



ICJ INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

BACKGROUND GUIDE ALEMUN 2026

TOPIC: Trial of the United States: Jurisdictional challenges and international legal obligations under the Rome Statute regarding the 2026 operation in Venezuela, taking into account human rights and state sovereignty

CHAIRS: Maria Paula Toledo and Bella Moura

1. GREETING WORD

2. THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

2.1 Structure of the ICJ

2.2 ICJ's Mission

3. TOPIC BACKGROUND

3.1 General Information

3.2 Historical Context

3.3 Legal Background

3.3.1 International Jurisprudence

3.3.2 The Rome Statute and the International Criminal Court

3.3.3 State Sovereignty and Non-Intervention

3.3.4 International Human Rights and Humanitarian Laws

4. IMPORTANT INFORMATION ABOUT THE COUNTRIES

4.1 United States of America

4.2 United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

4.3 The Federal Republic of Germany

4.4 The State of Israel

4.5 The Italian Republic

4.6 Argentine Republic

4.7 Ukraine

4.8 The Republic of Panama

4.9 People's Republic of China

4.10 Russian Federation

4.11 Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela

4.12 French Republic

4.13 Federative Republic of Brazil

4.14 United Mexican States

4.15 The Republic of South Africa

4.16 The Kingdom of Spain

5. IMPORTANT FOR THE PREPARATION OF THE DEBATE

5.1 Topics to focus on during the debate

5.2 Questions for further research

6. BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. GREETING WORD

Dear delegates,

Welcome to the ALEMUN 2026!

We are Maria Paula Toledo from 12th grade (3EM) and Bella Moura from 11th grade (2EM) from Deutsche Schule Corcovado. We are incredibly honored to be chairing this year's ICJ committee in ALEMUN and, together with all of you, hope to produce helpful and innovative solutions for addressing such an important debate as the "Trial of the United States: Jurisdictional challenges and international legal obligations under the Rome Statute regarding the 2026 operation in Venezuela, taking into account human rights and state sovereignty"

In Model United Nations, the International Court of Justice council discusses ways of addressing and resolving legal disputes between states and providing advisory opinions on international legal issues. This mandate aligns with the principles of the 17 Sustainable Development Goals, which aim to address the world's most pressing issues by 2030. By delivering judgments and advisory opinions, the ICJ helps maintain international peace and security, fostering an environment where sustainable development can thrive.

Model United Nations is an incredible opportunity to learn extremely important life values - such as responsibility, leadership, passion and most of all, tolerance towards others. Debating complex topics contributes to the development of geopolitical understanding and English language proficiency, improving various academic and social skills.

We, as Chairs, not only encourage, but highly advise you to gather as much information and knowledge about our topic as possible, for you to have an easier time debating and trying to show your country's point of view. Remember as well, that in this simulation, our goal is to reach propositions that will address the issue with the aim of fostering constructive and well-informed debate.

We both wish you very good luck while preparing yourselves for the debate. If any questions arise, feel free to contact us at any time.

Sincerely,

Maria Paula Toledo.

Bella Moura

mpkarvaly@gmail.com.

bellavilhena2103@gmail.com

+55 (21) 989877060

+351 913 116 177

2. ICJ

2.1 STRUCTURE OF THE ICJ

The International Court of Justice is the principal judicial organ of the United Nations. The ICJ was established through the UN Charter in 1945, designed as an improved successor to the Permanent Court of Justice (PCIJ) which fulfilled a similar (but not such a strong role) within the League of Nations.

The Court is composed of 2 judges and 16 advocates. The advocates are divided into Applicant (prosecutor) and Respondent Party (defender). The prosecutors consist of eight advocates that represent a state which is instituting proceedings against another state, claiming that it failed to meet its obligations under international law, or is simply not a defender of the country, because of any other diplomatic reason. Eight advocates defend the state accused of failing to meet international law obligations or having strong diplomatic ties with the delegation.

2.2 ICJ'S MISSIONS

The International Court of Justice's primary task is to settle international disputes between states. Disputes concerning international law must be addressed when discussing relationships between states. The Court has a dual role: to settle in accordance with international law the legal disputes submitted to it by states, and to give advisory opinions on legal questions referred to it by duly authorized international organs and agencies.

3. TOPIC BACKGROUND

3.1 GENERAL INFORMATION

In January 2026, the United States initiated a large-scale military operation within Venezuelan territory that culminated in the capture of Venezuelan President Nicolás Maduro and several senior officials. The operation, reportedly conducted through coordinated air strikes, cyber operations, intelligence activities, and special forces deployments, was officially justified by the United States as part of a broader campaign against narco-terrorism, transnational criminal organizations, and regional instability.

