BUMUN IV

SOCHUM

DRIVEN BY PASSION,
INSPIRING ACTION.

Letters from the Presidents **1**
Introduction to the Committee **3**
Topic A: Freedom of expression in the digital age: Balancing online safety, national security, and state regulation. **4**
Topic Overview 4
Historical Context 5
Issue 6
Current Situation 8
International Efforts 11
Perspectives 12
Guiding Questions 15
QARMAS 15
Topic B: Evaluating and addressing due process and arbitrary detention in anti-gang and anti-organized crime operations in Latin America **15**
Topic Overview 16
Historical Context 16
Issue 18
Current Situation 19
International Effort 21
Perspectives 23
Guiding Questions 26
QARMAS 26
Glossary **27**
Bibliography **29**

Letters from the Presidents

Letter from President García

Esteemed delegates,

It is my pleasure to welcome you to the Social, Humanitarian, and Cultural Committee (SOCHUM) at the fourth edition of BUMUN. As your President, I am truly honored to guide you throughout this committee and to share this experience with all of you.

The topics we will discuss challenge us to examine the balance between fundamental human rights, state responsibilities, and the complex realities of today's world. I encourage each of you to approach these debates with curiosity, critical thinking, and a genuine willingness to listen to different perspectives.

Beyond defending your country's position, this committee is an opportunity to strengthen your diplomatic skills and engage in meaningful discussions. I truly hope you make the most of this experience. Challenge yourself, learn from one another, and don't be afraid to speak up. Some of the best moments in MUN come from stepping out of your comfort zone.

Above all, I want this committee to be a space where everyone feels welcomed, supported, and encouraged to participate. If you ever have questions or need guidance, please do not hesitate to reach out. I will always be happy to help.

Sincerely,

Gabriela García Avendaño.

agarcia@colegiobureche.edu.co

Letter from Vice-President Solano

Esteemed delegates,

Welcome to the Social, Humanitarian, and Cultural Committee (SOCHUM) at the fourth edition of BUMUN. I hope that at this model you can engage yourself, contribute actively to the debates, and enjoy every moment of the committee. Meaningful discussions are created when delegates are willing to listen, collaborate, and propose creative solutions.

Most importantly, I want SOCHUM to be a welcoming environment where everyone feels comfortable sharing their ideas. If you need any assistance during the conference, please know that I will always be available to support you.

I look forward to meeting all of you and to having an engaging and productive committee.

Sincerely,

Gabriel Solano

2027gabriel.solano@colegiobureche.edu.co.

Introduction to the Committee

The Social, Humanitarian and Cultural Committee (SOCHUM), also referred to as the "Third Committee" of the United Nations General Assembly, is one of the six main committees of the General Assembly. SOCHUM is the main forum for discussing global social, humanitarian, and human rights issues, bringing together all 193 UN Member States to debate challenges that affect people all around the world.

SOCHUM addresses a wide range of topics, including the promotion and protection of human rights, gender equality, the rights of children, refugees and internally displaced persons, indigenous peoples, persons with disabilities, youth, and social development. The committee also considers reports from UN bodies and experts, allowing Member States to evaluate current challenges and propose recommendations that strengthen international cooperation.

Although SOCHUM does not create legally binding resolutions, its work plays a vital role in shaping international norms, influencing global policy, and encouraging collaborative action on some of the world's most pressing humanitarian and social issues.

Topic A: Freedom of expression in the digital age: Balancing online safety, national security, and state regulation.

Topic Overview

The rapid expansion of digital technologies has transformed the way individuals communicate, access information, and participate in political, social, and cultural life. Social media platforms and many other online spaces have become essential tools for public discourse, enabling the exchange of ideas across borders and expanding opportunities for civic participation. At the same time, the digital environment has facilitated the spread of misinformation, hate speech, online harassment, cybercrime, violent extremist content, and other forms of harmful activity capable of threatening both individual safety and national security. In response, governments around the world have adopted a wide range of laws and policies to regulate online spaces and address emerging threats. These measures, despite seeking to protect public order and national security, have raised concerns regarding censorship, privacy, government surveillance, and the potential restriction of fundamental freedoms. As technologies continue to evolve faster than legal and institutional frameworks, defining the appropriate balance between protecting freedom of expression and ensuring online safety has become a pressing human rights issue in the digital age.

