



2026 Mid-South Model UN Conference



Security Council Committee

Chairs: Marcus Gray, Rabanni Rhythm

Introduction to the Committee:

The UNSC was founded in 1945 following World War II to prevent future large-scale conflicts. It operates as a continuous body, meaning it can meet at any time when peace is threatened. The Council consists of **15 members**: five permanent members with veto power (China, France, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom, and the United States) and ten non-permanent members elected for two-year terms by the General Assembly.

The work of the Security Council focuses on identifying and responding to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of aggression. Under **Chapter VI** of the UN Charter, the Council seeks to settle disputes through peaceful means, such as mediation and negotiation. If these fail, the Council may exercise its authority under **Chapter VII** to take more assertive actions, including the imposition of economic sanctions, arms embargoes, or the authorization of collective military action to restore stability.

The Committee discusses a wide range of critical security issues, including the oversight of **UN Peacekeeping Operations**, the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and the resolution of regional conflicts. The Council also addresses modern security threats such as international terrorism, the protection of civilians in armed conflict, and the security implications of climate change and resource scarcity.

Topic Background: Territorial Relations in Israel and Palestine

I. Historical Background

The territorial dispute between Israel and Palestine is one of the most enduring and complex conflicts before the United Nations Security Council. Its origins trace back to the late 19th and early 20th centuries, when competing nationalist movements—Zionism and Arab nationalism—emerged in Ottoman-controlled Palestine.

Following World War I, the League of Nations granted Britain the Mandate for Palestine (1922–1948). During this period, tensions escalated between Jewish and Arab communities, particularly after the 1917 Balfour Declaration expressed British support for the establishment of a “national home for the Jewish people.” Rising violence ultimately led Britain to refer the issue to the United Nations.

In 1947, the UN General Assembly adopted Resolution 181 (Partition Plan), proposing two states—one Jewish and one Arab—with Jerusalem under international administration. While Jewish leadership accepted the plan, Arab states and Palestinian representatives rejected it. In 1948, the State of Israel declared independence, prompting the first Arab-Israeli War. The war resulted in Israel controlling more territory than allocated under the UN plan and the displacement of approximately 700,000 Palestinians—an event Palestinians refer to as the Nakba (“catastrophe”).

The 1967 Six-Day War fundamentally reshaped the territorial dimension of the conflict. Israel captured the West Bank (including East Jerusalem), Gaza Strip, Golan Heights, and Sinai Peninsula. In response, the Security Council adopted Resolution 242 (1967), calling for the “withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict” and affirming the right of every state in the region to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries. Resolution 338 (1973) later reaffirmed 242 and called for negotiations toward a just and durable peace.

The Oslo Accords (1993–1995) represented a significant diplomatic breakthrough. The agreements established the Palestinian Authority (PA) and divided the West Bank into Areas A, B, and C:

Area A – Full Palestinian civil and security control

Area B – Palestinian civil control and Israeli security control

Area C – Full Israeli civil and security control

However, Oslo postponed final-status issues, including borders, settlements, refugees, Jerusalem, and security arrangements. These unresolved matters remain at the core of the present territorial dispute.

Israeli settlement expansion in the West Bank and East Jerusalem has been a major point of contention. The Security Council, in Resolution 2334 (2016), reaffirmed that settlements “have no legal validity” and constitute a violation of international law. Israel disputes this characterization, citing historical, security, and legal arguments.

The Gaza Strip presents a separate but related dimension. After Israel’s unilateral disengagement in 2005, Hamas gained control of Gaza in 2007. Israel and Egypt imposed restrictions on Gaza’s borders, citing security concerns. Multiple rounds of armed conflict followed (2008–09, 2014, 2021, and 2023–2024), further destabilizing the region and deepening humanitarian crises.

Despite diplomatic initiatives—including the Arab Peace Initiative, the Middle East Quartet framework (UN, U.S., EU, Russia), and normalization agreements such as the Abraham Accords—the core territorial questions remain unresolved.

II. Present Situation (2026)

As of 2026, territorial relations between Israel and Palestine remain at a critical juncture. Following the 2023–2024 escalation of violence in Gaza and southern Israel, international legal and diplomatic pressure intensified.

In 2024, the International Court of Justice (ICJ) issued advisory findings regarding the legal consequences of prolonged occupation and settlement expansion in the occupied Palestinian territory. These proceedings renewed debate within the Security Council over enforcement

mechanisms, compliance with international humanitarian law, and the legal implications of annexation or de facto territorial control.

In 2026, the implementation phase of the Gaza Peace Plan has introduced proposals for:

- Demilitarized border zones
- Internationally monitored crossings
- Deployment of an International Stabilization Force (ISF)
- Reconstruction corridors under UN supervision

However, significant divisions remain within the Security Council. Some Member States advocate invoking Chapter VII authority to enforce territorial compliance and prevent further expansion of settlements. Others maintain that borders must be determined exclusively through direct bilateral negotiations.

The West Bank continues to experience territorial fragmentation. Settlement expansion in Area C, the creation of security buffer zones, and restrictions on Palestinian movement have raised concerns regarding the viability of a contiguous Palestinian state. Critics argue that these developments undermine the two-state solution. Israel maintains that security arrangements are necessary to prevent attacks and ensure civilian protection.

East Jerusalem remains one of the most sensitive and symbolically significant issues. Both Israelis and Palestinians claim Jerusalem as their capital. Proposals under discussion include:

- A shared-capital model
- International oversight of religious sites
- Special administrative regimes for holy areas

The humanitarian situation in Gaza continues to influence territorial negotiations. Access to water, electricity, healthcare, and reconstruction materials is closely tied to border control mechanisms. The Security Council must therefore address not only sovereignty and territorial integrity, but also humanitarian law and civilian protection.