According to U.S. officials, the Maduro administration had become increasingly connected to narco-trafficking networks and armed non-state actors operating throughout the region. American authorities further argued that the operation was necessary to protect regional security interests and prevent further humanitarian deterioration in Venezuela.

However, the operation immediately generated significant international controversy. Several states, international organizations, and legal scholars questioned the legality of unilateral military action conducted without authorization from the United Nations Security Council. Critics argued that the intervention constituted a violation of Venezuelan sovereignty and the prohibition on the use of force established under Article 2 of the United Nations Charter. Russia, China, and various international observers additionally warned that the operation could establish a dangerous precedent for future interventions justified under broad security claims.

Additional controversy emerged after statements by President Donald Trump suggesting that the United States of America intended to exercise significant influence over Venezuela's oil industry and political transition following the operation. Critics contended that such declarations reinforced accusations that the intervention exceeded counterterrorism objectives and effectively amounted to an attempt at regime change.

Because Venezuela is a State Party to the Rome Statute while the United States is not, the operation further reignited international legal debate regarding the territorial jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court over nationals of non-State Parties accused of committing crimes within the territory of a State Party. Allegations involving civilian casualties, arbitrary detention, and the transfer of Venezuelan officials outside national territory intensified these jurisdictional discussions.

A central issue in this context is the potential characterization of the operation as a crime of aggression under Article 8 bis of the Rome Statute. The crime of aggression involves the planning, preparation, initiation or execution of an act of aggression that constitutes a manifest violation of the United Nations Charter. Given that the operation was conducted without United Nations Security Council authorization and involved the use of force against the territorial integrity of Venezuela, this classification has been widely debated among legal scholars.

However, the jurisdiction of the ICC over the crime of aggression is subject to significant limitations. Under Articles 15 bis and 15 ter of the Rome Statute, the Court cannot exercise jurisdiction over acts of aggression committed by nationals of non-State Parties, such as the United States, unless the situation is referred by the United Nations Security Council. This limitation represents a major legal obstacle to prosecuting the alleged conduct as a crime of aggression before the ICC.

The United States has also relied on various legal justifications under international law. These include the argument of self-defense under Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, particularly in response to alleged threats posed by transnational criminal organizations operating from Venezuelan territory. Additionally, some interpretations invoke collective security concerns and, more controversially, the doctrine of humanitarian intervention, although the latter remains highly debated and lacks clear legal consensus.

3.2 HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Relations between the United States and Venezuela have remained politically volatile for decades, shaped by ideological disputes, economic interests, regional security concerns, and recurring accusations of foreign interference. Although the two countries historically maintained significant trade relations — particularly through the oil sector — tensions intensified following the election of President Hugo Chávez in 1998 and the subsequent rise of the Bolivarian Revolution.

Throughout the early 2000s, the Chávez administration adopted increasingly anti-American rhetoric, strengthened relations with states such as Cuba, Russia, China, and Iran, and accused the United States of attempting to undermine Venezuelan sovereignty. Simultaneously, U.S. officials expressed growing concern regarding democratic backsliding, corruption, restrictions on political opposition, and the concentration of executive power within Venezuela.

Bilateral tensions escalated significantly after the failed 2002 coup attempt against Chávez, during which Venezuelan authorities accused the United States of indirectly supporting opposition movements seeking regime change. Although Washington denied direct involvement, distrust between the two states deepened considerably in the years that followed. Economic disputes, diplomatic expulsions, and sanctions further deteriorated relations throughout the following decade. Following the death of Hugo Chávez in 2013, Nicolás Maduro assumed power amid worsening economic instability, declining oil production, inflation, shortages of basic goods, and growing political unrest. Large-scale anti-government protests emerged across Venezuela, while international organizations and human rights groups raised concerns regarding arbitrary detention, political repression, restrictions on freedom of expression, and excessive use of force by Venezuelan security forces.

Beginning in 2015, the United States progressively expanded sanctions against Venezuelan officials, state institutions, and the national oil sector. U.S. administrations argued that these measures were necessary to combat corruption, narco-trafficking, democratic erosion, and human rights violations. Venezuelan authorities, however, characterized the sanctions as unlawful economic coercion that contributed to humanitarian deterioration and infringed upon Venezuelan sovereignty.

In 2019, political tensions intensified further after the United States formally recognized opposition leader Juan Guaidó as Venezuela's legitimate interim president following disputed presidential elections. The Maduro government denounced the recognition as foreign interference and accused Washington of pursuing regime change policies in Latin America consistent with historical interventionist practices in the region.

During the early 2020s, the humanitarian crisis in Venezuela continued to worsen, contributing to one of the largest displacement crises in modern Latin American history. Simultaneously, allegations emerged linking Venezuelan officials and armed groups to narco-trafficking networks and transnational organized crime. U.S. administrations increasingly framed Venezuela as both a humanitarian and regional security concern, particularly in connection with illicit trafficking routes operating throughout the Caribbean and northern South America.

