



GUIA DE REGRAS

XIII Lasmun
La Salle Model United Nations

LASMUN

La Salle Model United Nation

Universidade La Salle
Reitor: *Cledes Antonio Casagrande*
Vice-Reitor: *Euclides Casagrande*
Pró-Reitor de Graduação: *Márcio Michel*
Pró-Reitor de Administração: *Vitor Augusto Costa Benites*

Conselho da Editora Unilasalle
Márcio Michel, Cássio Cassel, Cristiele Magalhães Ribeiro, Moana Meinhardt
Projeto gráfico e diagramação: *Editora Unilasalle*

LASMUN STAFF (COLASMUN)
Secretary-General: *Nicole Kistt*
1st Under-Secretary-General: *Felipe Pohlmann Steffens*
2nd Under-Secretary-General: *Lydiane Audrin Ribeiro da Silva*

Editorial Committee:

<i>Asafe Carvalho de Brum</i>	<i>Isadora Oliveira Marcelo</i>
<i>Bernardo Vargas Terterola</i>	<i>Lydiane Audrin Ribeiro da Silva</i>
<i>Cecília Vieira Nabinger</i>	<i>Milena Land</i>
<i>Felipe Pohlmann Steffens</i>	<i>Nicole Kistt</i>
<i>Giovana Oliveira Elesbão</i>	<i>Renan Gomes Silveira</i>

Communication Committee:
Maria Luiza Dreschler
Mariana Trifilio da Silva Pereira

L111L La Salle Model United Nations (12. : 2025 : Canoas, RS).
LASMUN [recurso eletrônico] : La Salle Model United Nations / Fabrício Pontin, Vanessa Amaral Prestes, Nicole Kistt, Felipe Pohlmann Steffens, Lydiane Audrin Ribeiro da Silva, organizadores. – Dados eletrônicos. – Canoas, RS : Ed. Unilasalle, 2025.

ISBN 978-65-5441-124-0

Livro eletrônico.

Sistema requerido: Adobe Acrobat Reader.

Modo de acesso: <<https://repositorio.unilasalle.edu.br/handle/11690/4449>>.

1. Política. 2. Relações internacionais – Eventos. 3. Política internacional. 4. Assembleias – Simulação. 5. Nações Unidas. I. Pontin, Fabrício. II. Prestes, Vanessa Amaral, III. Kistt, Nicole. IV. Steffens, Felipe Pohlmann. V. Silva, Lydiane Audrin Ribeiro. VI. Título.

CDU: 327(063)

Bibliotecária Reponsável: Michele Padilha Dall Agnol de Oliveira – CRB: 2350

Editora Unilasalle
Av. Victor Barreto, 2288 | Canoas, RS | 92.010-000
editora@unilasalle.edu.br

Fabício Pontin

Vanessa Amaral Prestes

Nicole Kistt

Felipe Pohlmann Steffens

Lydiane Audrin Ribeiro da Silva

Organizadores

LASMUN

La Salle Model United Nation

Universidade La Salle- Editora Unilasalle
Canoas, 2025

SUMÁRIO

GENERAL INFORMATION ON LASMUN	5
-------------------------------------	---

PARTE ONE LASMUN's Study Guide

GENERAL RULES OF PROCEDURE OF LASMUN	7
GUIDE ON WRITING RESOLUTIONS	20

PART TWO LASMUN's Study Guide

UN WOMEN: GENDER VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN IN PUBLIC LIFE IN LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN	24
DENUCLEARIZATION OF THE KOREAN PENINSULA: IMPASSES AND THE ROLE OF IAEA	32
O CONGELAMENTO DE VERBAS PARA AJUDA HUMANITÁRIA AOS IMIGRANTES E REFUGIADOS PELO GOVERNO TRUMP	41

GENERAL INFORMATION ON LASMUN

Dress Code and National Symbols

In accordance with the standards observed at United Nations conferences and to ensure the integrity of the event, all delegates at LASMUN are required to wear Western business attire or a formal national equivalent. While traditional gendered norms need not be strictly followed, delegates are encouraged to express their identity in a manner that aligns with the formal and respectful tone of the conference. Appropriate attire includes, for example, a full suit with dress shirt and tie, or a blouse with dress pants or skirt, complemented by a blazer or sweater. Delegates may also choose to wear formal national dress, provided it is presented with due attention to detail, cultural conventions, and utmost respect. Additionally, small objects representing a delegate's country, such as flags, pictures, or memorabilia, are permitted as long as they are respectful and do not disrupt the proceedings. The Chair retains the discretion to determine the appropriateness of such items. Alcoholic beverages and weapons of any kind are strictly prohibited and may be confiscated for the duration of the conference. It is within the Chair's discretion to assess which objects are appropriate to be displayed and which are not.

Award Policy

While LASMUN values cooperation and the educational experience of all participants, it also seeks to recognize outstanding performance in a spirit that promotes learning rather than competition. To this end, each committee will award one Best Delegate prize and two Honorable Mentions. These recognitions are based on votes cast by delegates at the end of the conference, excluding members of the LASMUN Staff who are participating in the simulation. The Best Delegate will receive a certificate and a prize. Although awards are given, the primary goal remains to foster meaningful group work, mutual learning, and constructive dialogue. Delegates are expected to leave the conference with a deeper understanding of international affairs, enriched not only by their own research but also through collaboration with peers and guidance from the Bureau.

Parliamentary Language

Delegates must maintain the utmost respect in their interactions at all times. It is both conventional and professional to refer to fellow participants using neutral and courteous expressions such as "fellow delegate," rather than gendered pronouns like "he" or "she." Additionally, when presenting national viewpoints, delegates should avoid personal attributions such as "my position." Instead, they should refer to "my country's position" or explicitly state, for example, "France's position." The language employed throughout the conference must consistently reflect the diplomatic nature of the simulation, underscoring that delegates are official representatives of their states and are expected to engage in respectful and constructive cooperation.

PARTE ONE LASMUN's Study Guide

GENERAL RULES OF PROCEDURE OF LASMUN

1. SCOPE

These rules shall apply to the two committees simulated at the 13th edition of LASMUN. These General Rules of Procedure shall be considered adopted in advance of the session, and no other rules of procedure will be applicable. These rules were taken from the Handbook of the United Nations 2023-4, and LASMUN's 12th edition Handbook.

2. LANGUAGE

The official language of the Security Council and the Human Rights Council committees is English. The Organization of American States (OAS) committee may be conducted in Portuguese. Delegates are not permitted to address the Chair, the staff, or the committee in any other language. The use of foreign expressions is allowed only if immediately followed by a translation into the language of the respective committee.

3. DELEGATIONS

Each delegation will be represented by one delegate only.

4. CREDENTIALS

The name of the member of each delegation shall be submitted to the Secretariat prior to the opening of the Conference. All delegations will be assumed to have proper credentials to participate in the Conference. Delegates are all presumed to possess the diplomatic authority necessary to discuss and vote on the main issue being dealt with by the committee. The instructions and powers given to all delegates do not allow them to declare war, sign or denounce treaties, impose sanctions, or perform any action not strictly within the purview of the committee, unless so determined by the Chair.

5. GENERAL DUTIES OF THE DELEGATES

Delegates are expected to respect the decisions of the Chair, request the floor before speaking, represent and defend the interests of their assigned country, follow its official foreign policy, and consistently maintain diplomatic decorum. The Secretary-General is the highest-ranking official within the Secretariat and may appoint a staff member to act on her behalf during any session of the Conference. Along with the Under-Secretaries-General, they are responsible for directing all conference activities. The Secretary-General, or any designated representative, may address the committees at any time with oral or written statements on any relevant matter.

6. GENERAL DUTIES OF THE CHAIR

The committee shall be led by a Chair, consisting of one or two Directors and Assistant Directors. In addition to the powers granted elsewhere in these rules, the Chair is responsible for declaring the opening and closing of each session, directing the flow of discussion, ensuring compliance with the rules of procedure, granting the right to speak, and making official announcements. The Chair shall rule on Points and Motions without the possibility of appeal, set time limits for speeches, and maintain full control and responsibility over the proceedings. The Chair may also propose motions it considers beneficial to the progress of the debate. Members of the Chair are also responsible for assisting delegates and ensuring a productive and respectful environment throughout the session.

7. RULINGS OF THE CHAIR

The rulings and decisions of the Committee's Chair are final and not subject to appeal. Members of the Chair are authorized to interpret and, when necessary, override the rules in order to ensure the effective and productive progression of the committee's work.

8. PLAGIARISM

Plagiarism is understood within the scope of these rules as the unacknowledged use of another individual's words or ideas. When writing position papers, working papers, draft resolutions and during all their participation in the conference, delegates are not allowed to make use of fragments of already existent documents without proper reference. A participant

caught plagiarizing any written work will be dealt with accordingly. Punishment may entail disqualification for awards, denied voting and/or speaking rights and possible exclusion from the conference. Applicable legal measures will be taken at the discretion of the conference's organization alone.

RULES GOVERNING DEBATE

Throughout these rules, a “simple majority” will be understood to be one half of the possible votes plus one, rounded down, whereas a “two-third majority” shall consist of two thirds of the possible votes, rounded up. For example, the simple majority of five is three, and the two-third majority of ten is seven.

9. QUORUM

The Chair may declare a session open and permit debate to proceed when at least one third (rounded up) of registered delegations are present. The presence of a simple majority of registered delegations shall be required for any substantive vote to be taken. The Chair shall proceed with a Roll Call at the beginning of each session to recognize the presence of the delegates. The Chair shall inform the delegates of the Quorum whenever required. Every committee shall start with a First Session composed by: Opening Speeches with Speakers List.

10. OPENING PLENARY SESSION

Every committee shall start with a First Session composed of two parts: (i) Interactive Dialogues and Briefings; (ii) Opening Speeches with Speakers List. The beginning of this session, therefore, is composed by a Briefing of the topic(s) to be discussed in the Committee, made by a specialist in the area or by some member of the Bureau. This moment may allow the initial interaction of the delegates with the discussion theme. Soon after that, the Bureau will present to the delegates a proposal of agenda on the topics to be discussed. The delegates may later decide for its adoption or suggest changes to it - if so, the delegates should submit the new agenda to the Bureau, which will present the new document to the committee. Albeit strongly recommended, still, the agenda is not mandatory and the delegates may prefer to go straight to

the debate. Following the agenda presentation, each delegation may perform an Opening Speech. This shall contain, essentially, the topics presented in the Country Report, previously sent to the Bureau. In this sense, the delegates must adhere to the foreign policy of the country they are representing, according to the topic(s). These Speeches shall be made in accordance with a Speakers List, opened exclusively for this reason. To be included in the list, delegates should raise their placards, provided that the delegation's name is not already on the List. The delegations' names will appear according to the order in which they indicate their desire to speak. The delegation can withdraw its name from the General Speakers List by indicating so to the Bureau. The speech time must be defined by the Bureau in informal voting with the delegations. Even though these Opening Speeches are not mandatory, we strongly encourage all the delegations to participate in it. After the finish of the Speakers List, the Bureau shall automatically change to the Formal-Informal type of debate. Then, to make a Speech, the delegations must raise their placards and wait for the Bureau's indication – it's their prerogative to choose the delegates.

11. SPEECHES

No delegates may address the Committee without previously obtaining the permission of the Chair. The Chair shall call upon speakers in the order they signify their desire to speak. The speaking time shall be stipulated by the Chair in advance, though it may consult the committee before deciding on the matter. When a delegate has ten seconds of speaking time left, the Chair will make a discreet signal. When the allotted time has expired, the Chair will call the delegate to order.

12. RIGHT OF REPLY

There is no right of reply. Real or perceived offenses or untruths should be dealt with during normal debate.

13. WORKING PAPERS

Working Papers are informal documents that aid the Committee in its discussions on substantive matters. Delegates may propose Working Papers for consideration by the Committee at any time during the Conference. They need not to be written in a specific format,

but must be approved by the Chair to be distributed for and to be mentioned in the Committee. There is no need for sponsors of Working Papers.

14. POINTS

There are three types of Points by which a delegate may address the Chair directly. Should delegates wish to consult the Chair on a matter not covered by any of these three points, they should do so privately, with the understanding that the Chair will inform the whole committee of the matter if it is deemed to be a general interest.