Historical Context

The relationship between freedom of expression and state regulation has been significantly transformed by the rapid expansion of digital technologies and social media platforms. During the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, the development of the internet created new spaces for individuals to communicate, access information, participate in political debates, and organize social movements. Unlike traditional forms of communication, digital platforms allowed information to circulate rapidly across national borders, reducing the ability of governments to control public discourse and creating new opportunities for civic participation.

The expansion of platforms such as Facebook, YouTube, X, Instagram, and TikTok further transformed the digital environment by allowing individuals to become both consumers and producers of information. This development contributed to the democratization of public debate, particularly by giving marginalized groups and independent voices greater opportunities to express themselves. However, the same technological developments also created new challenges, including disinformation, hate speech, online harassment, incitement to violence, and foreign interference. As digital platforms became increasingly influential in shaping public opinion, governments began to consider stronger forms of regulation in order to protect citizens and national institutions.

The events of the 2010s and early 2020s intensified these debates. The spread of misinformation during elections, the use of social media for political manipulation, and the increasing influence of algorithmic systems raised concerns about the potential impact of

digital platforms on democratic stability. At the same time, governments introduced laws and regulations intended to address harmful online content and protect national security. However, these measures also generated concerns that broad or poorly defined regulations could be used to restrict legitimate political criticism, silence journalists, or suppress opposition voices.

This tension became particularly relevant as governments increasingly adopted digital surveillance technologies and expanded their ability to monitor online communications. While authorities often justified these practices as necessary to combat terrorism, organized crime, cyber threats, and national security risks, human rights organizations warned that excessive surveillance and censorship could undermine privacy and freedom of expression. Consequently, the historical development of digital communication has created a lasting tension between the need to maintain a safe online environment and the obligation of states to protect fundamental rights.

Issue

The difficulty of protecting freedom of expression in the digital age lies in the need to balance the individual's right to communicate and access information with the responsibility of states to protect public safety, national security, and democratic institutions. Digital platforms have become essential spaces for political participation and social interaction, meaning that restrictions imposed online can have significant consequences for individuals and societies. At the same time, the internet can be used to spread disinformation, hate speech, violent content, and material that may threaten public safety.

One of the central difficulties is determining when state intervention is legitimate and when it becomes excessive censorship. Governments have a responsibility to address genuine threats, but restrictions on freedom of expression should be lawful, necessary, proportionate, and consistent with international human rights standards. Broad regulations that allow authorities to remove content without sufficient oversight may create opportunities for political abuse, particularly in countries where democratic institutions and independent judicial systems are weak. UNESCO has emphasized that states should avoid arbitrary or disproportionate measures when addressing harmful online content and should ensure that digital governance remains aligned with human rights principles (UNESCO, 2023).

The issue also involves the growing power of private technology companies. Digital platforms play a central role in determining what information users can access through content moderation policies and algorithmic systems. However, decisions made by private

companies can also affect freedom of expression, especially when content is removed without transparency or when users have limited opportunities to appeal moderation decisions. This creates a complex governance environment in which states, technology companies, civil society, journalists, and users all have different responsibilities.

Furthermore, the regulation of digital spaces has become increasingly connected to national security. Governments may argue that monitoring online communications is necessary to prevent terrorism, organized crime, cyberattacks, and foreign interference. Nevertheless, excessive surveillance can threaten privacy and discourage individuals from expressing political opinions or criticizing authorities. In this context, digital security policies must be carefully designed to prevent legitimate security concerns from being used as a justification for restricting fundamental freedoms.

According to UNESCO (2023), addressing disinformation, hate speech, and other online harms requires a multi-stakeholder approach involving governments, digital platforms, civil society, media organizations, academia, and technical experts. This approach recognizes that neither governments nor technology companies can independently solve the challenges created by the digital environment. Instead, effective regulation should protect users while maintaining freedom of expression, access to information, transparency, and accountability.