By late 2025, tensions escalated dramatically as the United States expanded military deployments throughout the Caribbean, increased naval operations near Venezuelan waters, and intensified rhetoric connecting the Maduro government to narco-terrorism and regional instability. Critics argued that the growing military presence resembled earlier periods of American interventionism in Latin America, while supporters maintained that stronger measures were necessary to address organized criminal activity and prevent broader regional destabilization.

These long-standing political, economic, and security tensions ultimately culminated in the 2026 United States military operation in Venezuela, which generated intense international debate concerning state sovereignty, the legality of unilateral intervention, and the applicability of international criminal jurisdiction under the Rome Statute.

3.3 LEGAL BACKGROUND

3.3.1 INTERNATIONAL JURISPRUDENCE

International jurisprudence provides important guidance on the interpretation of the prohibition on the use of force, the principle of state sovereignty, and the limits of self-defense under international law. In *Nicaragua v. United States* (1986), the International Court of Justice held that the support, financing, and training of armed groups operating against another state constituted a violation of customary international law and the principle of non-intervention. The Court further rejected the broad interpretation of collective self-defense advanced by the United States, emphasizing that the use of force must comply with strict legal requirements. Similarly, in *Democratic Republic of the Congo v. Uganda* (2005), the ICJ concluded that Uganda's military activities within Congolese territory violated the principles of territorial sovereignty and non-use of force established under the United Nations Charter. Furthermore, in *Oil Platforms (Iran v. United States)* (2003), the Court reaffirmed that any invocation of self-defense under Article 51 of the Charter must satisfy the conditions of necessity and proportionality. Together, these precedents demonstrate the restrictive approach adopted by international courts toward unilateral military intervention and are therefore highly relevant in assessing the legality of the 2026 United States operation in Venezuela.

3.3.2 THE ROME STATUTE AND THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT

The Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, adopted in 1998 and entering into force in 2002, established the International Criminal Court (ICC) as a permanent international tribunal responsible for prosecuting individuals accused of genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes, and the crime of aggression. The Statute seeks to combat impunity for serious violations of international law and reinforce mechanisms of international accountability.

Under Article 5 of the Rome Statute, the Court's jurisdiction is limited to crimes considered of concern to the international community as a whole. Articles 6, 7, and 8 further define genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes respectively, including acts such as torture, unlawful detention, deportation, persecution, and intentional attacks directed against civilian populations. One of the principal legal controversies surrounding the 2026 United States operation in Venezuela concerns the jurisdictional reach of the ICC. Venezuela is a State Party to the Rome Statute and therefore accepts the territorial jurisdiction of the Court. The United States, however, signed but did not ratify the Statute and has historically rejected the exercise of ICC jurisdiction over U.S. nationals. Nevertheless, Article 12 of the Rome Statute establishes that the ICC may exercise jurisdiction when alleged crimes are committed within the territory of a State Party, regardless of the nationality of the accused individual. Consequently, legal scholars and international observers have argued that alleged crimes committed during military operations within Venezuelan territory could potentially fall under ICC jurisdiction even when involving nationals of non-State Parties.

The Rome Statute additionally operates under the principle of complementarity, established under Article 17, according to which the ICC acts only when domestic judicial systems are unwilling or genuinely unable to investigate and prosecute alleged crimes themselves. As a result, the adequacy and legitimacy of domestic investigations conducted by the United States may become central elements in debates concerning admissibility before international institutions.

3.3.3 STATE SOVEREIGNTY AND NON-INTERVENTION

State sovereignty constitutes one of the foundational principles of international law and governs the legal independence and territorial authority of states within the international system. Sovereignty generally implies that states possess exclusive authority over their internal affairs, political institutions, territory, and population, free from external interference. Closely connected to sovereignty is the principle of non-intervention, which prohibits states from interfering in matters falling within the domestic jurisdiction of another sovereign state. These principles are reflected in the Charter of the United Nations and form part of the broader framework governing international peace and security.

Critics of the 2026 United States operation argue that unilateral military action conducted within Venezuelan territory without authorization from the United Nations Security Council constituted a violation of Venezuelan sovereignty and the prohibition on the use of force established under Article 2(4) of the UN Charter.

Supporters of the operation, however, maintain that the measures were justified under Article 51 of the Charter, which recognizes the inherent right of individual and collective self-defense in response to armed attacks. U.S. authorities additionally argued that the operation sought to address threats posed by transnational criminal organizations, narcotrafficking networks, and armed groups allegedly operating in coordination with Venezuelan actors.

The case further raises broader questions regarding the legality of humanitarian intervention and the Responsibility to Protect. While some scholars argue that severe humanitarian crises and widespread human rights violations may justify limited intervention under exceptional circumstances, others contend that such doctrines remain legally controversial and risk undermining the principle of sovereignty if applied unilaterally.

