria regime until the complete dismantling of apartheid laws.

The delegation of Pakistan believes that the United Nations faces a critical test of its moral authority. We cannot tolerate a system that replicates the "ghetto regimes" of history. Our commitment is to a South Africa where all individuals, regardless of race, are equal before the law.

---

<sup>18</sup> *Pakistan-South Africa Relations.*

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pakistan%E2%80%93South\\_Africa\\_relations#:~:text=Pakistan%E2%80%93South%20Africa%20relations%20refers.Pakistan%20on%20a%20yearly%20basis](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pakistan%E2%80%93South_Africa_relations#:~:text=Pakistan%E2%80%93South%20Africa%20relations%20refers.Pakistan%20on%20a%20yearly%20basis)

<sup>19</sup> *The 40th Anniversary of the Soweto Uprising.* <https://www.britannica.com/story/the-soweto-uprising>

<sup>20</sup> *Resolution 392 (1976).* <https://www.refworld.org/legal/resolution/unsc/1976/en/81155>

<sup>21</sup> *United Nations Centre against Apartheid, Notes and Documents.*

[https://www.jstor.org/site/struggles-for-freedom/southern-africa/united-nations-centre-against-apartheid.-notes-and-documents/?so=item\\_title\\_str\\_asc](https://www.jstor.org/site/struggles-for-freedom/southern-africa/united-nations-centre-against-apartheid.-notes-and-documents/?so=item_title_str_asc)

Committee: UN Security Council 1976  
Topic: The Internal Situation in South Africa  
Country: Republic of South Africa  
Date: (some time in 1976)

#### The South African Position

Let's be clear from the outset: the United Nations is treading on dangerous ground. The Republic of South Africa is a sovereign nation, yet this Council continues to treat us like a colony. We are here today to remind you that under Article 2(7) of the UN Charter, the UN has absolutely no right to tell us how to run our own streets or manage our own schools.

#### The Reality of the June Riots

The world has seen the photos of Soweto, but you haven't heard the full story. What happened in June wasn't a "peaceful protest"—it was a calculated outbreak of arson and violence fueled by agitators. Our police didn't go in to cause chaos; they went in to stop it. We have already shown flexibility by changing the language requirements in schools, but no government can sit back while its cities burn. We will maintain law and order, and we make no apologies for that.

#### Independence, Not Oppression

You talk about "human rights," but when we actually grant independence to the Transkei, the UN refuses to recognize it. Why? Because it doesn't fit your narrative. Our policy of Separate Development is designed to give every group their own voice and their own land. If this Council were actually interested in self-determination, you would be welcoming the Transkei as a new member, not trying to suffocate it.

#### The Red Shadow

Finally, let's talk about what's actually happening in Southern Africa. While you condemn us, Soviet-backed rebels are marching through Angola and Mozambique. South Africa is the only thing standing between this continent and a total communist takeover. If you weaken us with sanctions or embargoes, you aren't just hurting South Africans—you are handing the keys of the Cape sea routes to Moscow.

It is frankly exhausting to sit here and listen to lectures on "morality" from certain members of this Council. We see representatives from Eastern Bloc states and various "newly independent" regimes shouting for justice, yet their own citizens have never seen a ballot box. While the Soviet Union bankrolls militias across our borders, they have the audacity to call us the "aggressor." We see a blatant double standard at work: the UN ignores the mass purges and lack of basic freedoms in the Marxist regimes of the East, yet spends every waking hour obsessing over South African school policies. If this Council wants to talk about "crimes against humanity," perhaps it should look at the Gulags or the chaos in the neighboring territories before pointing its finger at Pretoria. We will not be lectured by those who use "liberation" as a mask for communist expansion.

#### Our Stance

South Africa is tired of being the world's scapegoat. We are willing to talk, but we will not be dictated to. We ask the Council to drop the double standards and respect our sovereignty.