Current Situation

The current digital environment has intensified the debate surrounding freedom of expression, online safety, and state regulation. Governments around the world are increasingly introducing legislation designed to address misinformation, hate speech, online violence, child exploitation, and other forms of harmful content. At the same time, technological developments, including artificial intelligence and increasingly sophisticated surveillance tools, have created new challenges for governments attempting to regulate digital spaces without restricting legitimate expression.

Across Latin America, these challenges are particularly relevant due to the region's history of political instability, violence, organized crime, and restrictions on press freedom. Digital platforms have provided journalists, activists, and citizens with new tools to expose corruption, report human rights abuses, and participate in political debates. However, journalists and civil society actors can also face online harassment, threats, surveillance, and attempts to discredit their work. Human Rights Watch reported that Colombia remained a dangerous environment for journalists, while also noting concerns surrounding the use of social media by political leaders to stigmatize journalists and media outlets perceived as critical of the government (Human Rights Watch, 2025).

At the same time, governments across the region continue to face pressure to respond to the spread of misinformation and harmful content online. The challenge is particularly complex because digital platforms operate across national borders, while legal systems remain primarily national. As a result, regulations adopted by individual states may differ

significantly, creating uncertainty regarding how online content should be governed and who should be responsible for enforcing these rules.

International organizations have increasingly emphasized the importance of developing digital regulations based on human rights principles. UNESCO's Guidelines for the Governance of Digital Platforms recommend a multi-stakeholder approach in which states, technology companies, civil society, media, academia, and technical communities share responsibility for creating a safer digital environment. The organization also stresses that governments should protect freedom of expression and access to information while avoiding arbitrary or disproportionate restrictions, including unjustified internet shutdowns (UNESCO, 2023).

The Inter-American Commission on Human Rights and its Special Rapporteurship for Freedom of Expression have also continued to address emerging threats to freedom of expression in the Americas, including digital surveillance, online harassment, and violence against journalists. These developments demonstrate that the protection of freedom of expression is no longer limited to traditional media, as digital platforms have become a fundamental part of democratic participation and public debate (Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, 2026).

As digital technologies continue to evolve, the central challenge for governments is to develop effective policies that protect citizens from genuine online harms without creating excessive state control over information. The regulation of digital platforms must therefore balance national security and online safety with the protection of privacy, freedom of

expression, and access to information. Ultimately, the current debate is not simply about whether digital spaces should be regulated, but about how states can establish transparent, proportionate, and accountable regulations that protect both individuals and democratic institutions.

International Efforts

International efforts to protect freedom of expression in the digital age have been led primarily by the United Nations (UN), the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), and regional human rights institutions such as the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR) and the European Court of Human Rights. These institutions emphasize that governments have a responsibility to protect users from online harms while ensuring that restrictions on digital expression are necessary, proportionate, and consistent with international human rights obligations.

A major development has been the growing international recognition that the same human rights protections that apply offline must also be protected online. The UN Human Rights Council has repeatedly emphasized the importance of freedom of expression on the internet while recognizing legitimate concerns related to disinformation, hate speech, terrorism, cybercrime, and online violence. International standards encourage states to ensure that laws regulating digital platforms are clearly defined, avoid excessive censorship, and include judicial or independent oversight when content is removed or accounts are restricted.

The IACHR, through its Office of the Special Rapporteur for Freedom of Expression, has also issued recommendations concerning digital rights in the Americas. These recommendations emphasize protecting journalists, activists, and ordinary users from censorship, surveillance, and unjustified restrictions. The Commission has encouraged states to establish transparent rules for content moderation, protect personal data, guarantee access to information, and ensure that national security measures do not become a justification for suppressing legitimate political criticism or public debate.

At the global level, the United Nations has promoted a rights-based approach to online safety that balances freedom of expression with the prevention of serious harms. The UN encourages states to address online threats through transparent legislation, independent oversight, digital literacy, and cooperation with technology companies rather than relying primarily on censorship or mass surveillance. International institutions also stress that governments should provide effective mechanisms for challenging unlawful content removals, protecting journalists and human rights defenders, and ensuring that national security policies remain subject to the rule of law.