3.3.4 INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS AND HUMANITARIAN LAW

International human rights law and international humanitarian law establish legal protections applicable during both peacetime and armed conflict. Instruments including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), and the Geneva Conventions prohibit torture, arbitrary detention, enforced disappearance, collective punishment, and disproportionate attacks against civilians.

During and following the 2026 operation, international observers and human rights organizations raised concerns regarding alleged civilian casualties, unlawful detention, forced displacement, and the transfer of Venezuelan officials outside national territory. Such allegations intensified debates concerning the obligations of intervening states under international law and the extent to which international accountability mechanisms may apply to nationals of non-State Parties operating within the territory of a State Party.

4. IMPORTANT INFORMATION ABOUT THE COUNTRIES

DEFENSE:

4.1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The United States argues that the operation in Venezuela was legal because it aimed to protect regional security and combat threats related to drug trafficking, terrorism, and human rights violations allegedly committed by the Maduro government. To justify the action, the U.S. may invoke Article 51 of the UN Charter, which guarantees the right to self-defense, claiming that the situation in Venezuela represented a concrete threat to international stability. Furthermore, the U.S. maintains that the intervention was necessary and proportionate in light of the country's humanitarian and political crisis. However, critics consider the operation illegal because it violated Venezuela's sovereignty and the principle of non-intervention, especially since there was no formal authorization from the UN Security Council.

<https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter/full-text?utm>

<https://legal.un.org/repertory/art51.shtml?app=true&utm>

<https://www.icc-cpi.int/venezuela-i>

<https://www.reuters.com/world/americas/legality-us-capture-venezuelas-maduro-focus-united-nations-2026-01-04/>

<https://agenciabrasil.ebc.com.br/internacional/noticia/2026-01/trump-operacao-e-um-aviso-quem-ameacar-soberania-dos-eua>

4.2 UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland supports the United States' position regarding the 2026 operation in Venezuela, emphasizing the importance of combating transnational organized crime, narco trafficking, and regional instability. At the same time, the United Kingdom reaffirms its commitment to the Rome Statute and the International Criminal Court, recognizing the importance of international accountability for alleged war crimes and human rights violations. The UK maintains that the ICC may exercise territorial jurisdiction over crimes allegedly committed within the territory of a State Party, such as Venezuela, even when the accused are nationals of non-State Parties. However, the United Kingdom also stresses the importance of respecting state sovereignty, international humanitarian law, and the principle of proportionality during military operations.

<https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/cy4qgvwxp08o>

<https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/the-united-kingdom-is-committed-to-working-together-to-fight-transnational-organised-crime-uk-statement-at-the-un-security-council>

4.3 THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

The Federal Republic of Germany emphasizes the importance of respecting international law, state sovereignty, and the United Nations Charter regarding the 2026 United States operation in Venezuela. Germany reaffirms its strong support for the Rome Statute and the International Criminal Court, maintaining that the ICC may exercise jurisdiction over alleged crimes committed within the territory of a State Party, such as Venezuela. At the same time, Germany stresses the importance of accountability, proportionality, and the protection of human rights during military operations. German leadership avoided outright condemnation and emphasized political transition in Venezuela, while some German political actors, particularly the AfD, openly supported the intervention.

<https://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/en/newsroom/news/venezuela-icc-2153686>

<https://www.reuters.com/world/americas/germany-urges-political-solution-venezuela-crisis-2026-01-03/>

<https://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/en/aussenpolitik/laenderinformationen/venezuela-node/venezuela-235432>

<https://www.cnnbrasil.com.br/internacional/chanceler-da-alemanha-pede-transicao-para-governo-legitimado-por-eleicoes/>

4.4 THE STATE OF ISRAEL

The State of Israel supports the United States' position regarding the 2026 operation in Venezuela, emphasizing the right of states to defend themselves against terrorism, transnational criminal organizations, and threats to regional security. Israel argues that governments linked to armed groups and illicit networks may pose risks beyond their own borders, justifying international action under certain circumstances. At the same time, Israel highlights the importance of protecting civilians and respecting international humanitarian law during military operations.