## **The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics**

### ***Position Paper for the Historical Security Council (1976)***

#### **10. The question of Palestine and Israeli Occupation of Arab Territories**

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics reaffirms its position that the ongoing occupation of Arab territories by Israel is a serious threat to international security and peace. Since the Six-Day War in 1967, Israel has retained control over the West Bank, Gaza Strip, East Jerusalem, the Golan Heights, and the Sinai Peninsula.<sup>1</sup> The ongoing occupation has created a situation that leads to instability and recurring violent encounters throughout the Middle East. The October War of 1973 demonstrated that unresolved occupation can lead directly to military conflict.<sup>2</sup> The Soviet Union further observes that between 1973 and 1976, Israel has received billions of dollars in military and economic assistance from external powers.<sup>3</sup> This support risks emboldening continued occupation, and enables Israel to maintain their territorial acquisitions rather than for supposed self-defense. The Soviet Union recalls United Nations Security Council Resolution 242 (1967), which called for the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories in the recent conflict, and affirms the impermissibility of the acquisition of territory by means of war.<sup>4</sup> The USSR further supports Resolution 338 (1973), which calls for a ceasefire and the implementation of Resolution 242 in its entirety.<sup>5</sup> These two resolutions serve as the basic framework that will produce a just and equal solution that establishes lasting peace and security for all nations in the region. The continued expansion of Israeli settlements in Arab territories is a violation of international law and hinders peace and security.<sup>6</sup> Furthermore, the denial of the rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to self-determination, remains a central obstacle to stability in the region.<sup>7</sup> The Soviet Union recognizes the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) as the representative of the Palestinian people, as was the adopted position of the United Nations General Assembly in 1974.<sup>8</sup> The USSR advises that peace in the Middle East must be based upon the withdrawal of Israeli forces from all territories occupied in 1967, the recognition of the right of Palestinian people to self-determination, and the guarantee of the sovereignty of all states in the region. The Soviet Union calls upon the Security Council to reaffirm Resolutions 242 and 338, reject any future territorial expansion resulting from military action, and support the establishment of an international peace conference under the UN with the participation of all concerned parties, including the PLO.

#### **11. Apartheid in Southern Africa and the Illegal Occupation of Namibia**

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics expresses grave concern regarding the apartheid regime in South Africa and its destabilizing consequences for the African continent. Instituted in 1948, apartheid continues to promote the social, political, and economic

disenfranchisement of black South Africans by creating systems of racial segregation while restricting their access to political and economic rights.<sup>9</sup> The international community has repeatedly condemned these policies as a clear violation of the Charter of the United Nations.<sup>10</sup> South Africa's continued occupation of Namibia remains illegal under international law. In Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), the UN declared South Africa's continued presence in Namibia unlawful and called upon Member States not to recognize the authority there.<sup>11</sup> Despite this ruling, South Africa has maintained its administrative and military control. The human cost of apartheid and regional destabilization has been significant. In the past year alone, the Soweto uprising resulted in the deaths of hundreds of civilians who were protesting discriminatory education policies.<sup>12</sup> Furthermore, South African military incursions into neighboring states, including Angola, have escalated tensions throughout southern Africa.<sup>13</sup> The denial of Namibian independence and the ongoing cross-border destabilization threaten continental stability. The USSR supports broad, mandatory sanctions against South Africa, the full implementation of Resolution 276 regarding Namibia, the recognition of the South West African People's Organization (SWAPO) as the legitimate representative of the Namibian people,<sup>14</sup> and increased UN monitoring and assistance to parties affected by South African aggression. Failure to act on this issue risks normalizing racial oppression and undermines the authority of this Council.

---

<sup>1</sup>United Nations Security Council, Official Records of the Security Council, June 1967 (Six-Day War outcomes).

<sup>2</sup>United Nations Security Council, Official Records, October 1973 (Yom Kippur/October War).

<sup>3</sup>United States Congress, Foreign Assistance Act Reports and appropriations, 1973–1976.

<sup>4</sup>United Nations Security Council Resolution 242 (1967).

<sup>5</sup>United Nations Security Council Resolution 338 (1973).

<sup>6</sup>Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War (Fourth Geneva Convention), 12 August 1949, Article 49; UN General Assembly debates on Israeli settlements, 1975–1976.

<sup>7</sup>United Nations General Assembly Resolution 3236 (1974), Question of Palestine.

<sup>8</sup>United Nations General Assembly Resolution 3237 (1974), Observer Status for the Palestine Liberation Organization.

<sup>9</sup>Government of South Africa, Population Registration Act (1950); Group Areas Act (1950).

<sup>10</sup>Charter of the United Nations (1945); UN General Assembly Resolution 2202 A (XXI) (1966) condemning apartheid policies.

<sup>11</sup>United Nations Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Namibia.

<sup>12</sup>United Nations reports on the Situation in South Africa following the Soweto Uprising, 1976.