Modern security concerns have further complicated the dispute. These include:

- The role of non-state armed actors
- Regional proxy dynamics
- Maritime security in the Eastern Mediterranean
- Control of airspace and underground infrastructure
- Climate-related resource scarcity

The central question before the Council is no longer solely whether peace is desirable, but what territorial framework can realistically sustain it. Delegates must consider:

Should the 1967 borders serve as the binding baseline for negotiations?

What legal consequences should follow continued settlement expansion?

Can an international stabilization force operate effectively without full consent?

How should the Council balance territorial integrity with security guarantees?

The Security Council now faces a defining challenge: translating decades of resolutions and diplomatic initiatives into a coherent, enforceable territorial settlement capable of ensuring long-term stability for both Israelis and Palestinians.

Note to Delegates

Dear Delegates,

Welcome to the **2026 Mid-South Model United Nations Conference (MSMUN)** and to the **United Nations Security Council (UNSC)**. My name is **Rhythm**, and I am honored to serve as your co-chair for this session. I am a Sophomore at Rhodes College, majoring in Biomathematics with a focus on Evolutionary Biology. Joining me as your Chair is **Marcus Gray**, a senior double major in International Studies and Latin American/Latinx Studies.

We are incredibly excited to lead the Security Council this year. Unlike other committees, the UNSC carries the unique responsibility of maintaining international peace and security. Our primary focus for this session will be **Territorial Relations in Israel and Palestine**. In light of the 2024 International Court of Justice (ICJ) rulings and the recent implementation of the **2026 Gaza Peace Plan**, our work is more urgent than ever. We are tasked with moving beyond humanitarian debate to the actual mechanics of peace: border security, the mandate of stabilization forces, and the legal status of occupied territories. The Security Council is a fast-paced environment where the stakes are high and the power of the veto is a constant factor. We hope this topic inspires rigorous debate, strategic diplomacy, and, ultimately, a resolution that reflects the Council's mandate to provide a stable future for all civilians in the region.

We look forward to meeting you all in committee. If you have any questions regarding the background guide or parliamentary procedure, please feel free to reach out to any of us.

Regards,

Marcus Gray *Chair, UN Security Council* Email: [grama-26@rhodes.edu]

Rabbani Rasha Rhythm *Co-Chair, UN Security Council* Email: [rhyra-28@rhodes.edu]

Countries:

United States: Historically Israel's strongest ally. While the U.S. supports a two-state solution, it often vetoes resolutions that impose unilateral borders or immediate sanctions on Israel. In 2026, the U.S. remains focused on the "Board of Peace" framework and ensuring any territorial changes are negotiated directly between the two parties.

China: A vocal supporter of Palestinian statehood. China advocates for a large-scale international peace conference and the full recognition of the 1967 borders. China views Israeli settlement expansion as a direct threat to international law and has called for an immediate halt to all construction in Area C.

Russian Federation: Russia emphasizes the "Middle East Quartet" framework. In 2026, Russia has been critical of "unilateral security zones" created by the IDF, arguing they are a form of de facto annexation that violates UNSC Resolution 242.

France: Following its official recognition of the State of Palestine in late 2025, France now pushes for a "territorial integrity" mandate. It supports the deployment of an International Stabilization Force (ISF) in Gaza to ensure borders remain demilitarized but open for humanitarian aid.

United Kingdom: The UK maintains a "balanced" but firm stance against settlement expansion. It has recently focused on the legal status of East Jerusalem, advocating for a shared-capital model to prevent the total territorial fragmentation of the West Bank.

Algeria: As a lead advocate for the Arab Group in 2026, Algeria frequently submits resolutions demanding an end to the "blockade and siege" of Palestinian territories. It views the territorial dispute as a matter of decolonization and resists any plan that does not include the Right of Return.

Pakistan: A staunch supporter of the Palestinian cause, Pakistan argues that the Security Council must use its **Chapter VII** powers to enforce the 1967 borders and prevent the further "slicing" of the West Bank into disconnected enclaves.

Colombia: Representing a shift in Latin American foreign policy, Colombia has called for an immediate international investigation into territorial "buffer zones" that displace civilians. They prioritize the protection of indigenous Palestinian land rights.

Somalia: Representing the African and Asia-Pacific group, Somalia views the territorial restrictions in Gaza as a violation of the UN Charter's principle of sovereignty. It often votes in solidarity with the OIC (Organization of Islamic Cooperation).

Denmark: Typically aligns with the EU's "Land for Peace" formula. Denmark focuses on the technical aspects of border management and has offered to provide personnel for the International Stabilization Force (ISF).

Bahrain: As a signatory of the Abraham Accords, Bahrain occupies a unique "bridge" position. It supports Palestinian territorial sovereignty but also prioritizes regional security cooperation to prevent the spillover of conflict into broader territorial waters.

Greece: Strategically located in the Eastern Mediterranean, Greece advocates for maritime security and the protection of religious sites. It seeks to balance its growing defense ties with Israel against its historical support for a viable Palestinian state

References:

<https://main.un.org/securitycouncil/en>

<https://press.un.org/en/2025/sc16225.doc.htm>

<https://news.un.org/en/story/2023/11/1143632>

<https://www.nytimes.com/live/2024/06/10/world/israel-gaza-war-hamas>

<https://www.un.org/unispal/document/october-2025-monthly-bulletin/>