Rule	Speeches	Votes	Comments
Point of Order	-	-	Used when the proper observance of procedural rules is in doubt. Not in order during speeches.
Motion to Adjourn the Session	-	Simple Majority	In order when announced by the Bureau; refers to adjourning the committee until the next meeting.
Motion to Introduce Topic to the Top of the Agenda	2 in favor and 2 against (maximum)	Simple Majority	Used to discuss and vote on the committee's Agenda, i.e., which of the two topics (A or B) will be addressed first.
Motion to Postpone the Debate	2 in favor and 2 against (maximum)	Two-Thirds Majority	Modifies the topic under discussion in the committee, moving on to the next topic listed on the Agenda.
Unmoderated Debate	-	Simple Majority	Aims to facilitate discussion and promote the drafting of resolutions.
Division of the Question	2 in favor and 2 against (maximum)	Simple Majority	Four-step process: 1) motion to divide the question is voted on; 2) each division proposal is voted on; 3) vote on inclusion of each part; 4) vote on the final Draft Resolution.

15. FORMS OF DEBATE

In order to structure the discussions and ensure a balanced participation among delegations, different formats of debate are adopted throughout the sessions. Each form serves a specific purpose in the progression of committee work, from the formal presentation of positions to more flexible negotiation environments. The following subsections outline the three main types of debate that will guide the flow of the sessions: Formal Debate, Formal-Informal Debate, and Informal-Informal Debate. Delegates are expected to adapt their interventions and strategies accordingly, respecting the procedural rules and the authority of the Chair.

15.1 Formal Debate

The Formal debate happens exclusively in the First Session of the committees and must be composed by the Speakers List for the Opening Speeches of the delegations. To be included in the list, delegates should raise their placards, provided that the delegation's name is not already on the List.

15.2 Formal-Informal Debate

This type of debate will happen during all the sessions in all committees after the First Formal Session. This debate is conducted directly by the Chairwoman/Chairman: delegates willing to speak during the Formal Informal Debate may raise their placards, and will be recognized by the Chair at its discretion. Points of Order and Motions for Adjournment of the Session or Debate can be raised by delegates, according to the Chair indications.

15.3 Informal-Informal

This motion suspends the Formal-Informal debate, allowing delegates to engage in open discussions without interference from the Chair. During this time, delegates are free to move around the room, form working groups, and collaborate more informally. The purpose of the unmoderated debate is to facilitate in-depth, substantive negotiations—such as the drafting of resolutions or amendments—by temporarily relaxing the structure imposed by formal procedures. Delegates are encouraged to use this time to work in political blocs to develop and negotiate proposals.

To initiate an unmoderated debate, a delegation must request it from the Chair. The Chair will then ask whether there is consensus on the motion. If consensus is not reached, the motion must be put to a vote and requires a simple majority for approval. Although there is no fixed duration for this type of debate, a single unmoderated debate may not exceed 45 consecutive minutes.

SPECIAL RULES OF PROCEDURE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL

16. CREDENTIALS

Delegates must hand over their credentials at the beginning of the first session. These credentials are sent to the delegates by their respective country's Ministry of Foreign Affairs in advance. In the case of not having received the Credentials delegates must contact the Secretariat. Delegates are encouraged to write letters to their governments to obtain authorization to undertake actions beyond those listed in the credentials section of the General Rules of Procedure or request needed information.

17. CONDUCT DURING VOTING ON A DRAFT RESOLUTION

The Secretary-General shall immediately bring to the attention of all representatives on the Security Council all communications from States, organs of the United Nations, or concerns regarding any matter that requires consideration of the Security Council in accordance with the provisions of the Charter. The Secretary-General may designate members from the Secretariat to attend any council's meetings. The selected members from the Secretariat must provide logistical and technical support to the Security Council's discussions, entertaining the Council with any formal or informal documents specifically sent to the Council or addressing any matters under its consideration. Draft-communiqués reporting on behalf of the Council may also be sent to its appreciation, whenever the Secretariat finds it.

SUBSTANTIVE MATTERS

18. VOTING MAJORITIES

Decisions of the Security Council on procedural matters shall be made by a simple majority of nine members. Decisions of the Security Council on substantive matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of nine members with no negative votes on the part of the permanent members; provided that, in decisions under Chapter VI on the UN Charter and under paragraph 3 of Article 52, a party to a dispute shall abstain from voting. The matters hereby considered as substantive are the approval of Amendments to the Draft Resolution, the approval of Draft Resolutions and approval of clauses/parts in a division of the question.

19. FORM OF DEBATE

6.1 Unless otherwise stated by the committee, all sessions of the Security Council are presumed to be closed until the adjournment of the session, except for the First Session, when takes place the reading of the Briefing and/or the Interactive Dialogue, and when the delegates may deliver an Opening Speech, available to the Press. Closed sessions are secret and information on the proceedings is entrusted to the discretion of the participants. This is meant to facilitate discussion and negotiation between members of the Council as the conversations will be confidential and undocumented.

6.2 Closed Sessions follow the format of a Formal/Informal Debate at all times, except in the case of shifting to an Informal-Informal Debate. Besides the Point of Order described in the General Rules of Procedure, the following motions will be allowed during closed sessions (according to the order of precedence): (i) Motion for adjournment of the session; (ii) Motion for adjournment of the debate; (iii) Motion of no confidence; (iv) Motion for an open session; (v) Motion to issue a presidential statement.

6.2.1 A motion for an open session is functional when the action phase on a draft resolution is about to begin (i.e. after its introduction and during its voting). The Presidency must consult the Council about opening the session with a voting procedure. If a simple majority decide in favor of opening the session, all statements will be duly recorded and made available to the Press.

6.2.2 Any delegate may request the issuance of a Presidential Statement from their respective committee, an official document intended to inform the public about some of the Council's deliberations. If the motion is considered valid, the delegate will read the proposed text of the statement, and the chair will ask if any Council member objects. If there are no objections, the statement is considered issued and released to the public.

6.3 During Open Sessions, the following motions will be allowed (according to the order of precedence): (i) Motion for adjournment of the session; (ii) Motion for adjournment of debate; (iii) Motion for a closed session.

6.3.1 A motion for a closed session is a procedural matter, which will immediately be put to a vote. If the motion passes, the session will be immediately closed to the public, statements will no longer be recorded and all individuals who do not belong to the Secretariat or to the delegations represented in the Council will be asked to leave the room.

20. PARTICIPATION IN COUNCIL DELIBERATIONS

Should any member of the Council wish to invite an individual or representative of an organization or government to participate (without entitlement to vote on substantive matters) in the deliberations of the Council, he or she should submit a written request to the President of the Council. The President will ask if any Council member objects to the invitation. There being no objection, the invitation will be issued.

21. LETTER TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

Should any member of the Council wish to issue a letter addressed directly to the Secretary-General, or intended to be transmitted to an organization or government relevant to the deliberations of the Council, he or she should submit the proposed letter and a request in writing to the President of the Council. The President will ask if any Council member objects to the letter. There being no objection, the letter will be issued.

22. PRESIDENCY

The Presidency of the Security Council shall be held in rotation by the delegations that express their willingness to assume it. Each President shall serve for the duration of one session.

During the first session, lots shall be drawn among the interested delegations to establish the order of rotation.

Should the President of the session be perceived as failing to fulfill their responsibilities in a satisfactory manner, as judged by the members of the Security Council and the Secretariat, a change in the presidency may be considered. To initiate such a change, an informal written request must be submitted to the Secretariat, bearing the signatures of at least three members of the Council, including at least one permanent member.

The Secretariat may, at its discretion, submit the request to a vote. The motion shall pass with a simple majority. If approved, the presidency shall be transferred, for the remainder of the session, to the delegation scheduled to preside over the following session. The predetermined rotation shall remain unchanged for future sessions.

Some delegations may be requested to preside over more than one session, depending on the number of interested parties.

The President shall chair the meetings of the Security Council and, under its authority, represent the Council in its capacity as a principal organ of the United Nations.

23. PRESIDENTIAL STATEMENTS

Any delegate may request the issuance of a Presidential Statement from their respective committee, an official document intended to inform the public about some of the Council's deliberations. If the motion is considered valid, the delegate will read the proposed text of the statement, and the chair will ask if any Council member objects. If there are no objections, the statement is considered issued and released to the public.

24. DRAFT RESOLUTIONS AND AMENDMENTS

In Closed Sessions, more than one Draft Resolution and Amendments may be on the floor at the same time. All the Draft Resolutions and Amendments shall be discussed simultaneously, yet the Council may approve only one resolution per topic. Before being introduced for debate, all Draft Resolutions and Amendments require the approval of the Secretariat. Draft Resolutions require five signatures and Amendments require three signatures to be introduced.

Once a Draft Resolution or an Amendment has been introduced, it can be withdrawn only if all signatories remove their signatures. Friendly Amendments are allowed. Before voting an Amendment, delegates can move for Roll Call Voting. Draft Resolutions are voted in open sessions; therefore, the Roll Call Voting is automatically in order.

SUBSTANTIVE MATTERS

25. DRAFT RESOLUTIONS

Before being introduced for debate, all Draft Resolutions require the approval of the Chair. All Draft Resolutions also require 5 signatures to be introduced and a simple majority to pass. Signing a Draft Resolution does not necessarily indicate that a delegation supports its ideas, but only that it desires to have the Draft Resolution discussed. A signatory of a Draft Resolution is not required to vote in favor of it. The Draft Resolution needs its signatories' support to continue on the floor. In the event of all signatories withdrawing their signatures, debate on the Draft Resolution is ceased. Other delegations may add their signatures to the Draft Resolution in the course of the debate. In general debate on a topic, there may be more than one Draft Resolution on the floor at the same time. All the Draft Resolutions shall be discussed simultaneously on the General Speakers List. Only one Draft Resolution may be approved by the Committee. A Draft Resolution will remain on the floor until debate on that specific Draft Resolution is closed or another Draft Resolution on the topic passes. There will be no time limit to debate on one topic.

25.1 Motion for Introduction of Draft Resolution

Delegates may move for the Introduction of a Draft Resolution once it has been approved by the Chair and distributed to the Committee. This motion does not require a vote to pass, once accepted by the Chair it is automatically approved. The Chair will then grant the floor to one of the signatories of the Draft Resolution for the time required for them to read its operative clauses. After the Draft Resolution is read, the Chair asks for questions, which shall be limited

to grammar or technical matters on the document and may not pertain to the substance of the Draft Resolution.

25.2 Motion for Introduction of an Amendment

Delegates may amend any Draft Resolution that is on the floor. Amendments may add, subtract, or modify parts of the Draft Resolution. An Amendment requires the approval of the Chair and the signatures of three members of the committee. Signing an Amendment does not constitute or require a vote in favor of it. After a Motion for the Introduction of an Amendment is approved by the Chair, debate on the General Speakers List shall be suspended and a Special Speakers List shall be established for and against the specific Amendment. A Motion for Closure of the Special Speakers List or a Motion to Close Debate on the Amendment will be in order after the Committee has heard at least two speakers in favor of the Amendment and two speakers against, when available. When debate is closed on the Amendment, the Committee shall proceed to an immediate vote, which may be a Roll Call Vote if so moved. Following the voting procedure, debate according to the General Speakers List shall resume. Once an Amendment is approved, it becomes part of the Draft Resolution, which means that it is no longer considered an Amendment.

25.3 Friendly Amendment

When all the current signatories of a Draft Resolution on the floor agree to modify any part of its operative clauses, they may do so through a Friendly Amendment, which has the same effects of a regular Amendment. A Friendly Amendment must be presented in a written format to the Chair for its approval. After approving it, the Chair will ask if all the signatories of the Draft Resolution support the Friendly Amendment and, if they do so, it will automatically become part of the Draft Resolution. In case any signatory is absent or does not agree on the Friendly Amendment, it will be discarded. Yet, it may be presented again as a regular Amendment.

25.4 Procedure of Approval by Consensus

The resolution will be read aloud by one of the signatories. Delegations can suggest, if necessary, grammatical or technical corrections to the document (content-related questions

cannot be altered). After, the Bureau will ask if any delegation opposes the Draft Resolution - this is not to happen, in general. If none, the resolution is approved and the discussion addresses the next topic, if there is one.

25.5 Procedure of Approval by Voting

In case there is not a consensus, the Draft Resolution is introduced to the debate if approved by the Bureau: from this moment on, the Draft becomes the sole focus of discussion of the committee, which is obliged to approve the document or reject it. Just after its introduction, the Draft is read aloud by one of the signatories, and the delegations can suggest, if necessary, grammatical or technical corrections to the document. When this process is completed, the committee returns to the normal flow of the debate.