<sup>13</sup>United Nations Security Council discussions on Angola, 1975 (South African intervention).

<sup>14</sup>United Nations General Assembly Resolution 3111 (XXVIII) (1973), Recognition of SWAPO

## Republic of Turkey

### Position Paper for the Historical Security Council

#### 12. Cyprus Crisis

Following Cyprus' independence in 1960<sup>22</sup>, the Treaty of Guarantee<sup>23</sup> was signed by Turkey, Greece, and the United Kingdom to establish Cyprus as an independence state and to prohibit union with another state. However, intercommunal violence between Greek and Turkish Cypriots began in 1963, creating insecurity and instability for the Turkish Cypriot population<sup>24</sup>. In July 1974, a Greek-backed coup d'état<sup>25</sup> overthrew the Cypriot President Makarios with the objective of achieving Enosis, union with Greece. This action directly violated the constitutional framework of Cyprus and the Treaty of Guarantee<sup>2</sup>. Under Article IV of the Treaty of Guarantee, The Republic of Turkey exercised its legal right to intervene to restore order and protect the Turkish Cypriot community from further violence and political marginalization in Cyprus<sup>26</sup>. Turkey's actions were defensive and grounded in international agreement through the rulings of the Treaty of Guarantee<sup>2</sup>.

As of 1976, Cyprus remains divided and tensions persist. Turkey states that any lasting settlement must recognize the political equality of both Greek and Turkish Cypriots and avoid enosis with Greece or annexation for the security and livelihood of the Turkish Cypriots<sup>27</sup>. Developing a bi-zonal and bi-communal solution to ensure that neither community dominates the other is a main method in preventing violence<sup>4</sup>. The security and safety of Turkish Cypriots cannot be compromised, and international guarantees remain essential to preventing renewed violence against them<sup>6</sup>. If the Member States choose to ignore the political equality of the Turkish Cypriots, then Turkey will support the creation of a two-state solution in which Cyprus would be divided into two political states as it would be the only viable option to retain to retain the security of the Turkish Cypriots who are being disregarded<sup>28</sup>.

Turkey supports continued United Nations peacekeeping efforts and encourages negotiations conducted under UN supervision. The Republic of Turkey calls upon the fellow Member States to recognize the legal foundations of its actions in Cyprus and hopes for their support to preserve the safety and security of Turkish Cypriots in Cyprus.

---

<sup>22</sup> Cyprus Gains Independence: <https://www.ebsco.com/research-starters/history/cyprus-gains-independence>

<sup>23</sup> Treaty of Guarantee: <https://peacemaker.un.org/en/node/9382>

<sup>24</sup> Cyprus' Bloody Christmas: The Evening of 21 December 1963: <https://en.politis.com.cy/politics/politics-cyprus-divided/975923/cyprus-bloody-christmas-the-evening-of-21-december-1963>

<sup>25</sup> July 15, 1974: The Cyprus Coup That Gave Turkey a Pretext to Invade: <https://greekreporter.com/2025/07/15/cyprus-coup-instigates-turkish-invasion/>

<sup>26</sup> How Did the Situation Change after July 1974: [https://www.mfa.gov.tr/how-did-the-situation-change-after-july-1974-\\_.en.mfa](https://www.mfa.gov.tr/how-did-the-situation-change-after-july-1974-_.en.mfa)

<sup>27</sup> 145. Telegram From the Embassy in Cyprus to the Department of State: <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1969-76v30/d145>

<sup>28</sup> The Cyprus Issue (Overview) : <https://www.mfa.gov.tr/the-cyprus-issue-overview.en.mfa>

# United States of America

## Position Paper for 1976 Historical Security Council

---

### **13. The destabilization of Angola by the military intervention of Cuba.**

The United States of America is quite delighted with the process of nations in the African continent fighting for their rights of self-determination and freedom. We support their ability to gain full sovereignty on their lands and free themselves from colonial oppression that have restricted the ability for the people of Africa to prosper and lead their lives the way they desire.

In relation to that we would like to commend the Angolan people's desire to get their independence. What we are especially concerned about is the blatant globalization of this conflict. Taking advantage of this chaos, foreign military powers like Cuba have violated the sovereignty of the Angolan nation by sending in their military forces to support the People's Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA)<sup>1</sup>. This act of military escalation exasperates the already dire situation in Angola.