<https://www.metro1.com.br/noticias/internacional/175777,netanyahu-apoia-acao-dos-eua-na-venezuela-coreia-do-norte-e-china-critic>

<https://www.correiodamanhacanada.com/netanyahu-apoia-acao-determinada-dos-eua-na-venezuela/>

<https://www.cnnbrasil.com.br/internacional/netanyahu-parabeniza-donald-trump-por-operacao-na-venezuela/>

<https://www.timesofisrael.com/israel-expresses-hope-for-resumption-of-venezuela-ties-after-maduros-deposal/>

<https://www.barrons.com/news/israel-hails-us-operation-in-venezuela-calls-it-leader-of-free-world-0b6a0456>

https://www.democracynow.org/2026/1/5/headlines/israeli_prime_minister_netanyahu_congratulate_s_trump_on_perfect_operation_in_venezuela

4.5 THE ITALIAN REPUBLIC

Italy adopted one of the most favorable European positions toward the United States' intervention in Venezuela. Prime Minister Giorgia Meloni argued that, although external military action should not generally be used to impose regime change, the operation could be considered a "legitimate defensive intervention" because the Maduro government was allegedly involved in narcotrafficking and hybrid threats against regional security. The Italian government therefore framed the US action not as unlawful aggression, but as a justified response to transnational criminal and security threats linked to the Venezuelan regime. Italy also reaffirmed its long-standing refusal to recognize Nicolás Maduro as the legitimate president of Venezuela following the disputed elections, aligning itself politically with Washington's broader objective of removing Maduro from power. At the same time, Rome tried to maintain a balanced diplomatic tone by emphasizing that military force should remain exceptional and should not become the standard mechanism for democratic transition.

<https://www.governo.it/en/articolo/statement-palazzo-chigi-developments-situation-venezuela/30686>

<https://peoplesdispatch.org/2026/02/04/new-wave-of-solidarity-with-venezuela-sweeps-across-italy/>

<https://www.ndtv.com/world-news/legitimate-italy-pm-giorgia-meloni-on-us-military-action-in-venezuela-10252057>

<https://www.barrons.com/news/italy-pm-meloni-calls-us-military-action-in-venezuela-legitimate-82fb48f0>

4.6 ARGENTINE REPUBLIC

The Argentine Republic recognizes the United States' concerns regarding regional security, narco-trafficking, and instability in Venezuela, while emphasizing the importance of international cooperation in addressing transnational threats. At the same time, Argentina reaffirms its commitment to the Rome Statute, state sovereignty, and international law, stressing that military operations must respect human rights, proportionality, and international legal obligations. Argentina also supports the role of the International Criminal Court in ensuring accountability for alleged crimes committed within the territory of a State Party.

<https://www.gazetadopovo.com.br/mundo/argentina-e-eua-assinam-acordo-para-fortalecer-luta-contra-crime-organizado/>

<https://www.batimes.com.ar/news/argentina/milei-cheers-trump-ordered-capture-of-maduro-in-venezuela.phtml>

<https://www.batimes.com.ar/news/latin-america/argentina-takes-venezuela-to-icc.phtml>

4.7 UKRAINE

Ukraine supports the United States' concerns regarding regional security, narco-trafficking, and instability in Venezuela, emphasizing the importance of international cooperation in addressing transnational threats. Ukraine recognizes the right of states to protect international peace and security when confronted with serious criminal and security challenges. At the same time, Ukraine stresses that military operations must remain consistent with international law, human rights obligations, and the protection of civilians. Ukraine also highlights the importance of accountability and international legal mechanisms in addressing alleged violations committed during armed conflicts. At the same time, Ukraine emphasizes that its support for the United States should not be interpreted as endorsing a broader precedent that could legitimize unlawful uses of force or violations of territorial sovereignty. Given its own legal position in ongoing disputes concerning Russian actions in Ukrainian territory, Ukraine remains particularly attentive to the risks of normalizing unilateral military interventions without clear international legal justification.

<https://www.pravda.com.ua/eng/news/2026/01/03/8014485/>

https://www.dailyfinland.fi/europe/47104/Ukraine-backs-US-action-in-Venezuela-Russia-terms-violation-of-sovereignty_

<https://united24media.com/latest-news/ukraine-reacts-to-us-action-in-venezuela-calls-for-democracy-and-rule-of-law-14743>

4.8 THE REPUBLIC OF PANAMA

Panama adopted a position broadly supportive of the United States' intervention in Venezuela, with President José Raúl Mulino emphasizing that the Maduro government represented a threat to regional security and democratic stability. Although Panama avoided fully celebrating the military operation, the government framed the US action as understandable within the context of combating narco-trafficking, organized crime, and authoritarian destabilization in the region. Panamanian officials also highlighted their close security cooperation with Washington, especially given rising regional tensions and joint military exercises conducted shortly before the intervention. Supporters of the operation inside Panama compared it to the 1989 US invasion that removed Manuel Noriega, arguing that external action can sometimes be justified against regimes linked to criminal networks. At the same time, the intervention reopened historical debates in Panama about sovereignty and US influence in Latin America, making the government careful to balance support for regional security with references to democratic order and stability.