Perspectives

Supporting Block:

- China

China is one of the strongest advocates for extensive state regulation of digital spaces. Through laws such as the Cybersecurity Law, the Data Security Law, and strict internet censorship, the Chinese government argues that controlling online content is essential to protect national security, social stability, and public order. Authorities actively regulate social media platforms, remove content considered harmful or destabilizing, and require technology companies to cooperate with government oversight. China maintains that every state has the sovereign right to regulate its digital environment according to its domestic laws and security needs.

- Russia

Russia supports broad government authority to regulate online information in the name of national security and the protection of public order. The government has enacted legislation allowing authorities to restrict websites, monitor internet traffic, and remove content considered extremist, false, or threatening to national interests. Russian officials argue that stronger state control is necessary to combat terrorism, foreign interference, cybercrime, and disinformation campaigns. International organizations, however, have criticized these measures for limiting freedom of expression and restricting independent media.

- India

India adopts a mixed but increasingly regulation-oriented approach. The government has introduced rules requiring digital platforms to remove unlawful content, identify the originators of certain messages, and cooperate with law enforcement during national security

investigations. Authorities have also imposed temporary internet shutdowns in regions experiencing unrest, arguing that these measures are necessary to prevent violence and maintain public order. India maintains that online freedom must be balanced with national security, public safety, and the prevention of misinformation.

Opposing Block:

- Germany

Germany strongly supports protecting freedom of expression while recognizing the need to address illegal online content through democratic and transparent legal frameworks. The government backs regulations that require platforms to remove hate speech and illegal content while ensuring judicial oversight, transparency, and respect for fundamental rights. Germany consistently promotes international cooperation based on human rights standards and supports the implementation of the European Union's Digital Services Act.

- Canada

Canada advocates for a balanced approach that protects freedom of expression while addressing online harms such as hate speech, terrorist content, and child exploitation. The government supports independent regulatory mechanisms, transparency requirements for digital platforms, and safeguards against arbitrary censorship. In international forums, Canada emphasizes that restrictions on online speech should be lawful, necessary, proportionate, and consistent with international human rights law.

- Estonia

Estonia is widely recognized for promoting digital rights, cybersecurity, and democratic governance in the online environment. As one of the world's most digitally advanced countries, Estonia supports protecting freedom of expression through secure digital infrastructure, media literacy, and transparent governance rather than extensive government censorship. The country advocates international cooperation against cyber threats while maintaining that any restrictions on online speech must comply with the rule of law and international human rights obligations.

Guiding Questions

1. How can governments balance freedom of expression with online safety and national security?
2. What safeguards should regulate online content without violating human rights?
3. How can governments and digital platforms address misinformation and hate speech while protecting free expression?
4. What role should international organizations play in promoting responsible digital governance?
5. How can digital literacy and public awareness support a safer and more open online environment?

QARMAS

1. How can governments regulate online content while protecting freedom of expression and access to information?
2. What safeguards can prevent censorship and ensure transparency in content moderation?
3. How can accountability and oversight be strengthened in digital regulation?
4. What mechanisms can strengthen international cooperation against cyber threats and misinformation while respecting human rights?
5. What long-term measures can promote online safety while protecting freedom of expression and democratic institutions?

Topic B: Evaluating and addressing due process and arbitrary detention in anti-gang and anti-organized crime operations in Latin America

Topic Overview

For decades, gang violence and organized crime have heavily influenced the political landscape throughout Latin America, eroding public trust in institutions, stretching judicial capacity and continuously subjecting communities to insecurity. Criminal groups have attained enough power in many countries that they effectively overturn state-authority and even govern. Because of this, governments are increasingly desperate to intervene with violence and maintain order. Emergency decrees, extensive police powers, large-scale arrests, and lengthy detentions have all been justified as necessary measures to keep the population safe. Although these strategies have created some conditions that lead to enhanced public security, they are sparking debates regarding their compliance with due process and standards of international human rights. However, when such measures are used in the face of permissive or vague legal standards and limited judicial oversight, they result in enforcement turning into abuse, leaving communities susceptible to indefinite detention as a consequence; fuelling further distrust in the rule of law.