As a result, the United States of America demands that the nation of Cuba end their military assistance to the MPLA and unilaterally withdraw their military assets from the nation of Angola. This act of cessation of hostilities will confirm to this body that Cuba is committed to adhering to the Charter of the United Nations and respecting the sovereignty of the nation of Angola.

---

<sup>1</sup>Angolan War of Independence:

<https://www.ebsco.com/research-starters/history/angolan-war-independence>

<sup>2</sup>The Angolan Civil War:

<https://sahistory.org.za/article/angolan-civil-war-1975-2002-brief-history>

## 14. Crisis in the Middle East

The United States of America applauds the delicate work of diplomacy that was conducted by Arab nations and the State of Israel in bringing their latest hostilities to an end.<sup>3</sup> With the silence of the guns, one must truly hope that this can create a pathway for a just and lasting peace to all sides. The United States of America cares deeply about maintaining peace and tranquility in the region and urges all sides to come to the negotiating table and settle all disputes in a peaceful and orderly manner as outlined in the United Nations Security Council Resolution 338<sup>4</sup>.

However, we must also recognize that peace cannot be achieved without all belligerents being treated in an equal manner. We would like to remind the security council that not a single member of the Arab League recognizes the sovereignty of the State of Israel. Not a single Arab League member recognizes the unalienable fact that the Jewish people deserve their homeland and have the right to exist and live peaceful and prosperous lives. We recognize that the Arab world is hesitant to establish relations with the State of Israel because of the territorial advantage that Israel has post the 1973 hostilities.

As a result we call upon members of the Arab world to recognize the sovereignty of the State of Israel and we urge the state of Israel to reciprocate their positive advances and negotiate a fair and just agreement with the Arab world on redrawing territorial boundaries to benefit the Israeli and Arab peoples.

---

<sup>3</sup>Yom Kippur War: <https://www.britannica.com/event/Yom-Kippur-War>

<sup>4</sup>United Nations Security Council Resolution 338:  
<https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/93466?ln=en&v=pdf>

# Democratic Kampuchea

## Positions for 1976 Security Council

---

### I. Established Role of Member States

Democratic Kampuchea encourages the Security Council to recall both founding principles and jurisdiction of the United Nations while contemplating action and nonaction in current events involving Member States. The United Nations is a nongovernmental organization, developed for the purpose of diplomacy and preservation of peace. It has no jurisdiction in intrastate matters, as laid out in Chapter I, Article 2, Clause 9 of the United Nations Charter<sup>1</sup>. Democratic Kampuchea recognizes its own role in the United Nations as diplomatic and mediary<sup>2</sup>, not as governing, imposing, or overreaching, and recommends all Member States bear in mind that this is their intended, legally established role in this assembly. A great failure of those Member States acting beyond their intended, precedented, and moral role as not only Member States of the United Nations but peace-loving nations of the world has been the rise of interventionist policy.

### II. Interventionist Policy

Democratic Kampuchea would like to broadly condemn interventionist policy. A symptom of sovereignty is an obligation to establish control and maintain peace within one's own borders; however, a failure to satisfy this does not warrant another Member State forcing their poisonous "help" on a struggling Member State. Each Member State espousing interventionist policy harbors ulterior motives, and stands to gain from power being maintained or lost by a certain group through their intervention. The people native to the Member State are not considered, much less the common working people, and they are almost always hurt by the intervention of foreign troops and diplomats<sup>3</sup>.

Democratic Kampuchea was a bystander viciously hurt and blatantly attacked during the United States' botched intervention in Vietnam<sup>4</sup>. Though the North Vietnamese commanded the spirits of the people and planned policies meant to better them<sup>5</sup>, the United States feared communism, and so intervened and began to slaughter those not assimilating to Western ideology. Despite the neutrality of Democratic Kampuchea, then Cambodia, during this conflict, the United States soon found fault with Cambodia, and began a ruthless bombing campaign, dropping over 2.7 million

---

<sup>1</sup> United Nations Charter (full text), <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter/full-text>.

<sup>2</sup> Embassy of Democratic Kambuchia in Berlin, [https://d.dccam.org/Archives/Documents/pdf/Bulletin\\_of\\_the\\_Embassy\\_of\\_Democratic\\_Kampuchea\\_in\\_Berlin\\_GD\\_R\\_March\\_1977.pdf](https://d.dccam.org/Archives/Documents/pdf/Bulletin_of_the_Embassy_of_Democratic_Kampuchea_in_Berlin_GD_R_March_1977.pdf).