25.6 Motion for Division of the Question

After debate has been closed and the Chair has started the voting procedures on a Draft Resolution, a delegate may move for the Operative Clauses of the Draft Resolution to be voted on separately. Perambulatory and Sub-Operative Clauses may not be divided this way. If a delegate moves for a Division of the Question, the Chair shall recognize two speakers in favor and two speakers against the Motion if available. A simple majority is needed for the Motion to pass (this is a procedural vote, with no abstentions allowed). If it does pass, a five-minute Unmoderated debate will be automatically granted to the Committee so that delegates can discuss, prepare, and present to the Chair, in written format, their proposals to divide the question. The Committee will hear two speakers in favor and two speakers against every proposal of division before voting it until one is approved. No abstentions are allowed in these votes, as they are procedural matters. If no proposals are approved by simple majority, the Draft Resolution shall be voted as a whole. When one of the proposals is approved, a separate vote shall be taken on each divided part to determine whether it shall be included in the Draft Resolution to be voted later. For the Operative Clauses to remain in the Draft Resolution, a simple majority of the votes is required. The substantive nature of this vote means abstentions are permitted.

26. MOTION FOR ROLL CALL VOTING

After debate has been closed on a Draft Resolution or Amendment, a delegate may move for a Roll Call Vote. In a Roll Call Vote, the Chair will recognize, in alphabetical order each voting delegate, who must state his/her vote. Delegates may vote in favor, against or abstain. Once recognized by the Chair, the motion for a Roll Call Voting is automatically approved and does not require a vote to pass. During a Roll Call Vote, delegates may choose to pass their turn of voting and wait for another roll call round to state their actual vote. However, delegates who pass their vote are not allowed to abstain from voting. Moreover, delegates are allowed to pass only once.

GUIDE ON WRITING RESOLUTIONS

27. DRAFT RESOLUTIONS

The United Nations does not pass “laws”, it passes Resolutions. A Resolution is a way of bringing pressure upon Member States, of expressing an opinion on a pressing matter, or recommending some action to be taken by the UN or other agency. Draft Resolutions should not be introduced into formal session until they have circulated among other delegates to incorporate different perspectives and to build support. It is desirable for a Draft Resolution to be sponsored by several States or by an entire bloc. Delegates should not bring pre-written Resolutions to the Conference. Pre-written Resolutions are not only frowned upon by the Secretariat, but will inevitably alienate the other delegates in the committee. The process of writing Resolutions in committee with other delegates is designed to teach delegates the subtler forms of negotiations and concessions. Prefabricated Resolutions obviously pre-empt this process. When drafting and sponsoring a resolution, keep in mind that the wording will greatly influence its appeal. The Resolution should be clear, concise and specific. The substance should be well researched, and reflect the character and interests of the sponsorship nations. Being a signatory to a Resolution only means that delegates want to see it put on the floor; it does not indicate sponsorship or support and the signatory has no further obligations. For instance, you might be against a Draft Resolution but might want to see it debated to be able to convince other countries who have written the Draft Document. UN Resolutions follow a common format. A

resolution in one long sentence, with commas and semi-colons used to separate the ideas and a period at the very end of the document. They should be single-spaced, with each line numbered in the left-hand margin. Resolutions consist of three main parts:

27.1 The Heading

The heading of the Draft Resolution should read as follows:

COMMITTEE: the name of the organ where it was introduced;

SUBJECT: the topic of the resolution;

SPONSORED BY: list of sponsoring nations. A document number will be given to the resolution as part of the heading and it will be referred to by its number for the remainder of the simulation.

27.2 The Perambulatory

Causes within the preamble of a Resolution, one will not find clauses proposing action or making substantive statements. The perambulatory causes explain the purpose of the resolution and state the main reasons for the suggestions to follow. This is where previous UN Resolutions are referred to and relevant precedents of international law are cited. The preamble may also include altruistic appeals to the common sense or humanitarian instincts of Member States regarding the Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, etc. Each clause begins with an italicized participle and is followed by a comma.

Affirming	Emphasizing	Having studied
Alarmed by	Expecting	Keeping in mind
Aware of	Fulfilling	Noting with
Bearing in mind	Fully alarmed	Noting with approval
Believing	Fully aware	Noting with deep concern
Confident	Fully believing	Noting with regret
Convinced	Further deploring	Noting with satisfaction
Declaring	Guided by	Observing

Deeply concerned	Having adopted	Reaffirming
Deeply convinced	Having considered	Realizing
Deeply disturbed	Having examined	Recalling
Deeply regretting	Having heard	Recognizing
Desiring	Having received	Welcoming

27.3 The Operative Clauses

The operative clauses list the recommendations for action, or state a favorable or unfavorable opinion regarding the existing situation. These actions can be as vague as a denunciation of a certain situation or a call for negotiations, or specific as a call for a ceasefire or monetary commitment for a Project. Remember that only Security Council Resolutions are binding on Member States, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council can only make recommendations. Operative clauses begin with an active, present tense verb and are followed by a semicolon at the end of the sentence. The first word in each operative clause is italicized. Operative clauses are numbered, beginning with “1”.

The follow words are a partial list of appropriate terms for initiative operative clauses:

Accepts	Denounces	Further reminds
Accordingly	Deplores	Further requests
Approves	Designates	Further resolves
Authorizes	Draws the attention	Further urges
Calls	Emphasizes	Has resolved
Calls upon	Encourages	Notes
Commands	Endorses	Proclaims
Condemns	Expresses appreciation	Reaffirms
Confirms	Expresses its hope	Recommends
Congratulates	Further	Regrets
Considers	Further encourages	Reiterates
Decides	Further invites	Reminds
Declares	Further proclaims	Requests
Demands	Further recommends	Solemnly affirms

PARTE TWO LASMUN's Study Guide
GUIDE ON WRITING RESOLUTIONS - COMMITTEES AND ITS GUIDES

**UN WOMEN: GENDER VIOLENCE AGAINST
WOMEN IN PUBLIC LIFE IN LATIN AMERICA
AND CARIBBEAN**

Giovana Oliveira Elesbão¹

Milena Land Gonçalves Ávila²

ABSTRACT

The following paper aims to analyse the diversity of forms of gender-based violence, with a focus on female press-workers and female Human Rights defenders. The research was based on data and reports published by the Organization of United Nations (UN), in order to comprehend the patterns and consequences of gender violence for press freedom, democracy and Human Rights. The methodology consists of a qualitative analysis of official documents, specialized studies and the contribution of the literature on the theme. The results indicate a significant increase in cases of harassment, physical and symbolic aggression, often marked by impunity and that female press-workers are – along with women victims of multiple discrimination – in fact, a vulnerable group. The result is that gender-based violence in journalism not only compromises the integrity of victims but also represents a structural obstacle to democracy.

1. GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) is the main policy-making organ of the Organization, currently composed of all UN Member States to provide an unique multilateral forum for discussion of international issues covered by the UN Charter. The first session of the UN General Assembly took place in 1946 in London, where fifty-one Member States marked the beginning of the Organization's activities.

To this day, the General Debate brings together heads of States and governments at the UN Headquarters in New York to seek common solutions to global problems. The regular meetings address specific items or sub-items on the agenda, resulting in non-binding resolutions, that is to say they are politically influential but not legally enforceable. The sitting arrangements in the General Assembly Hall change for each season of debate, which happens annually from September to December and thereafter as required.¹

2. CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN

The text of the Convention (CEDAW) was approved by the United Nations General Assembly in 1979 and is often described as “an international bill of rights for women” (UN Women). It consists of thirty articles that establish a national action agenda to erase gender-based violence. By accepting the Convention, States commit themselves to undertake a series

¹ Undergraduate student in International Relations at La Salle University

² Undergraduate student in International Relations at La Salle University

of measures, among which we can highlight (1) the incorporation of principles of equality between men and women into the legal system, adopting laws that prohibit discrimination against women, (2) the establishment of public institutions that work towards the effective protection of women, and (3) the guarantee of the eradication of any and all discriminatory acts based on gender, by individuals, organizations or corporations.

CEDAW is the United Nations instrument for achieving gender equality by ensuring that women in its Member States have equal access to opportunities in personal, professional and educational life. All Member States agree to adopt the proposed measures, including measures against all forms of trafficking and exploitation of women and girls.

3. THE FACTORS FOR GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE

The World Health Organization (WHO) defines violence against women as “any act of gender-based violence that results in, or is likely to result in, physical, sexual or mental harm or suffering to women, including threats of such acts, coercion or arbitrary deprivation of liberty, whether occurring in public or in private life” (WHO). In light of this, it also classifies such violence as socially rooted and a perpetuating cause of gender inequalities.

Escibano (2008, p. 71) conceptualized violence in Latin America as “a product of the psychological impact and loss of social fabric caused by the various armed conflicts experienced in the region; institutional weakness and the absence of inclusive and equitable public policies”. The author highlights the proliferation of firearms and easy access to them as elements that instigate violent acts. Regarding gender aspect in the region, gender-based violence manifests itself as a multifactorial phenomenon, being the result of cultural and ideological processes, and of a history of sectarian policies inherited from State totalitarianism during the 20th century. In a context of fighting militant insurgency, repressive methods were diversified and selectively catalogued, targeting specific sectors. Femicide – the murder of a woman by a man motivated by misogyny – is the ultimate consequence of this form of violence and occurs when historic conditions, such as gender inequality, generate social practices that allow for attacks against the integrity, health, freedoms and development of women (Escibano, 2008, p. 9).

Gender-based violence, once understood as a historically persistent occurrence, requires the analysis of the attitudes of various institutions that make up the global community, as it can be committed by an individual, a group or by the State. According to the published in the WHO

database in 2021⁴, 34% of women in the Americas, between fifty and forty-nine years old, were subjected by sexual violence, either by romantic partners or people with whom they didn't have a close relationship, with the global estimate being 31% among women in the same age group. In 2017, the report "From Commitment to Action: Policies to Eradicate Violence against Women in Latin America and the Caribbean", published by the United Nations, found that, despite advances in policies to protect women between 2013 and 2016, Latin America remained the region with the highest rates of gender-based violence in the world. Overall, this data means that one in three women in the Americas have experienced physical and/or sexual violence by intimate partners or sexual violence by non-partners.

Based on the estimates above, when developing an analytical framework on crimes committed against women and girls, the social, political, economic and cultural contexts in which such crimes occur must be considered. The United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women, commonly referred to as UN Women, points out some of the risk factors for gender-based violence, concluding that women who face multiple types of discrimination are the most vulnerable, emphasizing women with disabilities, teenagers, sex workers, alcohol or drug users and low-income women (ONU Women, 2024).

However, according to WHO, the main indicator of vulnerability is the perpetuation by a partner or spouse, given that a significant percentage of cases of gender-based violence are committed by men against women who are in relationships or live with them: 27% to 42% of cases committed in the Americas are by male partners, equivalent to an average of 53 million female victims in the region (OMS, 2018).

4. TECHNOLOGY-FACILITATED VIOLENCE AND GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN IN PUBLIC LIFE

Technology-facilitated gender-based violence is a topic that has recently come to the forefront of international discussions on violence against women. This kind of abuse, also called digital abuse, refers, according to UN Women, to "any act committed, aided, aggravated, or amplified by the use of information and communication technologies or other digital tools, that results in or is likely to result in physical, sexual, psychological, social, political, or economic harm, or other violations of rights and freedoms".

In November 2024, the United Nations entity published a booklet demonstrating that the digital age has served as a facilitator element for gender-based violence, as it makes it difficult

to collect comparable global data. However, regional studies carried out in Global South countries, such as the Caribbean region, report that about half of the female population has been a victim of online gender harassment. This phenomenon is characterized three emerging challenges, according to the 2024 report of the UN Secretary-General, António Guterres: the crescent negative reaction against women rights, the dissemination of artificial intelligence (AI) and the expansion of the so-called “manosphere”, a subcultural ecosystem of misogynistic content that shapes public attitudes toward women and girls. Among the most vulnerable potential victims are women in public office or politics, with journalists and activists at greatest risk.

A study published in 2021 by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) indicates that digital abuse intersects issues of racial discrimination, homophobia and religious intolerance, reinforcing the susceptibility of female Human Rights defenders and media workers. The most prevalent forms of digital abuse are threats of rape and murder, which are frequently extended to the victims’ relatives (UNESCO, 2021). The World Health Organization also addresses the issue, reinforcing the need for public policies (WHO, 2018).