Historical Context

Public security policies and due process protections are two components of the rule of law whose relationship has been shaped by decades of political instability, armed conflict, and the expansion of organized crime. During the Cold War era and its immediate aftermath, many nations experienced military dictatorships, internal armed conflicts and authoritarian rule, all environments that systematically prioritized state security over individual procedural guarantees. Although democratic transitions in the 1980s and 1990s initiated structural reforms aimed at strengthening the rule of law and human rights, these developing judicial systems lacked the institutional capacity, funding, and independence needed to withstand emerging security threats (Cutrona et al., 2024). This vulnerability coexisted with a rapid increase in transnational drug trafficking, extortion, and human smuggling.

Driven in part by North-American deportation policies, street gangs like *Mara Salvatrucha* (MS-13) and *Barrio 18* expanded alongside major drug cartels, capturing territory and directly challenging state sovereignty. Governments across the region frequently reverted to hardline, punitive approaches known as "*mano dura"* (iron fist) policies, as they were confronted by overwhelming public demands for protection. These strategies heavily relied on domestic military deployments, broad anti-gang legislation, and sweeping police roundups (redadas).

While proponents argued these extraordinary measures were necessary to dismantle sophisticated criminal networks, they established a governing precedent that routinely circumscribed constitutional safeguards. Emergency decrees and special security acts expanded executive power, normalized extended pre-trial detentions, and diluted fair trial standards. (Bergmann & Gude, 2021). As courts were flooded with thousands of

simultaneous arrests lacking individualized evidentiary support, arbitrary detentions became widespread. Over time, this reliance on extraordinary state powers normalized the erosion of due process, entrenching a lasting structural tension between state efforts to enforce public order and the legal obligation to guarantee fundamental rights under international law.

Public security policies and due process protections are two components of the rule of law whose relationship has been shaped by decades of political instability, armed conflict, and the expansion of organized crime. During the Cold War, the region became a battleground between the United States and Soviet influence, which often led to the installation or support of authoritarian regimes. Countries such as Brazil, Argentina, Chile, and Uruguay faced some of the harshest military dictatorships who justified repression by framing internal opposition as part of a global communist threat. In this contexts, state security was systematically prioritized over individual rights, and practices such as unlawful detention, torture, and enforced disappearances became common tools of governance.

Issue

The challenge of addressing due process and arbitrary detention in anti-gang and anti-organized crime operations stems from the inherent tension between two equally legitimate state responsibilities: protecting public security and safeguarding the fundamental rights of individuals. While governments are expected to respond decisively to criminal organizations capable of undermining state authority and threatening civilian populations, they are also bound by domestic and international legal frameworks that require every deprivation of liberty to be lawful, justified, and subject to judicial oversight.

Unlike conventional criminal investigations, anti-gang operations often seek to dismantle entire criminal networks whose members operate through secrecy, intimidation, and decentralized structures. These conditions place significant pressure on law enforcement agencies to act quickly, prevent suspects from coordinating their activities, and avoid the destruction of evidence. However, the urgency that characterizes these operations may also reduce the time available for individualized investigations and judicial review, increasing the risk that people are detained on the basis of insufficient evidence or broad assumptions of criminal association rather than their own conduct.

This challenge extends beyond the moment of arrest. Large-scale security operations can overwhelm courts, prosecutors, and public defense systems, making it increasingly difficult to process cases efficiently while preserving procedural guarantees. Delays in judicial proceedings, prolonged pretrial detention, and limited access to legal representation may leave individuals deprived of their liberty for extended periods before their responsibility has been determined. At the same time, governments argue that releasing suspects prematurely

may allow criminal organizations to regroup, intimidate witnesses, or continue unlawful activities, illustrating the complex trade-offs involved in combating organized crime.

As the scope and sophistication of organized criminal networks continue to evolve, the debate has shifted beyond whether states should adopt strong security measures to how those measures can remain effective without compromising the rule of law. According to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (2026), public security and human rights should not be viewed as competing objectives, but as complementary obligations that must guide the design and implementation of state security policies.

Current Situation

Across Latin America, governments have increasingly adopted more assertive security strategies to confront the growing influence of gangs, drug trafficking organizations, and other transnational criminal networks. Rising homicide rates, territorial disputes between criminal groups, extortion, forced displacement, and attacks on public institutions have intensified public demand for stronger state intervention. As a result, many countries have expanded the use of emergency powers, increased military participation in domestic security operations, and strengthened anti-organized crime legislation, reflecting a broader regional shift toward more forceful approaches to public security.