<sup>3</sup> Embassy of Democratic Kambuchia in Berlin, [https://d.dccam.org/Archives/Documents/pdf/Bulletin\\_of\\_the\\_Embassy\\_of\\_Democratic\\_Kampuchea\\_in\\_Berlin\\_GD\\_R\\_March\\_1977.pdf](https://d.dccam.org/Archives/Documents/pdf/Bulletin_of_the_Embassy_of_Democratic_Kampuchea_in_Berlin_GD_R_March_1977.pdf).

<sup>4</sup> The U.S Incursion into Cambodia, <https://adst.org/2017/04/u-s-incursion-into-cambodia/>

<sup>5</sup> The Rise and Fall of Democratic Kampuchea, <https://www.asianstudies.org/publications/ea/archives/the-rise-and-fall-of-democratic-kampuchea/>

tons<sup>6</sup> of bombs on a neutral Member State between October 4, 1965 and August 15, 1973. Dissatisfied with the blood of a mere one hundred, fifty thousand Cambodians, the United States began a land invasion. The interventionist actions of the United States in Vietnam and Cambodia led to massive suffering, famine, and death<sup>7</sup>. Only once the United States was pushed outside of Cambodia on April 17, 1975<sup>8</sup> could the people begin to rebuild, and begin the establishment of Democratic Kampuchea. Interventionist policy was weaponized against the people of Kampuchea and Vietnam, and continues to be used as an excuse for carrying out violence based in actuality on ideology, alignment, economics, race, and geopolitics.

### III. Imperialism, Colonialism, and Neocolonialism

Democratic Kampuchea considers imperialism, colonialism, and neocolonialism to be great evils weaponized by developed, “first world” Member States against those with inferior militaries and infrastructure<sup>9</sup>. This complete and total abuse of Member States, their citizens, and their resources cannot be allowed by the United Nations to continue in any form. As such, Democratic Kampuchea suggests the Security Council consider any overreaching actions by Member States which may be construed as imperialist, colonialist, or neocolonialist as threats to peace, and in response modify or discontinue diplomatic relations with and oppose economic sanctions on offending Member States until their actions have stopped or been remedied<sup>10</sup>. Though this may be viewed by many Member States as extreme, the effects of the economic exploitation, political destruction, and cultural dismantling caused by these evils cannot be overstated. As a former colony of France<sup>11</sup>, Democratic Kampuchea and her people have known the suffering and dehumanization that results from the abuse and control of a “first world” colonizer in a fledgling nation. After nearly ninety years<sup>12</sup> of the despotism and disgrace of existing as a colony, Democratic Kampuchea, then Cambodia<sup>13</sup>, was able to secure her independence, and nothing was sweeter than our people having control of their borders. Therefore, Democratic Kampuchea stands with all Member States and those being denied membership to the United Nations that are experiencing imperialism, colonialism, or neocolonialism, and implores the Security Council to implement the measures suggested above to ensure that the wrongs of colonizers are discontinued and made right.

---

<sup>6</sup> Bombs over Cambodia, [https://gsp.yale.edu/sites/default/files/walrus\\_cambodiabombing\\_oct06.pdf](https://gsp.yale.edu/sites/default/files/walrus_cambodiabombing_oct06.pdf).

<sup>7</sup> The U.S Incursion into Cambodia, <https://adst.org/2017/04/u-s-incursion-into-cambodia/>.

<sup>8</sup> Phnom Penh becomes ‘an echo chamber of silent streets’, <https://www.pulitzer.org/article/phnom-penh-becomes-echo-chamber-silent-streets>.

<sup>9</sup> Embassy of Democratic Kambuchia in Berlin, [https://d.dccam.org/Archives/Documents/pdf/Bulletin\\_of\\_the\\_Embassy\\_of\\_Democratic\\_Kampuchea\\_in\\_Berlin\\_GD\\_R\\_March\\_1977.pdf](https://d.dccam.org/Archives/Documents/pdf/Bulletin_of_the_Embassy_of_Democratic_Kampuchea_in_Berlin_GD_R_March_1977.pdf).

<sup>10</sup> United Nations Charter (full text), <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter/full-text>.