This [online violence against women journalists] constitutes an attack on democratic deliberation and press freedom, encompassing the public's right to access information. It must not be normalized or tolerated as an inevitable aspect of online discourse, nor of contemporary journalism aimed at public engagement (UNESCO, 2021, p. X).

Furthermore, the report reveals that the significant increase in cases of harassment, threats, physical assaults, and murders of women journalists and human rights defenders has been accompanied by high levels of impunity, as many of these crimes are not properly investigated by the competent authorities. This is partly due to the fact that online violence often occurs in an orchestrated manner and frequently involves the organization of State-sponsored networks. These actions are rooted in political polarization and rely on the dissemination of hate campaigns that originate in fringe networks and extend into partisan ones.

The following list presents the data collected by the study entitled Global Trends in Online Violence Against Women Journalists, published in 2021 and coordinated by the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women.

- 73% of the journalists interviewed said they had suffered online violence;
- 25% identified death threats and physical violence;
- 18% identified threats sexual assault;
- 13% affirmed to have received threats against people close to them, including friends, the elderly and children.

Moreover, 20% of the women interviewed in the study reported having been attacked or assaulted outside digital platforms, in connection with the online violence they experienced and the most severe rates were found among black, Arab and lesbian women. Beyond digital abuse, estimates of physical aggression against journalists have also risen significantly, with the risk increasing even further during election periods: UNESCO data revealed that between 2019 and 2022, 759 attacks against journalists were recorded during 89 elections in 70 countries.

5. CLIMATE CHANGE AND GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE

The report published by UN Women in 2023, *Feminist Climate Justice*, reveals that by 2050, around 158 million of girls and women across the globe will be living under extreme poverty, as a result of climate change, increasing the risk of gender violence. The debate about environmental issues is widely present on the international sphere, however, the agency highlights that disinformation campaigns and hate speech are the main barriers for the dissemination of scientific knowledge (UN Women, 2024). In this regard, the protection of journalists' integrity and freedoms emerges as an essential tool for preserving the future of the planet.

The United Nations punctuate that indigenous women, especially those who live in the Amazon region, are particularly susceptible to the consequences of climate crisis, given that the impact on the female populations happens differently from how it happens on the male populations: in many indigenous peoples, such as the Chiquitanía people, women are traditionally responsible for domestic and family care; water scarcity and extractivism make it difficult for them to access the natural resources essential for carrying out their care activities.

In 2024, UN Women interviewed Bolivian environmental journalist Miriam Jeremio who argues that, due to political polarization in the country, environmental journalists are the main targets of miners, which ends up threatening access to information about the climate emergency and undermining the calls for policies to protect indigenous women.

Access to information is the basis of democracy. That's what we're losing if journalists can't safely cover issues like the climate crisis, deforestation, biodiversity loss, extractive activities... (Jeremio, 2024, p. 55)

6. CONCLUSION

Violence against female Human Rights defenders and journalists in Latin America represents a complex challenge that transcends national borders and requires a multilateral approach in the field of International Relations. The persistence of this form of violence emphasized the urgent need to strengthen international protection mechanisms, cooperation between States, and an effective commitment to guarantee the safe exercise of freedom of expression and the equal participation of women in the public sphere.

Indigenous people inhabiting eastern Bolivia

Data published by the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) shows that, in 2023, eleven women were murdered every day in countries in this region for gender-related reasons, and declares gender-based violence a growing phenomenon that requires urgent preventive measures. Currently, all ECLAC Member States have laws that aim to eradicate violence against women, which the bloc attributes to the adoption of the 1979 Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and the 1994 Inter-American Convention on the Prevention, Punishment and Eradication of Violence Against Women. However, legislative progress has proven insufficient as a response from the State, given that national estimates indicate that 63% to 76% of Caribbean and Latin American women have suffered some type of gender-based violence, and around 55% of women working in the press have been victims of gender-related violence.

The correlation between Human Rights, security, and democratic governance reinforces the central role of multilateral institutions, such as the United Nations General Assembly Commission, in promoting policies and strategies that ensure environments free from violence and discrimination. In this context, coordinated collaboration between national and international actors is understood as an effective solution for advancing the construction of democratic and inclusive societies, making gender equality an indispensable mechanism for women in public and journalistic positions to fully play their role in spreading information.

REFERENCES

CEPAL. *Ao menos 11 mulheres são vítimas de feminicídio a cada dia na América Latina e no Caribe*. 22 nov. 2024. Available on: <https://www.cepal.org/pt-br/comunicados/menos-11-mulheres-sao-vitimas-feminicidio-cada-dia-america-latina-caribe>. Accessed on: July 12, 2025.

DE ASSIS, C. *Violência de gênero nas redações: Estudo revela impunidade e falta de protocolos na América Latina*. Available on: <https://latamjournalismreview.org/pt-br/articles/violencia-de-genero-nas-redacoes-estudo-revela-impunidade-e-falta-de-protocolos-na-america-latina/>. Accessed on: July 08, 2025.

ESCRIBANO, C. R. L. Violência e Gênero en América Latina. *Pensamiento Iberoamericano. Seguridad y violencia en América Latina: un reto para la democracia*, n° 2, 2008. p. 71-91. Informe regional. Available on: <https://fiplatina.press/informe/informe-regional-situacion-de-las-trabajadoras-de-prensa-en-america-latina-y-el-caribe>. Accessed on: July 08, 2025.

UNESCO. *UNESCO Science Report: The race against time for smarter development*. 2021. Available on: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000377223/PDF/377223eng.pdf.multi>. Accessed on: July 10, 2025.

UN WOMEN. *Access to information is the basis of democracy* – Interview with environmental journalist Miriam Jemio on World Press Freedom Day. 1 maio 2024. Available on: <https://www.unwomen.org/en/news-stories/interview/2024/05/access-to-information-is-the-basis-of-democracy>. Accessed on: July 10, 2025.

UN WOMEN. *Intensification of efforts to eliminate all forms of violence against women and girls: Report of the Secretary-General*. 2024. Available on: <https://www.unwomen.org/sites/default/files/2024-10/a-79-500-sg-report-ending-violence-against-women-and-girls-2024-infographic-and-recommendations-en.pdf>. Accessed on: July 10, 2025.

UN WOMEN. *Overcoming gender-based violence as a barrier to human rights and environmental sustainability*. 18 abr. 2023. Available on: <https://www.unwomen.org/en/news-stories/feature-story/2023/04/overcoming-gender-based-violence-as-a-barrier-to-human-rights-and-environmental-sustainability>. Accessed on: July 12, 2025.

ONU NEWS. *Violência contra mulheres e meninas continua sendo uma das violações de direitos humanos mais persistentes*. 22 nov. 2023. Available on: <https://news.un.org/pt/story/2023/11/1822802>. Accessed on: July 12, 2025.

**DENUCLEARIZATION OF THE KOREAN
PENINSULA:
IMPASSES AND THE ROLE OF IAEA**

Asafe Carvalho de Brum¹

Renan Gomes Silveira²

ABSTRACT

The impasse surrounding the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula is one of the greatest challenges to contemporary international security. The prolonged tensions between the Republic of Korea, hereinafter referred to in this article, in accordance with international custom, as South Korea, and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, hereinafter referred to as North Korea or DPRK, are intertwined with regional and global strategic interests, creating a scenario where the role of regulatory agencies such as the IAEA stands out. This impasse for the multilateral security system worsened after North Korea's withdrawal from the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in 2003 and the expulsion of International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) inspectors in 2009, generating and consolidating the DPRK's nuclear program as a tool of deterrence and political survival. In this context, the IAEA plays a fundamental role in overseeing the peaceful use of nuclear energy and preventing its use for military purposes. Despite its operational limitations in the North Korean case, the IAEA continues to monitor, through indirect means, the DPRK's nuclear program, providing technical input for Security Council decisions.

1. INTRODUCTION

Tensions on the Korean Peninsula are a major topic of contemporary international security. The escalation of tensions between Korean states and North Korea's threat to other actors in the geopolitical landscape reflect ideological disputes that extend beyond the Korean Peninsula and directly involve major powers such as the United States, Japan, China, and Russia.²

Since its withdrawal from the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in 2003, North Korea's nuclear program has been a central point of contention. Following its withdrawal from the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in 2003 and the expulsion of International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) inspectors in 2009, the DPRK has conducted multiple nuclear and ballistic missile tests in violation of several Security Council resolutions.

On the other hand, South Korea, a signatory to the NPT and a traditional ally of the United States, has sought coordinated responses with its strategic partners while reiterating its commitment to multilateral non-proliferation mechanisms. In this context, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) plays a central role, albeit conditioned by the limits imposed by the very nature of the North Korean regime. Created in 1957 as an autonomous technical body within the UN system, the IAEA works to promote the peaceful use of nuclear energy and

² Undergraduate student in International Relations at La Salle University

³ Undergraduate student in International Relations at La Salle University

prevent its use for military purposes. Its functions include inspecting nuclear facilities, monitoring compliance with safeguards agreements, and issuing periodic technical reports that support Security Council decisions.

Since the expulsion of its inspectors from North Korea in 2009, the IAEA has monitored the country's nuclear program through indirect means, such as satellite imagery and open sources, and has reiterated its willingness to return to the territory if authorized. Although without direct access, the agency continues to exert influence by providing technical support to UN decision-making bodies and reinforcing the importance of the international non-proliferation regime. As the IAEA Statute highlights, the agency's objective is to "accelerate and enhance the contribution of atomic energy to world peace, health and prosperity":

ARTICLE II: The Agency shall seek to accelerate and enlarge the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health and prosperity throughout the world. It shall ensure, so far as it is able, that assistance provided by it or at its request or under its supervision or control is not used in such a way as to further any military purpose.
(International Atomic Energy Agency, 1956, art. II)

In practice, however, the North Korean case reveals the structural limitations faced by the IAEA in the face of regimes that refuse any form of cooperation and verification. The persistence of the impasse highlights the complexity of the issue: more than a technical problem, it is a strategic challenge that articulates state survival, national sovereignty, and power struggles on a global scale (Balbino; Schaffer, 2023; Oliveira, 2003; Reyero, 2023).

2. IAEA DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) is an autonomous organization within the United Nations system, established in 1957 with the mission of promoting the peaceful use of nuclear energy and preventing its use for military purposes. Since its creation, the IAEA has served as the primary international body responsible for implementing verification and monitoring mechanisms in the nuclear field, representing one of the central pillars of the global non-proliferation regime.

Its decision-making process is guided by principles established in the IAEA Statute, which defines its competencies, institutional structure, and the mechanisms by which Member States deliberate on technical and policy issues. The IAEA General Conference, composed of

all its members, meets annually to approve the budget, review programs, and discuss the agency's general guidelines. However, the Board of Governors, composed of 35 States chosen based on geographic and technical criteria, exercises the most important executive functions. This council meets frequently throughout the year to approve safeguards, oversee international inspections, review technical reports, and, when necessary, refer violations to the UN Security Council.

The IAEA's role within the United Nations is closely linked to the implementation of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). The agency is responsible for verifying that signatory states are fulfilling their commitments not to develop nuclear weapons through a safeguards system that includes on-site inspections, remote monitoring, and nuclear data analysis. In the case of North Korea, this role was profoundly affected starting in the 2000s. After announcing its withdrawal from the NPT in 2003, North Korea expelled IAEA inspectors in 2009, suspending any form of direct verification on its territory. Since then, the agency has indirectly monitored North Korea's nuclear program through satellite imagery and open-source analysis, publishing regular reports on its observations and remaining ready to resume verification activities if authorized by the DPRK government.

Although the IAEA does not wield direct coercive power, it plays an essential strategic role by providing technical data that underpins United Nations Security Council resolutions and sanctions. Furthermore, by serving as a forum for multilateral cooperation, the IAEA contributes to building trust among states and strengthening international norms on the responsible use of nuclear energy.

Thus, in the matter of denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, the IAEA remains an indispensable actor: despite the limitations imposed by the lack of physical access to North Korean territory, its technical, diplomatic, and institutional work remains a vital tool for the international community in its pursuit of stability, transparency, and security.