<https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2026/jan/04/naked-imperialism-how-trump-intervention-in-venezuela-is-a-return-to-form-for-the-us?utm>
<https://newsroompanama.com/2026/01/03/panama-president-mulino-on-the-situation-in-venezuela/>
<https://g1.globo.com/mundo/noticia/2025/12/02/exercito-dos-eua-realiza-novo-treinamento-no-panama-em-meio-a-tensoes-com-venezuela.ghtml>
<https://www.cnnbrasil.com.br/internacional/eua-citam-invasao-do-panama-de-1989-para-justificar-acao-na-venezuela/>

PROSECUTION:

4.9 PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The People's Republic of China strongly emphasizes the principles of state sovereignty, territorial integrity, and non-intervention regarding the 2026 United States operation in Venezuela. China argues that unilateral military actions conducted without authorization from the United Nations Security Council violate international law and undermine the principles of the UN Charter. China further stresses that humanitarian concerns and regional instability must be addressed through diplomatic dialogue, peaceful negotiation, and multilateral cooperation rather than the use of force. At the same time, China highlights the importance of respecting international legal mechanisms and protecting civilian populations during conflicts.

https://en.chinadiplomacy.org.cn/2026-01/06/content_118263781.shtml
https://ir.china-embassy.gov.cn/eng/fyrth/202601/t20260103_11797170.htm
<https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2026/1/4/china-urges-us-to-stop-toppling-venezuelan-government-release-maduro>
https://un.china-mission.gov.cn/eng/hyyfy/202601/t20260106_11806819.htm?utm

4.10 RUSSIAN FEDERATION

The Russian Federation denounces the 2026 United States operation in Venezuela as a violation of international law, arguing that the intervention undermined Venezuelan sovereignty and the authority of the United Nations Charter. Russia opposes unilateral military actions conducted without authorization from the United Nations Security Council and warns that such measures create dangerous precedents for international stability. Russia further emphasizes the principles of non-intervention and territorial integrity as essential foundations of the international order.

<https://www.bssnews.net/international/347464>
<https://www.npr.org/2026/01/05/nx-s1-5666267/kremlin-condemns-u-s-military-operation-in-venezuela>
https://russiaun.ru/en/russia_n_un/podkategorija_00
<https://www.metropoles.com/mundo/russia-condena-agressao-armada-dos-eua-contra-venezuela>
<https://www.infomoney.com.br/mundo/russia-diz-que-acao-dos-eua-na-venezuela-mostra-uma-crise-da-lideranca-global/>

4.11 BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF VENEZUELA

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela rejects the 2026 United States operation as an act of foreign aggression aimed at interfering in Venezuela's internal affairs and political system. Venezuela argues that the intervention violated its sovereignty, territorial integrity, and right to self-determination, while also accusing the United States of using security and humanitarian arguments to justify regime change. The Venezuelan government additionally calls for international condemnation of unilateral intervention and defends the protection of national sovereignty under international law.

<https://www.opecu.org.br/2026/03/18/venezuela-pos-maduro-intervencao-tutela-e-riscos-de-desestabilizacao-na-america-do-sul/>

https://www.wola.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/01/Venezuela-Statement-01_03_26-1.pdf

<https://www.reuters.com/world/americas/us-launch-new-phase-venezuela-operations-sources-say-2025-11-22/>

<https://www.nytimes.com/2026/01/05/world/americas/un-security-council.html>

<https://www.icj.org/united-states-venezuela-territorial-sovereignty-the-rule-of-law-and-human-rights-must-be-guaranteed-and-respected/>

4.12 FRENCH REPUBLIC

The French Republic criticizes the 2026 United States operation in Venezuela, arguing that unilateral military interventions conducted without authorization from the United Nations Security Council risk violating international law and undermining state sovereignty. While France recognizes concerns regarding human rights and political instability in Venezuela, it maintains that such issues must be addressed through multilateral cooperation, diplomacy, and international legal mechanisms rather than unilateral use of force. France also reaffirms its strong support for the Rome Statute and the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court regarding alleged crimes committed within the territory of a State Party. France also expresses concern that normalizing unilateral military interventions—particularly without United Nations Security Council authorization—could establish a dangerous precedent in international relations. As a permanent member of the Security Council, France underscores the importance of preserving the Council's central role in authorizing the use of force and maintaining international peace and security.

<https://english.news.cn/20260104/d69833de6091471d8cb83fe1d59062dc/c.html>

<https://www.chinadaily.com.cn/a/202601/06/WS695c1d5aa310d6866eb32167.html>

https://www.lemonde.fr/en/international/article/2026/01/05/macron-criticizes-method-used-in-us-operation-against-venezuelan-leader-maduro_6749103_4.html

<https://onu.delegfrance.org/france-has-continued-to-stand-in-solidarity-with-the-venezuelan-people>

<https://g1.globo.com/mundo/noticia/2026/01/05/franca-nao-aprova-metodo-usado-pelos-eua-para-capturar-maduro-diz-macron.ghtml>

4.13 FEDERATIVE REPUBLIC OF BRAZIL

The Federative Republic of Brazil opposes the 2026 United States operation in Venezuela, emphasizing the principles of non-intervention, peaceful dispute resolution, and respect for state sovereignty. Brazil argues that unilateral military action without authorization from the United Nations Security Council threatens regional stability and sets a dangerous precedent for Latin America. Furthermore, Brazil supports the role of the International Criminal Court and international legal accountability mechanisms in investigating alleged violations of human rights and humanitarian law committed during the operation.