<sup>11</sup> Pol Pot’s Shadow, <https://www.pbs.org/frontlineworld/stories/cambodia/tl01.html>.

<sup>12</sup> Pol Pot’s Shadow, <https://www.pbs.org/frontlineworld/stories/cambodia/tl01.html>.

<sup>13</sup> Embassy of Democratic Kambuchia in Berlin, [https://d.dccam.org/Archives/Documents/pdf/Bulletin\\_of\\_the\\_Embassy\\_of\\_Democratic\\_Kampuchea\\_in\\_Berlin\\_GD\\_R\\_March\\_1977.pdf](https://d.dccam.org/Archives/Documents/pdf/Bulletin_of_the_Embassy_of_Democratic_Kampuchea_in_Berlin_GD_R_March_1977.pdf).

# United Kingdom

## Position Paper for the 1976 Historical Security Council

---

### I. Concerning Rising Tensions in Rhodesia

The United Kingdom addresses the Security Council recognizing the ongoing conflict involving the minority-led government in Southern Rhodesia. The United Kingdom is particularly concerned with the ongoing representation issues in Rhodesian government that have compounded into a larger, more dangerous situation involving international breaches of sovereignty.<sup>1</sup> Without action, these conflicts could continue to spread in the southern African region, developing into widespread aggression with longstanding global effects.

Southern Rhodesia has remained a British colony since its foundation by the British South Africa Company in 1890.<sup>2</sup> In 1865, Southern Rhodesia attempted to gain its independence with the publication of the Unilateral Declaration of Independence, seeking state recognition under a minority-led white government, an act the United Kingdom has since deemed illegal as it enforces unilateral minority rule.<sup>3</sup> The British Government maintains that independence must be built upon democratic legitimacy and the political participation of the entire population, a position grounded in international law, and does not recognize the statehood of Southern Rhodesia as a result. Article 21 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights affirms the “right of every person to take part in the government of his country”.<sup>4</sup> The Southern Rhodesian government has consistently denied this right to the black majority of its population, causing conflict not only within its borders to the extent of civil war but also internationally. The colony has impeded on the national integrity of Mozambique, a state which has previously filed a complaint against South Rhodesia at the latest Security Council meeting, resulting in the adoption of Resolution 386 that administered economic sanctions on Southern Rhodesia.<sup>5</sup>

While still in support of this resolution, the United Kingdom believes that long-term change will require more comprehensive international action.<sup>6</sup> Specifically, the United Kingdom recommends that the Security Council takes up discussion of a resolution to enact further restrictions on South Rhodesian government. The United Kingdom is also in support of providing further protection and financial assistance to states affected by Rhodesia’s actions and encourages that the Economic and Social Council address the issue in collaboration with the International Monetary Fund. Additionally, the United Kingdom is open to providing a pathway for South Rhodesia to attain legal independence, but only in the case of government reform providing an establishment of majority rule. The United Kingdom is adamant that this is not merely a colonial issue, but one risking international peace and the rights to racial equality of every global citizen that must be resolved.

---

<sup>1</sup> Rhodesian Bush War: [https://media.defense.gov/2023/Oct/23/2003326166/-1/-1/0/RhodesianBushWar\\_1965-80\\_20231204.PDF](https://media.defense.gov/2023/Oct/23/2003326166/-1/-1/0/RhodesianBushWar_1965-80_20231204.PDF)

<sup>2</sup> Origins of Southern Rhodesia: <https://www.gilderlehman.org/history-resources/essays/unilateral-declaration-independence-southern-rhodesia-later-zimbabwe#:~:text=The%20Eastern%20Bloc%20supported%20the,that%20triggered%20the%20liberation%20struggle>

<sup>3</sup> Unilateral Declaration of Independence:

<https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/ukgwa/20250613142119/https://blog.nationalarchives.gov.uk/southern-rhodesias-unilateral-declaration-independence-udi/>

<sup>4</sup> Universal Declaration of Human Rights: <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights>

<sup>5</sup> Mozambique Requesting Sanctions on Southern Rhodesia: [https://docs.un.org/en/S/RES/386\(1976\)](https://docs.un.org/en/S/RES/386(1976))

<sup>6</sup> United Kingdom Speaking in Support of Rhodesian Sanctions: <https://www.nytimes.com/1976/03/04/archives/britain-acclaims-mozambique-for-sanction-against-rhodesia.html>