3. THE CONFLICTS AND NUCLEARIZATION OF THE KOREAN PENINSULA: A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

The DPRK's accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in 1985 represented an apparent commitment to the peaceful use of nuclear energy. However, the country resisted IAEA oversight and demonstrated hesitancy in accepting comprehensive international inspections. In the 1990s, suspicions of nuclear weapons development led to the

first North Korean nuclear crisis, which was temporarily contained with the signing of the Framework Agreement in 1994. This agreement provided for the freezing of North Korea's nuclear program in exchange for energy aid and the construction of light water reactors. However, mutual distrust and implementation failures led to its deterioration.

Starting in 2003, with North Korea's formal withdrawal from the NPT, a new cycle of tensions began. The country conducted its first nuclear test in 2006, followed by others in 2009, 2013, 2016 (two tests), and 2017. These advances were accompanied by the development of long-range ballistic missiles and belligerent rhetoric against the United States, South Korea, and Japan. Such actions challenged multilateral nonproliferation efforts and opened a limited but significant space for diplomatic negotiations.

The Six-Party Talks, which began in 2003 and involved China, the United States, Russia, Japan, and the two Koreas, represented the main attempt at a multilateral approach. Despite occasional progress, such as the promise to dismantle the Yongbyon reactor in 2007, the talks were suspended in 2009 after North Korea resumed its tests and expelled inspectors from the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA, 2023). From then on, diplomacy took place bilaterally and intermittently, most notably in meetings between Kim Jong-un and Donald Trump between 2018 and 2019, although without concrete results.

Throughout this process, North Korea's nuclear program consolidated itself not only as an instrument of military deterrence, but also as a strategy for political survival and international affirmation. As Balbino and Schaffer (2023) note, nuclear development can be understood as a way to resist pressure from the international system, guaranteeing sovereignty and security to the North Korean regime. In this sense, denuclearization of the peninsula remains a distant goal, as it involves not only technical agreements but also structural issues such as mutual distrust, regime legitimacy, economic sanctions, and the US military presence in the region.

4. DIVERGENT VIEWPOINTS AND THE STRATEGIC ISSUES OF THE NUCLEARIZATION OF THE KOREAN PENINSULA

Among the central aspects of the strategic themes of development and military applicability of nuclear issues on the Korean peninsula, the core of these is found, above all, firstly, in North Korea's perspectives on the issues of national defense, political negotiation capacity on the international stage and guarantee of government stability; secondly, in the issues

of preservation and strategic development of South Korea and, lastly, in the geopolitical objectives of the United States of political projection and hegemonic assertion.

Let us begin this analysis, first, from the perspective of North Korea, which is divided between internal and, above all, external issues. Internal issues present themselves primarily as aspects of political stability and popular will. These issues connect with the fact that, for the DPRK, military capability is one of the foundations of its political structure and strategic vision. The army is seen as the manifestation of the revolution, responsible for, beyond the defense of the homeland, ensuring the continuity of a socialist construction for the future, based on a combative revolutionary logic, acting to, above all, ensure the protection of the nation against any threats from counterrevolutionary and imperialist forces. This vision, when taken to the broadest level, involves not only security, but also the sovereignty of the country, as well as its possibilities for development based on autonomy. In these aspects, the vision of a militarily powerful nation also becomes part of the political vision of the people, which leads to the fact that North Korea's nuclear programs enjoy broad popular support.

Taking these factors into consideration, North Korea's nuclear program is part of a dynamic of reconciliation between civilian and military interests, since the production required for this type of program allows the government to dedicate resources not only to the military sector, but also to release part of these resources to other sectors of the economy, ensuring joint development, which allows greater control of the power given to the military sectors, preventing the possibility of internal coups in the country, while also ensuring its sovereignty, maintaining internal cohesion and guaranteeing external security.

From an external perspective, North Korea's nuclear development thus fulfills the strategic role of acting as a deterrent that not only prevents potential attacks or interference from powers such as Japan and South Korea, or especially the United States, but also ensures favorable negotiating conditions for the country on the international stage. This can be seen in the fact that, since the development of North Korean nuclear devices and the proven functionality of its intercontinental ballistic missiles, there has been a marked decrease in threats or attempts of interference by the United States and its allies. Thus, from the DPRK's perspective, the program acts to guarantee the nation's sovereignty, the security of its population, and ensure the stability of its government.

As for South Korea's perspective, it is more focused on preservation. We must always remember that, technically, both Koreas are at war with each other; the apparent state of peace,

which has existed for decades, only exists because of an armistice in effect between the two countries. However, a peace treaty, or anything similar, has never been signed, and many indicators show that it may never be. It is, above all, for this reason that both countries invest so heavily in their military development. However, what must be emphasized is that the perspectives of each Korea are very different, in the sense that both countries see themselves as the only true one and, therefore, with a mission to defeat the other side: for North Korea, to liberate the people from the imperialist tyranny imposed by Western interests and promote a socialist nation; and for South Korea, to overthrow an authoritarian and oppressive regime. With both sides maintaining Korean reunification as a dream to be achieved.

During periods when relations between the two sides were more peaceful and nearly harmonious, there was discussion of the possibility of establishing peace and reunification, which would have provided for a single confederation state with two systems, maintaining both governments in a configuration similar to the relationship between China and Hong Kong. However, this possibility, and others, never moved forward due to the political and ideological differences between the two countries.

Considering these factors and what can be considered a growing tendency of the DPRK towards more aggressive measures, especially after its nuclear development, there has been an increase in South Korea, both within the government and among political figures, as well as among the general population, in support for the development of a national and independent nuclear program. This would give the country complete nuclear autonomy (without having to rely on the US) and thus possess a deterrent capability that would, theoretically, keep it safe from threats from the North. This idea, however, has several problems, such as the fact that the US does not support such an initiative; South Korea does not possess the necessary abundance of nuclear material; the fact that the country is a signatory to the NPT and has, to date, been a strong advocate of global nuclear disarmament policies (therefore, the country's development of nuclear weapons would not only generate strong international backlash and condemnation, but would also be considered a delegitimization of the NPT and the IAEA itself); and the dangerous possibility that such a move would only increase tensions and risks in the region.

Ultimately, the US perspective on the Korean Peninsula is largely limited to factors related to securing hegemony and geostrategic issues. The enmity between the US and North Korea stems from the Cold War and American involvement in the Korean War and remains to this day within the logic of conflict between liberal democracy and capitalism versus socialism. However, beyond ideological factors, this somewhat conflictual relationship also stems from

strategic issues. Since the end of World War II, the US has maintained its hegemony over the Pacific, a situation currently being challenged by the rise of China and, now, North Korea itself. Supporting South Korea and acting against North Korea (increasingly allied with countries like China and Russia) is an important factor in ensuring that the US does not lose its influence in the region.

5. CONCLUSION

After careful consideration, we can conclude that the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula is currently an almost unattainable challenge. North Korea will never relinquish its newly acquired nuclear power, as it is precisely this deterrent capability that guarantees the country's security and the government's stability. South Korea, for its part, is questioning whether it should pursue its own nuclear weapons to ensure its security, despite the challenges this entails. While the US, despite its desire for nuclear disarmament in the region, will not dare challenge the DPRK as a new nuclear power. Although this issue is no longer a direct focus of the country's foreign policy, it will continue to seek to assert its hegemony while avoiding losing strategic ground to China, North Korea, and their allies. What remains for international regulatory institutions like the IAEA is to continue monitoring the situation and recommending the use of peaceful resolutions in the region.

REFERENCES

OLIVEIRA, Henrique Altemani de. *Regional Security and Nuclear Development in North Korea*. GEAP PUC-SP, São Paulo, 2003. Available at: <https://www.pucsp.br/geap/coordenador/aseguran.PDF>. Accessed on: June 22, 2025.

BALBINO, Jayanne. SCHAFFER, Maria Luiza. *Nuclear Development of the People's Korea: A Way to Survive the International System? Center for Advanced Studies - UFPE*, Recife, Nov. 2023. Available at: <https://sites.ufpe.br/cea/2023/11/28/artigo-de-opiniao-desenvolvimento-nuclear-da-coreia-popular-uma-forma-de-sobreviver-ao-sistema-internacional/>. Accessed on: June 22, 2025.

REYERO, María Rodríguez. *The nuclear proliferation threat in the Korean Peninsula: Moving towards a South Korean nuclearization?* Universidad de Navarra, Pamplona, Apr. 2023. Available at: <https://www.unav.edu/web/global-affairs/the-nuclear-proliferation-threat-in-the-korean-peninsula-moving-towards-a-south-korean-nuclearization->. Accessed on: June 22, 2025.

IAEA. *Statute of the IAEA – Article II*. Available at:
<https://www.iaea.org/about/overview/statute>. Accessed on: June 22, 2025.

AMERISE, Atahualpa. *Why Kim Jong-un decided to abandon the idea of reunifying North and South Korea*. BBC News Brazil (World). December 16, 2024. Available at:
<https://www.bbc.com/portuguese/articles/c4gj8740vjpo>. Accessed on: July 19, 2025.

ORGANIZAÇÃO DOS ESTADOS AMERICANOS - OEA

**O CONGELAMENTO DE VERBAS PARA AJUDA
HUMANITÁRIA AOS IMIGRANTES E
REFUGIADOS PELO GOVERNO TRUMP**

Bernardo V. Terterola ¹

Cecília Vieira Nabinger²

Isadora Oliveira Marcelo³

1. INTRODUÇÃO

O presente artigo tem por objetivo abordar como o governo Trump tem congelado as verbas para ajuda humanitária a imigrantes e refugiados, seu contexto histórico que levou a este acontecimento, como isso afeta os países vizinhos pertencentes a Organização dos Estados Americanos (OEA) e qual a visão da organização em relação ao assunto. Assim como a situação Internacional e abordagem dos países para solução de tal situação.

Desde o primeiro governo Trump a política de imigração vem sendo amplamente debatida nos Estados Unidos, retornando no atual governo com uma série de medidas para restringir o acesso de imigrantes e refugiados ao país. Algumas das ações mais controversas vistas neste novo mandato de Donald Trump envolvem o congelamento de verbas destinadas à ajuda humanitária a populações vulneráveis. Todas estas medidas comprometeram a distribuição de recursos e afetaram diversas organizações que atuam no acolhimento de imigrantes e refugiados. Buscando aumentar o controle sobre o sistema de imigração e reduzir a assistência, o congelamento de verbas surge de forma estratégica, com um amplo objetivo governamental, mas que tem colocado em risco vidas, direitos, proteção e o bem-estar de diversos imigrantes e refugiados.

Tendo em vista um aumento na crise humanitária atualmente, a atitude tomada pelo governo americano foi recebida com diversas críticas e oposições, retomando com o debate sobre responsabilidade governamental quanto a proteção de imigrantes e refugiados. Ademais, o impacto causado pelo congelamento de verbas afetou diversos países, setores e regiões, enfraquecendo as operações de organizações humanitárias e aumentando a pressão sobre comunidades que posteriormente ficaram impedidas de auxiliar nas questões humanitárias.³

2. CONTEXTO HISTÓRICO

No contexto histórico será considerado a partir do dia 20 de janeiro de 2025, dia da posse de Donald Trump, até 20 de julho de 2025, considerando todos os pontos relevantes que culminaram no cancelamento de verbas para ajuda humanitária a imigrantes e refugiados realizado pelos Estados Unidos no segundo mandato de Donald Trump.

³ Estudante de graduação em Relações Internacionais na Universidade La Salle

⁴ Estudante de graduação em Relações Internacionais na Universidade La Salle

2.1 Alien Laws and Sedition Acts

As Leis de Estrangeiros e Sedição foram desenvolvidas em 1798, com o objetivo de proteger o país contra ameaças estrangeiras e garantir a segurança nacional. Essas leis foram criadas dentro de um contexto de desconfiança e instabilidade de uma jovem república, que havia conquistado sua independência recentemente, e tentava consolidar sua autoridade nacional e suas instituições enquanto lidava com diversas tensões políticas internas e uma ameaça de guerra contra a República Francesa.

Durante o governo de John Adams os quatro conjuntos de leis que formam a Sedition Act foram aprovadas, apesar de serem justificadas como medidas de segurança nacional, na prática, serviam para limitar a liberdade de expressão e criminalizar opositores políticos. Diversos jornalistas e editores que tinham ligação com a oposição Democrata-Republicana foram processados, o que levou ao aumento de críticas direcionadas ao governo e ao fortalecimento da oposição. Em 1800 Thomas Jefferson foi eleito e logo após sua posse ele revogou estas medidas.