<https://www.reuters.com/business/aerospace-defense/brazil-says-us-crossed-unacceptable-line-over-military-strikes-venezuela-2026-01-03/>

<https://www.gov.br/mre/en/contact-us/press-area/press-releases/joint-statement-of-brazil-chile-colombia-mexico-uruguay-and-spain-on-the-events-in-venezuela-4-january-2026>

<https://agenciabrasil.ebc.com.br/en/internacional/noticia/2026-01/brazil-un-us-action-venezuela-threatens-peace-south-america>

<https://www.chinadaily.com.cn/a/202601/06/WS695c3625a310d6866eb321b4.html>

4.14 UNITED MEXICAN STATES

Mexico strongly condemned the United States' military intervention in Venezuela, arguing that the operation violated the principles of sovereignty, non-intervention, and international law established in both the Mexican Constitution and the UN Charter. President Claudia Sheinbaum repeatedly rejected the use of military force in Latin America, stating that foreign intervention has never produced democracy or stability in the region. Mexico emphasized that cooperation with the United States on security and drug trafficking issues must never imply subordination or acceptance of unilateral military actions. The Mexican government also warned that the intervention set a dangerous regional precedent and defended diplomatic dialogue, mediation, and peaceful conflict resolution instead of armed intervention. Mexico's position reflected its longstanding Estrada Doctrine tradition, which prioritizes self-determination, respect for sovereignty, and opposition to external interference in the internal affairs of states.

<https://www.gob.mx/sre/prensa/mexico-condemns-military-intervention-in-venezuela>

<https://www.reuters.com/world/americas/mexicos-sheinbaum-again-rejects-us-intervention-venezuela-2026-01-05/>

<https://english.elpais.com/international/2026-01-06/mexico-seeks-to-shore-up-its-defenses-following-us-incursion-in-venezuela.html>

<https://www.trtworld.com/article/532c065a7499>

https://mexicobusiness.news/policyandeconomy/news/mexico-rejects-us-intervention-venezuela-defends-sovereignty_

4.15 THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

The Republic of South Africa criticizes the 2026 United States operation in Venezuela, emphasizing the importance of state sovereignty, non-intervention, and respect for international law. South Africa argues that unilateral military actions conducted without authorization from the United Nations Security Council undermine the principles of the United Nations Charter and threaten international stability. Furthermore, South Africa reaffirms its support for the Rome Statute and the International Criminal Court, highlighting the importance of accountability, human rights protection, and multilateral solutions to international conflicts.

<https://global.chinadaily.com.cn/a/202601/04/WS6959807ca310d6866eb31b8f.html>

<https://english.news.cn/africa/20260107/006f9649ac2a463299f0c0e91681947b/c.html>

<https://africa.businessinsider.com/local/lifestyle/south-africa-condemns-us-strike-in-venezuela-calls-for-urgent-un-action/qs9zcs0>

<https://dirco.gov.za/south-africa-urges-un-security-council-session-following-unilateral-military-action-in-venezuela/>

4.16 THE KINGDOM OF SPAIN

Spain strongly opposed the United States' military intervention in Venezuela, arguing that the operation violated international law, Venezuelan sovereignty, and the principles of the UN Charter. Prime Minister Pedro Sánchez stated that Spain would not recognize any intervention conducted outside the framework of international legality and later explicitly condemned the action as a "violation of international law." Spain also joined Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Mexico, and Uruguay in a joint communiqué rejecting the unilateral military operation and warning against foreign control over Venezuela's natural resources. At the European level, Spain aligned itself with the broader European Union position, which called for restraint, respect for international law, and a peaceful, negotiated solution to the Venezuelan crisis rather than military action.

