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# **Letter from the chair**

Honorable delegates,

We extend you a warm welcome to the XLII Model United Nations of Colegio Nueva Granada and thereby to the latest edition of the Global Leaders Summit committee of this Model. In this committee, you will have the opportunity to develop debating and communication skills about different topics that have been concerning humanity and been a big part of history. We hope you will have an invigorating experience that potentates your willingness and curiosity toward leadership and changing the world together. We invite you to challenge yourself and improve your argumentation skills to have a prospective discussion.

Not only that, but we expect the committee discussions to be fruitful and challenging, demonstrating an in-depth investigation of your role, the actual situation, and the historical context. We want you to develop skills in problem-solving and decision-making. Take advantage of the committee to interact with other delegates and come towards a real solution together.

As your presidents, we will always be here to support you before, during, and after the model. Don't hesitate to reach out for help. We wish every one of you the best of luck.

Welcome to the Global Leaders Summit committee!

Camila Angel & Antonia Benavides

**Introduction**

The Global Leaders Summit committee derives from the Global Leadership Summit organized annually by the International Leadership Association. This committee gathers leaders from industries all around the world and hosts conferences for speakers to share their experiences within leadership and offer advice to those interested in becoming leaders.

This respected committee is responsible for coordinating a crucial occasion designed to promote cooperation, tackle worldwide challenges, and set the direction for international collaboration.

The goal of the committee to comprise representatives from diverse nations is to bring together unique perspectives, expertise, and diplomatic skills to the table. Its primary objective is to create a platform where leaders from every corner of the globe can engage in open dialogue, fostering understanding, sharing ideas, and forming partnerships to address pressing global issues and chart a course toward a more harmonious world. The United Nations, with its foundational principles of equality, justice, and cooperation, provides the ideal forum for fostering understanding, building partnerships, and charting a course toward a more harmonious world.

During this edition of the commission, each one of you will be assigned a specific global leader that has been crucial in past and present history. We expect different points of view that will create valuable international dialogue.

**Topic A: Should Jus Ad Bellum always be respected?**

**Introduction**

The Latin term *Jus Ad Bellum* means “right to war” and it's a fundamental concept within the realm of just war theory. This theory aims to provide a guide to the right way for states to act in potential conflict situations. Although it only applies to states, individuals might appeal to the theory to determine whether it is morally right or not to take part in a particular war. This specific facet of just war theory refers to the conditions under which states may resort to war or the use of armed force in general[1].

The parameters that revolve around this theory were set out in the United Nations Charter of 1945 and address questions surrounding the legitimacy of war. It emphasizes the importance of determining whether a potential conflict is morally justifiable before engaging in hostilities. Furthermore, it guides political leaders, policymakers, states, and societies within the ethical considerations when contemplating the use of force. This takes into account its key principles which include legitimate authority, right intention, last resource, probability of success, and the requirements of just cause. All this seeks to ensure war aligns with ethical standards. Whether or not this principle is respected might be influenced by cultural, political, or historical contexts.

Taking into account that we live in a world where conflict persists, this principle is crucial to pursuing justice and avoiding unnecessary suffering and destruction; however, it is argued that it should not be respected in all situations because in some cases it might threaten survival[2].

[1] Introduction to Just War

<https://www.bbc.co.uk/ethics/war/just/introduction.shtml#:~:text=The%20aim%20of%20Just%20War,part%20in%20a%20particular%20war>). [2] What Might (Finally) Kill the *Jus ad Bellum*?

<https://academic.oup.com/clp/article-abstract/74/1/101/6333482>

Context:

The concept of Jus Ad Bellum has been referred to throughout a long period, and whether it should be respected has always been a complex and debated issue.

Taking into consideration the principles of this concept seek to provide an ethical framework, their application can be influenced by different factors such as political and cultural-historical context. Some argue that it should have strict adherence and should be considered as a universal guideline to prevent unjust wars and unnecessary human suffering. Others argue that strict adherence to the principle is not always feasible because they can not adhere to the complex and chaotic world we live in. This takes into account that in some scenarios it could be necessary to deviate from the principle to protect different aspects like national security. Furthermore, other perspectives acknowledge the importance of Jus Ad Bellum but argue that its application should be selective and context-dependent. This deviation, considering that it will result in the greater good. For example, preventing humanitarian catastrophe.