Apenas uma das quatro leis aprovadas nunca foi formalmente revogada, a Lei de Inimigos Estrangeiros que concede ao presidente o poder de deportar ou prender estrangeiros que venham de países inimigos em tempos de guerra. Essa é uma lei ainda vigente na legislação americana e que poderia ser utilizada por qualquer presidente a qualquer momento.

Como demonstrado no artigo *The Sedition Act and the Martyrdom of Thomas Cooper* (White, 2001), percebe-se uma relação de profunda tensão e conflito entre liberdade individual e tensão estatal, que se mostra extremamente duradoura ao longo da história dos Estados Unidos tanto no âmbito cultural quanto no constitucional. Essa situação demonstra como, mesmo em regimes democráticos, crises momentâneas podem servir como combustível para o uso de repressão legal que restringe direitos fundamentais básicos com o objetivo de garantir a estabilidade institucional.

2.2 Donald Trump

Donald John Trump nasceu em 14 de junho de 1946, em Nova York. Ele nasceu em uma família rica, sendo filho de Fred Trump, um grande empresário do setor imobiliário, dessa forma ele acabou sendo inserido no mundo dos negócios desde pequeno. Seguindo os passos do próprio pai Donald Trump assume os negócios logo após se formar em Economia pela Wharton

School da Universidade da Pensilvânia. Após assumir a empresa Trump Organization ele transformou a mesma em um império que combinava imóveis de luxo, cassinos e até mesmo uma marca pessoal que viria a se tornar mundialmente reconhecida.

As décadas de 1980 e 1990 foram de extrema importância para a imagem de Trump, nessa época ele participou de programas de televisão, escreveu livros e passou a se tornar uma figura constante na mídia, assim tornando-se símbolo para o sucesso empresarial e financeiro dos Estados Unidos. Essa influência que Trump desenvolveu dentro do sistema financeiro e com a mídia culminou no reality show *The Apprentice* do qual ele tornou-se apresentador nos anos 2000, constituindo a figura do “homem forte” que foi central para sua entrada e funcionamento dentro do âmbito político.

No ano de 2015 Trump anuncia sua candidatura à presidência, pelo Partido Republicano, trazendo à tona o slogan *Make America Great Again*, juntamente com discursos de construção de muro na fronteira com o México e o combate ao globalismo. Sua candidatura e seus discursos romperam a tradição do Partido Republicano em manter seus discursos moderados adotando um discurso nacionalista, conservador e populista posicionando-se contra acordos internacionais, imigração e ao politicamente correto. Trump e sua grande habilidade de usar as mídias sociais para se comunicar diretamente com o público tornaram sua imagem e discursos alvo de muita discordância e conflito.

Donald Trump se posicionou politicamente como um outsider, ou seja, como um político fora do sistema. O motivo de seu envolvimento político é pessoal, movido por sua ambição, desejo por poder e sua necessidade de protagonismo, mas também é influenciado pelo seu desejo de capitalizar sobre funções políticas e sociais que estiveram em conflito durante muitos anos nos Estados Unidos.

2.2.1 Propostas do primeiro mandato

A campanha presidencial de 2016 foi cercada pelas polêmicas propostas de Donald Trump. Elas estavam centradas em três eixos principais que envolviam a ideia de restauração da força dos Estados Unidos, o desenvolvimento de um nacionalismo econômico e maiores restrições referentes às políticas migratórias.

Com um plano econômico que prometia cortar impostos, repatriar indústrias e reduzir regulações empresariais, Trump utilizou do slogan *America First* para iniciar uma política

econômica protecionista que tinha como objetivo fortalecer a indústria nacional e aumentar a empregabilidade. Suas propostas referentes à política migratória foram consideradas ainda mais radicais, defendendo a construção física de um muro na fronteira com o México, propondo uma proibição temporária da entrada de pessoas vindas de países majoritariamente muçulmanos, além de tornar o sistema para a concessão de vistos cada vez mais rigoroso.

Para a segurança interna Trump prometeu forte apoio às forças policiais, garantindo medidas de tolerância zero referente ao tráfico de drogas e a qualquer manifestação violenta. Já no cenário internacional, houve um forte ceticismo em relação à atuação multilateral dos Estados Unidos, com alegações de Trump referentes a falhas na diplomacia tradicional realizadas por meios de tratados e órgãos como ONU e OTAN. Outra controversa proposta para seu mandato foi a promessa de que juízes conservadores seriam indicados para a Suprema Corte, para assim consolidar um modelo ideológico que seguissem os “padrões americanos”, desejados por Donald Trump, e que se mantivessem no Judiciário americano.

É importante ressaltar que por mais controversas que a mídia e a elite política considerassem as propostas vindas de Donald Trump, ele consolidou um eleitoral extremamente fiel que o via como símbolo de ruptura com a política tradicional da qual eles consideravam falha.

2.2.2 Primeiro mandato de Trump

O primeiro mandato de Donald Trump iniciou-se em 20 de janeiro de 2017, tornando-o o 45º presidente dos Estados Unidos. Sob uma gestão republicana, seu governo trouxe mudanças drásticas em relação à administração anterior e esteve marcado por inúmeras controvérsias.

Logo nos primeiros dias, Trump anunciou o chamado “travel ban”, uma medida que restringia a entrada de cidadãos estrangeiros, principalmente vindos de países de maioria muçulmana. A medida foi justificada pelo governo como uma ação de segurança nacional, mas gerou intensos protestos e batalhas judiciais. Ainda em 2017, o presidente retirou oficialmente os Estados Unidos do Acordo de Paris, tratado internacional voltado ao combate às mudanças climáticas, argumentando que o pacto prejudicava a economia americana. No final do mesmo ano, foi aprovada a Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, considerada a maior reforma tributária em décadas. Essa legislação reduziu significativamente o imposto de renda corporativo e ofereceu cortes para pessoas físicas, sendo elogiada por impulsionar a economia no curto prazo, mas criticada por aumentar o déficit público.

O segundo ano de governo começou com a imposição de tarifas sobre importações de aço e alumínio, medida que desencadeou tensões comerciais com a China e vários aliados. Essa política fez parte da agenda “America First” e visava proteger a indústria americana, mas provocou retaliações e preocupações sobre o aumento de preços. Em junho, ocorreu um encontro histórico com Kim Jong-un, líder da Coreia do Norte, em Singapura. Foi a primeira vez que um presidente norte-americano em exercício se reuniu com um líder norte-coreano. A reunião buscava iniciar negociações para a desnuclearização da Península Coreana, embora os resultados concretos tenham sido limitados.

O ano terminou com o shutdown mais longo da história dos EUA, durando 35 dias. O impasse ocorreu porque Trump exigia US\$ 5,7 bilhões para a construção de um muro na fronteira com o México, promessa central de sua campanha. A Câmara dos Representantes, controlada pelos democratas, recusou-se a aprovar o valor, paralisando parcialmente o governo e afetando centenas de milhares de funcionários públicos.

O terceiro ano de mandato começou com a retirada formal dos EUA do acordo nuclear com o Irã, intensificando tensões no Oriente Médio e resultando em novas sanções econômicas contra o país persa. Em setembro, a Câmara dos Representantes iniciou um processo de impeachment contra Trump, acusando-o de pressionar o governo da Ucrânia para investigar o então pré-candidato democrata Joe Biden, visando obter vantagens políticas nas eleições de 2020. O impeachment foi aprovado pela Câmara, mas o Senado — com maioria republicana — absolveu Trump em fevereiro de 2020.

O quarto e último ano de mandato foi marcado por múltiplas crises. A pandemia da COVID-19 atingiu os Estados Unidos com força, levando à declaração de emergência nacional e à implementação do programa Operation Warp Speed, que acelerou o desenvolvimento e a distribuição de vacinas. No meio do ano, o país foi abalado por protestos antirracismo após a morte de George Floyd, vítima de violência policial em Minneapolis. As manifestações, que se espalharam por todo o país, geraram debates intensos sobre racismo sistêmico e segurança pública.

Em novembro, Trump perdeu as eleições presidenciais para Joe Biden. Recusando-se a reconhecer a derrota, ele e seus aliados alegaram, sem provas, que houve fraude eleitoral, movendo dezenas de ações judiciais — todas rejeitadas pelos tribunais.

Em 6 de janeiro de 2021, uma multidão de apoiadores de Trump invadiu o Capitólio durante a certificação da vitória de Biden no Congresso. O episódio resultou em mortes, feridos

e ampla condenação internacional. A Câmara aprovou um segundo impeachment contra Trump, acusando-o de incitar à insurreição após o ocorrido no Capitólio, tornando-o o único presidente americano a ser impeachmado duas vezes. O Senado novamente o absolveu, porém em 20 de janeiro de 2021 o governo de Donald Trump chegou oficialmente ao fim com a posse de Joe Biden como 46º presidente dos Estados Unidos.

2.2.3 Estados Unidos pós-primeiro mandato

O período após o primeiro mandato de Donald Trump foi marcado por intensas controvérsias e atividades políticas que mantiveram o ex-presidente norte-americano em evidência mesmo fora do cargo. Após sua derrota nas eleições de 2020, Trump recusou-se a aceitar os resultados, alegando, sem provas, fraudes eleitorais. Esse posicionamento gerou uma forte polarização política e alimentou movimentos como o “Stop the Steal”. Além disso, ele quebrou uma tradição histórica ao ser o primeiro presidente desde Richard Nixon a não comparecer à posse de seu sucessor, Joe Biden. Trump continuou exercendo influência política.

O ex-presidente continuou exercendo influência política e, durante esse período, Trump criou o *Save America PAC*, por meio do qual continuou arrecadando fundos e influenciando eleições e os políticos do Partido Republicano. Na tentativa de manter sua presença nas redes sociais, principalmente após ter sido banido de plataformas como Twitter, Trump lançou a plataforma Truth Social em 2022. Contudo, também enfrentou uma série de processos judiciais, incluindo investigações sobre documentos confidenciais, pagamentos durante a campanha e tentativas de interferir nos resultados das eleições.

2.3 Relações com imigração

Conforme explica Martin (2019), em seu artigo, recém-empossado em 2017, Donald Trump declara suas três primeiras ordens executivas, todas relacionadas à migração. A primeira relacionada ao projeto do muro na fronteira com o México e também aumentando o policiamento da fronteira, a segunda dobrando o número de agentes de controle de imigração irregular e a terceira reduzindo o número de refugiados recebidos pelos EUA e o também conhecido como Muslim Ban (Banimento muçulmano) que dificultou a entrada de pessoas vindas de países julgados como não combatentes ao terrorismo pelo governo estado unidense.

“O presidente Trump mudou o debate dos Estados Unidos sobre migração. Antes de Trump, presidentes dos EUA celebravam “uma nação de imigrantes”, lembrando os americanos que eles ou seus antepassados migraram aos Estados Unidos pela liberdade e oportunidade, se enaltecendo e enriquecendo a América. Foi um consenso bipartidário que a imigração fortalecia o país, quando a maioria dos imigrantes se integravam bem” (Martin, 2019, p. 7, tradução nossa).

2.4 Propostas da eleição de 2024

As propostas da candidatura de Donald Trump segundo o próprio documento oficial de sua campanha aborda de maneira agressiva a migração, sendo a primeira delas “Fechar a fronteira e parar a invasão de imigrantes” e a segunda “Realizar a maior operação de deportação da história dos Estados Unidos”. Todas as 20 promessas de campanha convergem com o discurso nacionalista de valorização da indústria do país e de linguagem acessível ao público estadunidense característico do então candidato, o constante uso da palavra “América” como no famoso slogan “MAGA” fazem a base de sua política consolidada de America first como dito anteriormente. Outra articulação presente nas suas propostas é a questão da liberdade de expressão, porém também defendendo repressão a universitários considerados pró-Hamas. Dito isso, foram abordadas pautas de gênero pelo documento conservador, deixando claro o posicionamento contrário à implementação de direitos a comunidade trans e nesta linha impedir o financiamento federal do ensino de “teoria crítica da raça, ideologia de gênero radical e outros conteúdos raciais, sexuais ou políticos inadequados para nossas crianças” em escolas públicas. Impedir uma suposta terceira guerra mundial é uma das propostas que ganham destaque no quesito militar, além de fortalecer ainda mais o aparelho coercitivo do país, fortificação de fronteiras e a guerra às drogas.