The implementation of these measures has generated an equally significant debate regarding their impact on judicial guarantees and the protection of fundamental rights. Human rights organizations and regional institutions have expressed concern that prolonged states of exception, expanded police powers, and large-scale detention operations may increase the risk of arbitrary detention, limit access to legal representation, and weaken judicial oversight. At the same time, many governments maintain that extraordinary security threats require exceptional responses, arguing that traditional law enforcement mechanisms are often insufficient to dismantle highly organized criminal networks.

The most prominent example of this debate is El Salvador, where the state of exception declared in 2022 has resulted in more than 90,000 arrests while contributing to a substantial decline in homicide rates and gang-related violence (Amnesty International, 2026). Similar trends can be observed elsewhere in the region. Ecuador has expanded the role of the armed forces following the declaration of an internal armed conflict, Honduras has repeatedly extended states of exception to combat gang violence and extortion, and discussions

surrounding the use of military forces in public security continue in countries such as Mexico and Brazil. Although the legal frameworks and security contexts differ, these experiences illustrate a broader regional tendency to prioritize rapid security responses while continuing to debate their compatibility with due process and judicial guarantees.

In response, regional and international organizations have emphasized that combating organized crime and protecting human rights should not be treated as competing objectives. The Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (2026) has reiterated that states have both the right and the responsibility to guarantee public security, but that emergency measures must remain exceptional, proportionate, and subject to effective judicial oversight. As criminal organizations continue to evolve and public demand for security remains high, the central challenge for Latin America is no longer whether stronger security policies are necessary, but how they can be implemented without weakening the rule of law or eroding public confidence in democratic institutions.

International Effort

International efforts to address due process and arbitrary detentions in anti-gang and anti-organized crime operations in Latin America have centered on the inter-American human rights system, which treats public security and human rights as complementary obligations rather than competing goals. Since the early 2010s, the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR) has produced reports and guidelines urging states to adopt preventative and collaborative security policies that comply with due process guarantees under the American Convention on Human Rights.

A key milestone was the IACHR's 2026 Resolution No. 1/26 on Organized Crime and Human Rights, which provides 50 recommendations to guide states in combating organized crime while protecting fundamental human rights. The resolution emphasizes strengthening judicial capacities, limiting the use of states of emergency, and addressing corruption and impunity as essential to preventing arbitrary detention and abuse. It also promotes victim participation, raising social awareness, and reparations for victims of both organized crime and human rights violations.

These principles have been applied by the IACHR to country-specific contexts. For instance, in El Salvador, following widespread reports of mass arbitrary detentions under states of emergency, the Commission issued 23 recommendations, including restoring full due process, developing a human rights-based citizen security policy, and adapting criminal legislation to remove provisions that mandate preventive detention or allow adult sentences for minors (IACHR, 2026).

Beyond the IACHR, UN human rights mechanisms including the Special Rapporteur on counter-terrorism, have advocated for cooperative legal frameworks and investments in addressing root causes such as poverty, education deficits, and public health challenges. The Special Rapporteur has recommended that states reorient militarized approaches toward prevention strategies grounded in evidence-based social policy, including anti-corruption measures, participatory budgeting, and sustained investments in the rule of law (United Nations, 2022). The UN Office of High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) has further called for transparent oversight of law enforcement, clear legal standards for detention, and accountability mechanisms for violations committed under anti-gang policies (United Nations, 2025).

Perspectives

Supporting block: States favoring expansive emergency powers in anti-gang operations

1. El Salvador

The government of El Salvador is the most prominent example of an emergency-based approach to anti-gang operations. Since March 2022, President Nayib Bukele's government has maintained a state of emergency, suspending constitutional guarantees such as the right to legal counsel, the right to be informed of the reasons for detention, and the 72-hour limit for presenting detainees before a judge. The Salvadoran government defends its policy as a necessary and effective response to decades of gang violence, arguing that it has dramatically reduced homicides and restored public order. President Bukele has repeatedly stated that the security gains achieved under the state of emergency are now sustainable and could eventually be maintained under normal judicial procedures. International bodies, including the IACHR and the UN humans rights mechanisms, have urged El Salvador to lift the state of emergency, restore full due process, and investigate abuses such as torture, enforced disappearances and deaths in custody.