<https://www.euractiv.com/news/spain-joins-with-latin-america-to-criticise-venezuela-military-intervention/>

<https://www.aa.com.tr/en/europe/spain-says-us-military-s-intervention-in-venezuela-sets-very-dangerous-precedent-/3790257> <https://www.euronews.com/2026/01/04/spain-and-5-latin-american-countries-reject-us-attack-on-venezuela-in-joint-communique>

<https://www.reuters.com/world/americas/spain-will-not-recognize-us-intervention-venezuela-pm-says-2026-01-03/>

https://www.eeas.europa.eu/eeas/venezuela-statement-high-representative-aftermath-us-intervention-venezuela_en



5. IMPORTANT FOR THE PREPARATIONS OF THE DEBATE

5.1 TOPICS TO FOCUS ON DURING THE DEBATE

1. Did the United States have the legal right to intervene in Venezuela?
2. Did the 2026 operation violate Venezuelan sovereignty?
3. Can a country use military force without approval from the United Nations Security Council?
4. Should the international community interfere in humanitarian crises?
5. Were human rights potentially violated during the operation?
6. Can humanitarian intervention justify military action in another country?
7. Does fighting narco trafficking and organized crime justify foreign intervention?
8. What responsibilities do states have under international law during military operations?

5.2 GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

1. Can obligations connected to the Rome Statute affect countries that did not ratify the treaty?
2. Should territorial jurisdiction apply to nationals of non-State Parties accused of international crimes?
3. How should international law balance state sovereignty and humanitarian protection?
4. What role should the International Court of Justice play in disputes involving international criminal law?
5. Could unilateral interventions create dangerous precedents in international relations?
6. Are current international accountability mechanisms strong enough to address alleged violations by major powers?
7. Should humanitarian intervention doctrines be expanded or more strictly limited?
8. How can the international community prevent political misuse of international legal justifications for intervention?

6. BIBLIOGRAPHY

<https://www.brookings.edu/articles/making-sense-of-the-us-military-operation-in-venezuela/>
<https://time.com/7344628/us-venezuela-trump-maduro-oil-drugs-war-explainer-questions-answered/>
<https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2025/11/25/timeline-26-years-of-fraught-us-venezuela-relations>
<https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/R44841>
<https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/rome-statute-international-criminal-court>
<https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter/full-text>
<https://guide-humanitarian-law.org/content/article/3/sovereignty/>
<https://www.cfr.org/global-conflict-tracker/conflict/instability-venezuela>
<https://www.state.gov/releases/office-of-the-spokesperson/2026/03/a-statement-on-u-s-venezuela-relations>
<https://www.governo.it/en/articolo/statement-palazzo-chigi-developments-situation-venezuela/30686>
<https://peoplesdispatch.org/2026/02/04/new-wave-of-solidarity-with-venezuela-sweeps-across-italy/>
<https://www.ndtv.com/world-news/legitimate-italy-pm-giorgia-meloni-on-us-military-action-in-venezuela-10252057>
<https://www.barrons.com/news/italy-pm-meloni-calls-us-military-action-in-venezuela-legitimate-82fb48f0>
<https://www.euractiv.com/news/spain-joins-with-latin-america-to-criticise-venezuela-military-intervention/>
<https://www.aa.com.tr/en/europe/spain-says-us-military-s-intervention-in-venezuela-sets-very-dangerous-precedent-/3790257>
<https://www.euronews.com/2026/01/04/spain-and-5-latin-american-countries-reject-us-attack-on-venezuela-in-joint-communique>
<https://www.reuters.com/world/americas/spain-will-not-recognize-us-intervention-venezuela-pm-says-2026-01-03/>
https://www.eeas.europa.eu/eeas/venezuela-statement-high-representative-aftermath-us-intervention-venezuela_en
<https://www.gob.mx/sre/prensa/mexico-condemns-military-intervention-in-venezuela>
<https://www.reuters.com/world/americas/mexicos-sheinbaum-again-rejects-us-intervention-venezuela-2026-01-05/>
<https://english.elpais.com/international/2026-01-06/mexico-seeks-to-shore-up-its-defenses-following-us-incursion-in-venezuela.html>
<https://www.trtworld.com/article/532c065a7499>
<https://mexicobusiness.news/policyandeconomy/news/mexico-rejects-us-intervention-venezuela-defends-sovereignty>
<https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2026/jan/04/naked-imperialism-how-trump-intervention-in-venezuela-is-a-return-to-form-for-the-us?utm>
<https://newsroompanama.com/2026/01/03/panama-president-mulino-on-the-situation-in-venezuela/>
<https://g1.globo.com/mundo/noticia/2025/12/02/exercito-dos-eua-realiza-novo-treinamento-no-panama-em-meio-a-tensoes-com-venezuela.ghtml>

https://revistas.usp.br/rfdusp/pt_BR/article/download/67093/69704/0

<https://www.icj-cij.org/node/103924?utm>

https://www-icj--cij-org.translate.google.com/case/90?x_tr_sl=en&x_tr_tl=pt&x_tr_hl=pt&x_tr_pto=tc

<https://iusgentium.ufsc.br/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/7-2-DRC-vs.-Uganda-Taciano.pdf>

<https://www.cnnbrasil.com.br/internacional/eua-citam-invasao-do-panama-de-1989-para-justificar-acao-na-venezuela/>



Good luck, delegates!