2.4.1 Polêmicas no período eleitoral

O período eleitoral americano de 2024 foi marcado por intensas polêmicas onde o ex-presidente norte-americano, e agora candidato, questionou a integridade das eleições, alegando fraudes sem provas, o que aumentou a desconfiança entre seus apoiadores. Durante a campanha, surgiram debates acalorados sobre a segurança das urnas eletrônicas, o financiamento das campanhas, o papel das mídias sociais e a atuação de grupos extremistas ligados a Trump, que geraram preocupações sobre violência política. Além disso, processos judiciais envolveram

disputas sobre participação de candidatos e leis eleitorais estaduais que alteraram requisitos para votação, envolvendo desde tentativas de barrar a participação de certos candidatos até disputas sobre o financiamento das campanhas e o uso de dados pessoais de eleitores, fomentando debates sobre supressão de votos e direitos civis. Esses processos aumentaram a desconfiança do público e elevaram o clima de tensão política. O redistritamento eleitoral (gerrymandering) também foi criticado por favorecer partidos específicos.

Essas controvérsias não apenas definiram a disputa presidencial, mas também evidenciaram desafios significativos ao sistema democrático americano, gerando debates sobre transparência, segurança eleitoral e inclusão social.

2.4.2 Posse do Donald Trump

A posse do presidente levantou questões que são no mínimo preocupantes, primeiramente podemos destacar a questão patrimonialista do evento onde muitos grandes nomes das big techs e do Vale do Silício como: Mark Zuckerberg, Jeff Bezos, Elon Musk, Tim Cooks, Sundar Pichai, respectivamente ligados a Meta, Amazon, Tesla/SpaceX, Apple e Google, estavam presentes na primeira fila junto a família de Trump. Segundo a Forbes os três primeiros homens possuem uma riqueza estimada de US\$ 914,1 bilhões que equivale a 42 % do PIB brasileiro (US\$ 2.179 bilhões em 2024). É interessante ressaltar que estas posições de prestígio na cerimônia seriam prometidas a líderes da indústria, mas não foi o que ocorreu no evento.

Entretanto, o episódio mais controverso foi o gesto realizado por Elon Musk durante seu discurso, no qual aparentou erguer o braço ao declarar que “enviava seu coração ao público”. A ação foi amplamente interpretada como semelhante à saudação nazista, prática notoriamente associada ao regime do Terceiro Reich. Tal comportamento suscitou críticas significativas provenientes de diferentes setores da sociedade, incluindo manifestações do ex-presidente norte-americano Joe Biden. Levando em conta a questão migratória, podemos pressentir no mínimo um descaso do poder executivo federal em impedir o discurso de ódio contra este grupo de pessoas vulneráveis quando na própria posse do presidente um gesto para lá de ambíguo foi amplamente encorajado, reforçando o ideal de liberdade de expressão radical. No mais, em seu discurso o novo presidente comenta sobre botar em prática a política “Remain in Mexico” (Fique no México), intensificar a proteção militar sob a fronteira sul, anuncia deportações em massa utilizando a Alien Enemies Act e na mesma medida declara que os cartéis de drogas

estrangeiros serão considerados organizações terroristas, fica clara a correlação entre migrantes com criminalidade na manifestação de Trump.

2.4.3 Relações Internacionais dos EUA

As relações internacionais dos Estados Unidos são caracterizadas por uma combinação econômica, diplomática e militar. Sendo uma das principais potências globais do século XX os EUA desempenham um papel central dentro ordem mundial atual, promovendo ordem, acordos e uma política externa especializada em mesclar os interesses econômicos, ideológicos e estratégicos que demonstram perfeitamente sua influência nas relações internacionais.

Entretanto, durante as últimas décadas a política externa norte-americana vem tendo abordagens mais nacionalistas e unilaterais. Um grande exemplo é a administração do Trump que adotou uma postura protecionista e isolacionista, passando a questionar alianças, acordos e tratados tradicionais multilaterais levando a uma incerteza nas relações entre aliados e rivais, evidenciando uma mudança na ordem internacional liberal.

Para os Estados Unidos, utilizar de meios como intervenções diplomáticas e sanções econômicas passou a ser uma forma de promover seus interesses e influenciar o comportamento de outras nações. Deste modo, as relações internacionais dos Estados Unidos estão em constante mudança, sempre se adaptando ao cenário global e aos interesses do Estado.

Após o congelamento de verbas, muitas das relações que os Estados Unidos mantinham com os Estados-membros da OEA foram muito abaladas, pois a decisão do corte de verbas afetou muitos países que dependiam dos recursos para manter o apoio humanitário aos migrantes que estavam recebendo. Essas medidas do governo Trump geraram diversas tensões diplomáticas, já que muitos governos interpretaram essa decisão como enfraquecimento do compromisso norte-americano com os princípios de responsabilidade e solidariedade da atuação multilateral tradicional. O congelamento desenvolveu uma nova percepção sobre a política externa dos EUA se mostrando cada vez mais nacionalista e que prioriza seu interesses em detrimento do compromisso internacional.

3. CRISE HUMANITÁRIA

Crises humanitárias consistem em situações extremas que representam um risco aos direitos fundamentais de determinados grupos sociais, seja por resultado de conflitos armados,

crises políticas, crises econômicas, desastres naturais, entre outras possibilidades. De modo geral estes eventos acabam por gerar uma grande necessidade de deslocamentos forçados por provocarem risco a vida e a dignidade, levando a grande parte de populações em países que enfrentam estes problemas a sofrerem com fome, insegurança, violência, degradação e precarização. Assim, desenvolvendo uma grande demanda no sistema internacional, exigindo respostas coordenadas e urgentes que lidem com a demanda extrema que a crise humanitária constrói.

Em contrapartida, no contexto latino-americano, as crises humanitárias vem ganhando cada vez mais visibilidade, pois durante as últimas décadas houve uma crescente crise migratória na Venezuela, levando uma boa parte de sua população a atravessarem as fronteiras do país e se refugiarem nas nações vizinhas como Brasil, Peru e Colômbia. Ademais, a instabilidade política, social e econômica que ocorrem no Haiti vem prolongando a crise humanitária na região da América Latina.

Lidar com os problemas oriundos da crise humanitária é algo extremamente complexo que exige uma resposta multilateral que ultrapasse a ideia de uma assistência emergencial e passe a fundamentar a construção de ações que tenham como objetivo auxiliar no fortalecimento institucional, na reconstrução social e na promoção dos direitos humanos. Visando restaurar a dignidade das populações afetadas, restituir sua estabilidade e fomentar o desenvolvimento de um ambiente mais sustentável, onde essas populações não tenham risco de perpetuar uma maior vulnerabilidade. É de extrema importância que projetos mais amplos, que buscam tratar o problema e não apenas lidar com a emergência sejam mais cotados, incorporando seus desenvolvimentos nas políticas públicas de cada nação e inserindo estes processos no âmbito internacional, para minimizar os riscos de novos colapsos e estabelecer um sistema duradouro de desenvolvimento e cuidado.

3.1 Organização dos Estados Americanos e a Organização Internacional de Migração

A Organização dos Estados Americanos (OEA), foi fundada em 1948 com objetivo de promover a cooperação política, econômica e social entre os Estados membros. Com o tempo a OEA veio a se tornar um dos principais organismos regionais no continente americano, com seu papel centralizado na defesa dos direitos humanos e na promoção da estabilidade em todo continente. Dessa forma, a OEA busca propor políticas e ações multilaterais que coordenem

mecanismos para a mitigação dos mais diversos desafios enfrentados pelos Estados, como por exemplo os desafios que surgirem por causa dos fluxos migratórios.

A Organização Internacional para as Migrações (OIM), é uma agência especializada da ONU, ela tem como finalidade gestar, de forma eficiente e humana, os movimentos gerados pelo processo migratório. A OIM fornece uma assistência humanitária e técnica aos migrantes, principalmente aos que estão em situações de vulnerabilidade, desenvolvendo estratégias para facilitar a interação dos imigrantes com seus países receptores. Essa presença global da agência acaba por dar margem para uma abordagem multifacetada que complementa ações regionais, como as realizadas pela OEA.

A colaboração da OEA e da OIM é de extrema importância para os Estados, pois facilita a articulação entre governos, sociedade civil e os organismos internacionais. Fundamentando meios de respostas para a crescente crise migratória, com ambas organizações trabalhando arduamente na elaboração de políticas que auxiliem em uma melhora do setor humanitário, garantindo respeito aos direitos humanos e com foco na minimização de riscos para todos os imigrantes.

Consequentemente, com o aumento da demanda a necessidade do trabalho conjunto tem aumentado fazendo com que o trabalho conjunto fortaleça a governança migratória nas Américas. Sempre priorizando a garantia de segurança e bem-estar, promovendo soluções sustentáveis que consigam suprir as necessidades dos migrantes, construindo maior estabilidade social, política e econômica, colocando muitos destes imigrantes em um ambiente seguro que se diferem dos quais eles estavam em suas nações de origem.

3.2 Congelamento de verbas

O congelamento de verbas se configura em uma restrição temporária da utilização de recursos financeiros que estavam previamente definidos em orçamentos. Nas circunstâncias do congelamento de verbas realizado pelo governo Trump é preciso compreender que os Estados Unidos forneciam cerca de 47% de toda ajuda humanitária global, portanto a decisão do congelamento de forma tão abrupta acabou construindo um obstáculo considerável para a eficácia de atuação da OEA e da OIM, comprometendo a capacidade das organizações para executar as políticas essenciais de seus programas como fornecimento de abrigo, proteção, serviço médicos, saneamento básico e alimentação.

A falta de recursos resultou em uma enorme redução na qualidade de assistência, prejudicando principalmente os imigrantes em situação de vulnerabilidade. É importante ressaltar que essa decisão afetou não apenas os migrantes, mas também todos os outros diversos países receptores que sem o suporte financeiro e o aumento da demanda acabaram por muitas vezes enfrentarem grandes desafios econômicos e sociais.

A sobrecarga gerada pela falta de recursos acabou por expor estes migrantes a mais uma situação de vulnerabilidade, por expô-los às mais diversas tensões políticas e sociais. Ademais, esse congelamento ameaça o cumprimento em relação à assistência humanitária e aos direitos humanos, que são compromissos internacionais que diversos Estados-membros da OEA e da ONU assumem. Esse congelamento de verbas fragiliza todos os avanços gerados pela cooperação internacional e mina possíveis avanços na região receptora desses migrantes, comprometendo a proteção e a governança dessas populações deslocadas.

Após toda essa situação controversa e essas novas medidas políticas desenvolvidas pelos Estados Unidos, diversos especialistas vêm enfatizando a necessidade de políticas que assegurem de forma contínua um financiamento reservado exclusivamente para a ajuda humanitária. Uma manutenção no suporte financeiro seria extremamente eficiente para o fortalecimento da cooperação entre os Estados, a OIM e a OEA, garantindo que decisões unilaterais, como a tomada pelos Estados Unidos, não afetem tanto o sistema de apoio aos migrantes.

3.3 Organizações Afetadas

A Agência dos Estados Unidos para o Desenvolvimento Internacional (USAID) é o principal órgão responsável pela gestão da assistência humanitária e de programas de desenvolvimento econômico e cooperação internacional de diversos países. Foi criada em 1961, com objetivo de financiar projetos que promovem saúde, fortalecimento de democracias, proteção ambiental e redução da pobreza agência, sendo assim um fundo para respostas a crises humanitárias em escala mundial, sua atuação sendo por meio de parcerias com organizações internacionais, ONGs, agências da ONU e instituições comunitárias. Dessa forma, quando os Estado Unidos realizaram o congelamento de verbas, ele foi realizado por meio da USAID e assim acabou impactando diretamente diversas organizações que realizavam trabalho humanitário.

Algumas das organizações mais afetadas foram a Pan American Development Foundation (PADF) e a CARE International que não apenas perderam recursos como tiveram de encerrar seus atendimentos durante os quatro meses pelos quais o congelamento de verbas se estendeu. Enquanto isso, organizações como a World Vision, que possui uma forte presença na Colômbia, Equador, Brasil e América Central, sofreram com muitos cortes de verbas que reduziram recursos e trabalhadores, comprometendo toda sua atuação. O mesmo ocorreu com a Mercy Corps, que atua na Colômbia, Guatemala e Venezuela, com a International Rescue Committee (IRC), que teve de reduzir drasticamente suas operações na Colômbia, assim como a Save the Children que inclusive sofreu com diversas ameaças em seus programas e a Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) que perdeu muitos recursos ligados ao financiamento da USAID.