In the past few years, different wars have been occurring throughout the world. For example, the Russian invasion of Ukraine, the Israel-Palestine crisis, and the Yemeni civil war among others. Some of these cases have deviated from the implementation of the Jus Ad Bellum because of the context and situation surrounding them. This has occurred throughout history, for example during the Second World War, where the principle was not respected.

The idea is to respect and adhere to these principles; however, the complexity of international relations and the diverse perspectives on the Just War theory mean that their strict application may not be realistic or universally accepted. Whether it should be respected or not is an ongoing ethical and philosophical discussion within political theory and international relations.

Major Block Positions:

1. ***Adolf Hitler*:** German leader of the National Socialist German Worker's Party who played a central role in World War II. He implemented authoritarian and totalitarian policies that promoted the idea of racial supremacy, anti-Semitism, and extreme nationalism. His participation in World War II resulted in the loss of millions of lives and the occupation of numerous European countries. During this war, the principle of Jus Ad Bellum was not taken into account to enter the war and during the war.
2. ***Benjamin Netanyahu***: Member of the Likud party who has been the prime minister of Israel for 16 years. During this period, he has been constantly invading small parts of both strips that surround Israel. In the current crisis, he has decided to go against Hamas to condemn the belligerent act and to establish order around the territory.
3. ***Vladimir Putin***: Former intelligence officer and politician who has been President of Russia since 2012. Started the Russian invasion of Ukraine to defend its sovereignty and reclaim a rightful part of Russia. There have been millions of victims from both parties.
4. ***Ismail Haniya:*** Major leader of the Gaza Strip who commanded the recent belligerent act against Israel. This act started a very controversial war with both religious and political interests that resulted in thousands of deaths of innocent people.
5. ***Mahmud Abás***: Palestinian politician who has been president of Palestine since 2014. Argues that Israel has been constantly invading their territory and seeks to get to an agreement where both states can be recognized.

\

Discussion Questions:

1. What constitutes a just cause for going to war? How can we distinguish between just and unjust causes? Should preventive wars be considered justifiable under certain circumstances?
2. Who has the legitimate authority to declare war? How does this concept apply to both national and international contexts?
3. Can economic or strategic interests be considered "right intentions" for going to war, or should these be excluded from just causes?
4. Are there situations where preemptive strikes might be justifiable even if other options seem available?
5. To what extent do cultural and moral relativism influence the interpretation and application of Jus Ad Bellum principles globally? Can there be a universal standard for just causes in war, or is it culturally dependent?
6. How has Jus Ad Bellum been implemented in the Israel-Palestine crisis?
7. How has Jus Ad Bellum been implemented in the Russian invasion of Ukraine?
8. How was Jus Ad Bellum implemented during World War II?
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**Topic B: Is Freedom of speech absolute?**

Introduction:

Freedom of speech is a fundamental and cherished principle that underpins democratic societies around the world. Rooted in the belief that individuals have the right to express their thoughts, opinions, and ideas without fear of censorship or reprisal, freedom of speech is a cornerstone of civil liberties. This principle not only allows for the flourishing of diverse perspectives but also serves as a safeguard against authoritarianism.

However, the concept of freedom of speech is not without its complexities. Whether it is an absolute right or subject to limitations has been a subject of ongoing debate. While it is a crucial pillar of a free and open society, the boundaries of free expression may be tested in circumstances where it conflicts with other societal values, such as public safety, national security, or the protection of individuals from harm.