2. Ecuador

Ecuador has increasingly adopted a similar "iron fist" model under President Daniel Noboa. In January 2024, following a surge in violence and the takeover of a state television station by armed men, Noboa declared an internal armed conflict against 22 criminal organization, labeling them as terrorists and authorizing enhanced military and police operations. The government has frequently renewed states of emergency at the national and provincial levels, granting security forces expanded powers to conduct arrests, searches, and operations with reduced judicial oversight. Officially, Ecuador's position is that these exceptional measures

are temporary and proportionate responses to an unprecedented crisis of organized crime and drug trafficking that threatens the life of the country.

3. Mexico

Mexico presents a more complex position, combining aggressive security operations with formal commitments to due process and judicial reform. Successive federal administrations have deployed the military and federal police in large scale anti-gang and anti-drug trafficking operations, particularly in states such as Guerrero, Michoacán, and Sinaloa. These operations have often been criticized for arbitrary detentions, enforced disappearances, torture, and excessive use of force. At the same time, Mexico´s official position emphasizes the need to strengthen the rule of law, improve prosecutorial capacity and protect victims' rights within a framework of constitutional guarantees. In international forums, Mexico generally supports resolutions that recognize states' right and duty to combat organized crime, while also affirming that security measures must respect human rights and due process.

Opposing block: States emphasizing due process and human rights-compliant security policies

1. Brazil

Brazil supports strong action against organized crime, drug trafficking, and criminal groups, but its official legal framework requires these operations to remain subject to constitutional protections and judicial oversight. Brazilian institutions have emphasized the importance of independent investigations, documentation of police operations, and accountability for the excessive use of force. The country's courts and public prosecutors also play an important

role in reviewing police conduct and investigating alleged human rights violations. Its position is that anti-crime operations should combine effective enforcement with judicial supervision, independent investigations, and protection for vulnerable communities.

2. Costa Rica

Costa Rica represents a clear rights-based, preventive approach to the issue. Its National Public Security Policy "Costa Rica Segura Plus-2023-2030" explicitly frames security within a democratic, rule of law, and human rights perspective, prioritizing crime prevention, community participation, and institutional strengthening over mass incarceration or prolonged states of exception. In regional and UN discussions, Costa Rica advocates for security policies that are completely compatible with the American Convention on Human Rights and other international standards, emphasizing that effective crime control does not require the suspension of fundamental guarantees. Its position is often cited as an alternative model to the emergency based approaches seen in El Salvador and Ecuador.

3. Uruguay

Uruguay has pursued a preventive, human rights-oriented model of citizen security, integrating a rights perspective into police training, local security boards, and drug policy. While the country still faces challenges such as relatively high rates of pretrial detention, its official stance and reforms stress professionalization of law enforcement, victim-centered approaches, and alternatives to custody rather than broad emergency powers. In regional forums, Uruguay supports inter-American standards that limit states of emergency and promote due process as central to sustainable security. Its position emphasizes that long-term reductions in violence depend more on social inclusion, education, and effective justice institutions than on exceptional measures that risk undermining the rule of law.

Guiding Questions

1. How has the balance between public security and due process been addressed in national approaches to combating gangs and organized crime?
2. What approaches have been taken toward the use of states of emergency and other exceptional security measures in response to organized crime?
3. How are judicial institutions involved in overseeing anti-gang and anti-organized crime operations?
4. What position has been taken on international and regional cooperation in addressing organized crime and protecting human rights?
5. How have national policies addressed the long-term relationship between organized crime, public security, and trust in democratic institutions?

QARMAS

1. How can anti-gang and anti-organized crime operations be conducted while ensuring that arrests are based on sufficient and individualized evidence?
2. What safeguards can prevent arbitrary detention and ensure access to legal representation and timely judicial review?
3. How can accountability and judicial oversight be strengthened during large-scale security operations?
4. What mechanisms can strengthen regional cooperation in combating transnational organized crime while respecting human rights and national legal frameworks?
5. What long-term measures can reduce reliance on extraordinary security measures while strengthening public security and democratic institutions?