Organizações com atuações regionais também foram impactadas pelo congelamento de verbas, o Serviço Jesuíta a Migrantes e Refugiados, a Cáritas, o assentamento La Pista, abrigos de migrantes e coletivos jurídicos, organizações comunitárias no Haiti, pequenos coletivos ambientais na Amazônia, grupos locais de proteção a mulheres e redes religiosas menores voltadas ao serviço humanitário. Com a dificuldade de continuar com os projetos em diversos países da América Latina como Colômbia, Venezuela, Haiti, Brasil, Peru, Guatemala e México, as organizações não conseguiram fornecer maior apoio aos migrantes e refugiados.

3.4 Impactos na América Latina

Por meio da Ordem Executiva 14169, em janeiro de 2025, Donald Trump anunciou um congelamento de verbas para ajuda humanitária, o que resultou no encerramento de 83% de todos os programas da USAID que estavam ativos. Esse encerramento acabou com diversos projetos que forneciam acesso à educação, saúde, proteção ambiental e apoio aos migrantes. Impactando diretamente diversos países da América Latina, como por exemplo, a Colômbia que foi imediatamente impactada com congelamento de verbas ambientais e sociais de US\$ 70 milhões que vinham de verbas de US\$ 1,69 bilhão de um acordo de planejamento de 82 projetos que seriam realizados em 2025.

No Haiti, que tem enfrentado uma grave crise política e social, o congelamento de verbas e o encerramento dos projetos afetou os abrigos comunitários em Porto Príncipe, onde refugiados dependiam das verbas dos EUA para conseguir assistência alimentar e médica. Na Guatemala e em Honduras, o congelamento acabou sobrecarregando os abrigos, sendo que muitos deles já estavam operando em uma capacidade crítica antes. A decisão dos EUA, alterou

as rotas migratórias o que, de acordo com os registros da Organização Pan-Americana da Saúde, resultou em 183 mortes, ou seja mais de uma morte por dia, na fronteira Norte do México.

Entre janeiro e abril Trump intensificou as deportações com mais de 142 mil pessoas sendo deportadas, e entre 12 e 15 de fevereiro cerca de 300 migrantes foram enviados ao Panamá sem nenhum pedido de asilo e status de refugiado sendo processados. O campo de refugiados em El Salvador acabou tendo uma queda de 60% na distribuição de alimentos fornecida pelo governo dos EUA, de 210 toneladas passou a ser 85 toneladas, além disso 7 dos 11 postos médicos foram fechados por falta de recursos. Por causa da precarização do campo, a OIM estima que aproximadamente 4.300 pessoas abandonaram o campo, ampliando a crise migratória na região da América Latina e gerando um aumento de 140% na demanda de atendimentos do México. Durante o período do congelamento de verbas, o campo de refugiados de El Salvador foi sustentado por doações emergenciais feitas por ONGs locais.

No total, a estimativa é que cerca de 3,1 milhões de pessoas perderam acesso a abrigo, alimentação e saúde na região da América Latina. A ACNUR teve de demitir 400 funcionários na região e o Programa Mundial de Alimentos reduziu as entregas em 35%. De janeiro à agosto, 341.700 mortes foram contabilizadas por causa da suspensão de programas de saúde, alimentação e abrigo.

4. O ÔNUS DA CRISE

O congelamento de verbas humanitárias gerou um impacto significativo sobre países da América Latina, principalmente aqueles que são membros da Organização dos Estados Americanos (OEA), pois muitas vezes esses países são parte da rota ou até mesmo o destino de diversos imigrantes e refugiados vindos da Venezuela e de países da América Central. E em meio a toda essa movimentação migratória o maior suporte internacional para auxiliar no fornecimento do apoio necessário, congelou as verbas, retirando todos os seus recursos e assim desequilibrou toda estrutura de acolhimento para estes migrantes, afetando toda região.

Alguns pesquisadores afirmam que a falta de verbas afetou programas locais voltados ao apoio a migrantes, sobrecarregou ainda mais sistemas frágeis e provocou diversas tensões políticas e sociais. Sem um apoio financeiro internacional, programas que visavam incluir os migrantes dentro da sociedade não conseguiram atender a demanda e muitos nem conseguiram continuar atuando, levando a uma crise ainda maior dentro dos Estados receptores,

principalmente naqueles que possuem renda média ou baixa, gerando crises econômicas por terem que arcar sozinhos com as consequências da crise humanitária.

A falta de suporte dos Estados Unidos também afetou muito as organizações internacionais, como a OIM e a ACNUR, que com a falta de verbas e o aumento das migrações perderam sua capacidade de resposta em larga escala frente à crise. As operações de campo foram suspensas, os atendimentos foram prejudicados e a redução da presença internacional nas fronteiras contribuiu para o aumento de situações precárias de acolhimento e violações de direitos humanos.

Portanto, a crise antes abordada de forma multilateral se tornou desproporcionalmente, afetando de forma extrema países que até então não possuíam recursos suficientes para garantir a segurança dos migrantes. As medidas tomadas pelo governo Trump acentuaram as desigualdades no sistema internacional, abalando migrantes, países e até organizações internacionais.

5. CONSIDERAÇÕES FINAIS

O congelamento de verbas humanitárias por parte do governo Trump demonstra uma forte postura isolacionista, modificando de forma profunda as diretrizes da política externa dos Estados Unidos, rompendo décadas de envolvimento nas questões humanitárias e migratórias. Essa nova política americana tem diversos efeitos simbólicos, que reforçam xenofobia e nacionalismo, ao mesmo tempo que incentivam medidas restritivas e criminalizam a migração. De forma prática, desarticulou redes de apoio, agravou as situações de risco de milhares de pessoas e limitou os recursos de programas essenciais gerando lacunas institucionais e comprometendo todo mecanismo de resposta a situações de crise.

Contudo, diversas análises alegam que o corte de verbas está conectado a uma complexa, extremamente planejada e ampla estratégia que busca o controle migratório por meio de um sistema coercitivo baseado no financeiro. Assim, os Estados Unidos passam a condicionar o envio de recursos a mudanças no sistema interno do país, para eles desenvolverem medidas restritivas referente ao trânsito dos migrantes, terceirizando o controle das fronteiras em troca dos recursos necessários.

Conclui-se que a necessidade de recursos para lidar com a crise humanitária vem se instrumentalizando como ferramenta política, fazendo com que as consequências do

congelamento ultrapassem o curto prazo e reconfigurem todo o sistema de suporte global em relação à proteção humanitária.

REFERÊNCIAS

ASSOCIATED PRESS. Unspent aid worth billions lacks oversight as Trump dismantles USAID, watchdog warns. *AP News*, 10 fev. 2025. Disponível em: <https://apnews.com/article/9099c61b33aa7e4bfd40e849853be3b6>. Acesso em: 10 set. 2025.

BARNETT, Michael N. *Empire of Humanity: A History of Humanitarianism*. [Ithaca e Londres]: Cornell University Press, 2011. Capítulos 1–3. Disponível em: https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/arts/history/students/modules/hi995/syllabus/humanitarianism/barnett_-_empire_of_humanity_ch1-ch3.pdf. Acesso em: 06 ago. 2025.

BENÍTEZ-RUEDA, Miguel. *The productivity effects of forced migration: evidence from Venezuelan migrants in Colombia*. Washington, DC: Inter-American Development Bank, 2023. (IDB-DP-1307, Discussion Paper). Disponível em: <http://www.iadb.org>. Acesso em: 08 ago. 2025.

BERMEO, Sarah; LEBLANG, David. Migration and foreign aid. *International Organization*, v. 76, n. 3, p. 666-693, 2022. Disponível em: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818322000151>. Acesso em: 8 ago. 2025.

IKENBERRY, G. John. *Liberal Leviathan: The Origins, Crisis, and Transformation of the American World Order*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011.

JENKINS, David. The Sedition Act of 1798 and the Incorporation of Seditious Libel into First Amendment Jurisprudence. *American Journal of Legal History*, v. 45, p. 155-214, 2001. Disponível em: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2840908>. Acesso em: 02 jun. 2025.

MACIEL, Edgar. The fallout from USAID cuts: Latin America faces a humanitarian and environmental crisis. *DevelopmentAid*, 24 fev. 2025. Disponível em: <https://www.developmentaid.org/news-stream/post/191864/usaids-cuts-to-latin-america>. Acesso em: 10 set. 2025.

MARTIN, P. L. President Trump and migration policy. *Journal of Economy Culture and Society*, 22 out. 2019. Acesso em: 07 ago. 2025.

ORGANIZAÇÃO DOS ESTADOS AMERICANOS (OEA). *Migración internacional en las Américas: Tercer informe del Sistema Continuo de Reportes sobre Migración Internacional en las Américas (SICREMI) 2015*. Washington, D.C.: OEA, 2015. Disponível em: <https://www.oas.org/docs/publications/sicremi-2015-spanish.pdf>. Acesso em: 07 ago. 2025.

ORGANIZAÇÃO INTERNACIONAL PARA AS MIGRAÇÕES (OIM). *Relatório sobre impacto do congelamento de verbas na América Central*. OIM, 2025. Disponível em: <https://www.iom.int/news>. Acesso em: 24 set. 2025.

PFIFFNER, James P. *The Lies of Donald Trump: A Taxonomy*. Fairfax (VA): George Mason University, 2018. Preparado para publicação em: LAMB, Charles (ed.). *The Trump Presidency and Executive Power*. *Palgrave Macmillan*, 2019. Disponível em: <https://pfiFFner.gmu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/PfiFFner-The-Lies-of-Donald-Trump-A-Taxonomy.pdf>. Acesso em: 18 jun. 2025.

REDAÇÃO FORBES USA. Os 10 bilionários mais ricos do mundo em agosto. *Forbes Brasil*, 4 ago. 2025. Disponível em: <https://forbes.com.br/escolhas-do-editor/2025/08/os-10-bilionarios-mais-ricos-do-mundo-em-agosto/>. Acesso em: 5 ago. 2025.

REUTERS. EUA congelam US\$ 70 milhões de verba ambiental na Colômbia. *Reuters*, 13 fev. 2025. Disponível em: <https://www.reuters.com/business/environment/usaid-environmental-funding-worth-70-mln-frozen-colombia-minister-says-2025-02-13/>. Acesso em: 28 set. 2025.

SKOWRONEK, Stephen. The Conservative Insurgency and Presidential Power: A Developmental Perspective on the Unitary Executive. *Harvard Law Review*, Cambridge (Mass.), v. 122, p. 2070-2103, out. 2009. Disponível em: <https://harvardlawreview.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/10/skowronek.pdf>. Acesso em: 10 jun. 2025.

THE GLOBE AND MAIL. Trump details sweeping immigration crackdown in inauguration... [vídeo online]. *YouTube*, publicado há cerca de 6 meses. Disponível em: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=la_tNtxtyow. Acesso em: 07 ago. 2025.

THE GUARDIAN. “The gesture speaks for itself”: Germans divided over Musk’s apparent Nazi salute. *The Guardian* (tradução livre), 21 jan. 2025. Disponível em: [https://www-theguardian-com.translate.google/technology/2025/jan/21/the-gesture-speaks-for-itself-germans-divided-over-musks-apparent-nazi-salute?_x_tr_sl=en&_x_tr_tl=pt&_x_tr_hl=pt&_x_tr_pto=tc](https://www.theguardian-com.translate.google/technology/2025/jan/21/the-gesture-speaks-for-itself-germans-divided-over-musks-apparent-nazi-salute?_x_tr_sl=en&_x_tr_tl=pt&_x_tr_hl=pt&_x_tr_pto=tc). Acesso em: 07 ago. 2025.

THE GUARDIAN. Trump inauguration: Zuckerberg, Bezos and Musk seated in front of cabinet picks. *The Guardian*, 20 jan. 2025. Disponível em: <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2025/jan/20/trump-inauguration-tech-executives>. Acesso em: 07 ago. 2025.

TRADING ECONOMICS. *PIB do Brasil*. Disponível em: <https://pt.tradingeconomics.com/brazil/gdp>. Acesso em: 07 ago. 2025.

TRUMP, Donald J. President Trump’s 20 core promises to make America great again! *Donald J. Trump Platform*. Disponível em: <https://www.donaldjtrump.com/platform>. Acesso em: 05 ago. 2025.

WHITE, G. Edward. The Sedition Act and the Martyrdom of Thomas Cooper. *American Journal of Legal History*, v. 45, n. 2, p. 154-213, 2001