The concept of absolute free speech traces its origins to philosophical theories from the 17th century, but it was formally articulated by 20th-century advocate and philosopher Alexander Meiklejohn. Meiklejohn contended that for a nation to achieve true autonomy, individuals must have unrestricted freedom to express their views on matters about self-governance. In his perspective, governments or the state should not impose any limitations on speech to uphold the autonomy of the people. [[1]](https://www.liberties.eu/en/stories/free-speech-absolutist/44213)

Though this may be a very controversial topic, where different figures have different perspectives on it, it is a big part of autonomous international conversation and should be always taken into account.

Context:

In recent times, the concept of freedom of speech has become increasingly complex and contentious, as technological advancements and global events have reshaped the landscape in which expression occurs. The digital age has brought new challenges and opportunities, with social media platforms playing a significant role in shaping public discourse.

One notable aspect is the tension between the desire for open communication and the need to regulate harmful content. Platforms like Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube have faced criticism for their handling of hate speech, misinformation, and the spread of extremist ideologies. This has led to debates about the responsibilities of tech companies in moderating content and the potential impact on free speech.

The rise of “cancel culture” is another dimension of the contemporary discourse on freedom of speech. In various online and offline spaces, individuals have faced public backlash and professional consequences for expressing unpopular or controversial opinions. This phenomenon raises questions about the boundaries of free speech and the consequences of social and economic repercussions for expressing certain views.

In recent years, issues surrounding freedom of speech have not been limited to digital spaces. Protests, movements, and political polarization have highlighted the role of free expression in shaping public opinion and driving social change. Whether it's protests for racial justice, climate activism, or debates on contentious political issues, the right to free speech remains a central element of these movements.

Overall, the contemporary landscape of freedom of speech is marked by the intersection of technology, social dynamics, and global events. As society grapples with the challenges and opportunities presented by the digital age, the discussions surrounding freedom of speech continue to evolve, raising important questions about the balance between open expression and the need to address harmful consequences.

Major Block Positions:

1. ***Malala Yousafzai****:* Malala has frequently emphasized the value of free speech in opposing repressive ideologies and promoting constructive change. She has voiced her opposition to the Taliban and other extreme groups' limits on the right to free speech, highlighting the need for both freedom of speech and education in creating more accepting and tolerant communities. Malala's views on free speech are consistent with her larger dedication to equality, human rights, and the transformational potential of education. Her advocacy activity is a reflection of her conviction that open communication, debate, and the free exchange of ideas are vital to creating a world that is just and peaceful.
2. ***Adolf Hitler:*** ​​The leader of Nazi Germany from 1934 to 1945, Adolf Hitler, did not support free speech in the sense that it is understood in democratic countries. Rather, Hitler and the Nazi Party were associated with stifling oppositional voices, regulating information, and endorsing an authoritarian government that curtailed the right to free speech. Widespread propaganda, censorship, and persecution of those who disagreed with the Nazi philosophy or its leadership were all practices carried out by the Nazi administration. Through intimidation and physical force, the Nazis ruthlessly silenced opponents, controlled the media, and dismantled opposition parties.
3. ***John Locke:*** John Locke's views on free speech centered on its status as an inherent right, its function in averting tyranny, and its significance in promoting rational debate and public discourse. His theories established the theoretical groundwork for ensuing conversations about free speech in liberal countries.

Discussion Questions:

1. Is freedom of speech an absolute right, or are there legitimate limitations that can be placed on it? What criteria should be used to determine these limitations?

2. How do you balance the need for open discourse with the potential harm that certain types of speech, such as hate speech or misinformation, can cause to individuals or society? Where do you draw the line between free expression and preventing harm?

3. Should there be legal consequences for spreading false information or engaging in hate speech? How might such consequences impact the concept of free speech, and how can we strike a balance between accountability and preserving freedom of expression?

4. To what extent should freedom of speech apply in educational institutions? Are there circumstances where certain ideas or speakers should be restricted to maintain a safe and inclusive learning environment, or does this infringe upon the principle of academic freedom?

5. In the context of political discourse, should there be restrictions on campaign speech, especially when it comes to false claims or inflammatory rhetoric? How might these restrictions impact the democratic process, and can they be implemented without compromising the essence of free and open elections?
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