Glossary

Topic A:

1. **Freedom of expression:** The right of individuals to hold opinions and seek, receive, and share information and ideas without unjustified interference.
2. **Digital rights:** Human rights and freedoms that apply to individuals in the digital environment, including privacy, access to information, and freedom of expression.
3. **Online safety:** Measures and policies designed to protect individuals from harmful, illegal, or abusive content and activities online.
4. **Content moderation:** The process through which digital platforms review, restrict, remove, or otherwise manage content posted by users.
5. **Censorship:** The suppression or restriction of information, opinions, or forms of expression by governments, authorities, or other actors.
6. **Misinformation:** False or inaccurate information that is shared without necessarily intending to mislead or cause harm.
7. **Disinformation:** False or misleading information that is deliberately created or distributed with the intention of deceiving or influencing others.
8. **Hate speech:** Forms of expression that promote or encourage discrimination, hostility, or violence against individuals or groups based on characteristics such as ethnicity, religion, or nationality.
9. **National security:** The protection of a state, its institutions, and its population from threats such as terrorism, cyberattacks, espionage, and foreign interference.
10. **Cybersecurity:** The protection of digital systems, networks, and information from unauthorized access, disruption, damage, or cyberattacks.
11. **State regulation:** Government laws, policies, and measures established to regulate activities and behavior within the digital environment.

12. **Data privacy:** The protection of individuals' personal information and their rights regarding how such information is collected, stored, processed, and shared.
13. **Digital platform:** An online service or system that allows users to create, share, access, or interact with digital content and information.
14. **Proportionality:** The principle that restrictions on freedom of expression must be necessary and proportionate to achieving a legitimate objective, such as protecting national security or public safety.

Topic B:

1. **Rule of law:** The principle that all individuals and institutions, including the state itself, are accountable under publicly established laws that are applied consistently and independently.
2. **Due process:** Legal and procedural guarantees that protect individuals during legal proceedings and ensure that state action affecting their rights is carried out according to established law and fair procedures.
3. **Arbitrary detention:** The deprivation of a person's liberty that is not based on lawful grounds or is otherwise arbitrary.
4. **Judicial oversight:** The review of government actions by an independent judicial authority to determine whether those actions comply with applicable law and protect individual rights.
5. **Pretrial detention:** The detention of a person before the conclusion of their criminal trial.
6. **State of emergency:** A formally declared exceptional situation in which a state may temporarily take measures that derogate from certain obligations under international human rights law.
7. **Emergency powers:** Exceptional powers or measures available to authorities during a formally recognized emergency.

8. **Organized criminal group:** A structured group of three or more persons, existing for a period of time and acting together to commit one or more serious crimes in order to obtain a financial or other material benefit.
9. **Proportionality:** The principle that measures restricting rights must not go beyond what is necessary to achieve a legitimate objective.

Bibliography

1. Amnesty International. (2026, July 21). *El Salvador: "Security" without rights: Impact of mass arbitrary arrests and denial of due process on the potential commission of crimes against humanity in El Salvador - Amnesty International*. https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/amr29/0967/2026/en/

2. Bergmann, A., & Gude, R. (2021). Set up to fail: The politics, mechanisms, and effects of mass incarceration. *Latin American Law Review, 7, 43–59.* https://doi.org/10.29263/lar07.2021.03

3. Cutrona, S., Dammert, L., & Rosen, J. D. (2025). Conceptualizing Mano Dura in Latin America. *Latin American Politics and Society*, *67*(2), 20–35. doi:10.1017/lap.2024.32

4. *Ecuador*. (2026, February 4). Human Rights Watch. https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2026/country-chapters/ecuador

5. *El Salvador*. (2025, January 16). Human Rights Watch. https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2025/country-chapters/el-salvador

6. Inter-American Commission on Human Rights. (2026). *Organized crime and human rights in the Americas* (Resolution No. 1/26). Organization of American States. https://www.oas.org/en/iachr/decisions/pdf/2026/res-1-26-en.pdf

7. *IACHR issues resolution about organized crime and human rights*. (2026, March 10). Inter-American Commission on Human Rights. https://www.oas.org/en/IACHR/jsForm/?File=/en/iachr/media_center/PReleases/2026/037.asp