Dear Delegates,

My name is Daniel Yan and I have the distinct pleasure of serving as your director for NATO at VMUN 2017. I am currently a senior at St. George’s School. My first Model UN experience was in Grade 7 and needless to say, I have been hooked ever since. The cooperation between delegates and the intensive debates during caucuses were aspects of MUN that still captivate me to this day. I hope that your experience at VMUN 2017 will surely bring the same joy and excitement that my first conference brought me. I look forward to meeting you all in February!

For this year’s VMUN, NATO will be discussing the Turkish/Kurdish conflict as well as redefining the role of NATO in the 21st century. Each one of the topics will provide delegates with many areas to discuss and debate. Delegates will ultimately take into consideration each country’s stance on the topic, and reflect on the current geopolitical landscape.

For the first topic, delegates must redefine NATO’s ideologies in the 21st century. As NATO continues to progress, it must create and cement a well-defined agenda to separate it from other international organizations such as the European Union (EU). Over the years, the true nature of NATO and its goals are becoming increasingly opaque and ambiguous. Hence, it is up to the delegates to redefine NATO’s status in modern society, addressing its political and economic goals for the future.

As for the Kurdish/Turkish conflict, delegates must work together and reach a unanimous consensus on the necessary actions to ameliorate the existing tension. Furthermore, with Turkey’s membership in NATO, it is crucial that delegates find peaceful ways to resolve the conflict as exacerbating and or prolonging the conflict will reflect poorly on NATO as an organization in the global community. As such, it is imperative for delegates to cooperate and compromise to resolve a conflict that has plagued Turkey for over 30 years.

During your research, you will undoubtedly find that there is a lot of information that you must digest. If you have any questions at all regarding the topics or regarding how NATO works, please do not hesitate to contact me. I will be more than delighted to help you. On behalf of everyone on the Dais, I would like to welcome you to NATO!

Sincerely,
Daniel Yan
Director of NATO – VMUN 2017
North Atlantic Treaty Organization

Position Paper Policy

What is a Position Paper?

A position paper is a brief overview of a country’s stance on the topics being discussed by a particular committee. Though there is no specific format the position paper must follow, it should include a description of your positions your country holds on the issues on the agenda, relevant actions that your country has taken, and potential solutions that your country would support.

At Vancouver Model United Nations, delegates should write a position paper for each of the committee’s topics. Each position paper should not exceed one page, and should all be combined into a single document per delegate.

Formatting

Position papers should:
— Include the name of the delegate, his/her country, and the committee
— Be in a standard font (e.g. Times New Roman) with a 12-point font size and 1-inch document margins
— Not include illustrations, diagrams, decorations, national symbols, watermarks, or page borders
— Include citations and a bibliography, in any format, giving due credit to the sources used in research (not included in the 1-page limit)

Due Dates and Submission Procedure

Position papers for this committee must be submitted by midnight on January 8th, 2017.

Once your position paper is complete, please save the file as your last name, your first name and send it as an attachment in an email, to your committee’s email address, with the subject heading as your last name, your first name — Position Paper. Please do not add any other attachments to the email or write anything else in the body.

Both your position papers should be combined into a single PDF or Word document file; position papers submitted in another format will not be accepted.

Each position paper will be manually reviewed and considered for the Best Position Paper award.

The email address for this committee is nato@vmun.com.
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The Kurdish-Turkish Conflict

Overview

The Kurdish–Turkish conflict is an armed conflict dating back to 1978 between the Republic of Turkey and the various Kurdish insurgent groups. In short, the insurgents demand separation from Turkey, or greater autonomy along with political and cultural rights. The main rebel group is the Kurdistan Workers’ Party (PKK). This issue has seriously impacted Turkey’s industries, such as tourism, and has cost the national government a significant amount of money. Throughout the decades of conflict, the insurgents have conducted assaults in various regions of the country; however, the PKK mainly operates in the southeastern border near the Republic of Iraq. Due to the constant military presence near the border, the Turkish military frequently carries out missions involving ground incursions and air strikes into the country of Iraq. Despite warnings from both the United States of America and Iraq, the Turkish military continues to maintain its presence in the region. To date, the PKK has cost the Turkish government billion dollars, most of which are attributed to the military costs of eradicating the insurgents.

More recently, the insurgency has again erupted following the collapse and failure of a two-and-a-half-year long ceasefire between the PKK and the Turkish government. This disruption of peace occurred in late July 2015, and is referred to as the third phase of the Kurdish-Turkish conflict. The negotiations, which began in late 2012 failed to follow through due to the recent developments in the Middle East, particularly the border tensions with Syria in late 2014. The Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL)-led Siege of Kobani resulted in a massive wave of Kurdish refugees fleeing into Turkey, causing riots across the country which resulted in dozens of injuries and discontent among the majority of the Kurdish population. As the largest ethnic minority in Turkey, the Kurdish population, 15%-30% of the total Turkish population, has been subject to a number of massacres in the past, as well as governmental movements to deny their status within the country. The growing racial tensions and the constant oppression of the national government led to the radical actions of the PKK. The end of the ceasefire in 2015 has pushed the country into chaos. The conflict will continue to diminish the country’s resources if peace is not reached. As the coup d’état in 2016 failed, things have only gotten more unstable. 2017 will undoubtedly bring radical change to the country of Turkey and further consequences to the Kurdish—Turkish conflict.

Timeline

November 27th, 1978- Marks the founding of the congress of the Kurdistan Workers’ Party (PKK). It took place in Fis, in the Diyarbakır Province of Turkey.
August 20–25, 1982- The second PKK congress is held in Daraa, Syria.
August 15th, 1984- The start of the First Insurgence. The PKK begin armed Kurdish rebellions,
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including an attack on the police bases in Şemdinli and Eruh.

February 1, 1991 - The Turkish government eased restrictions on the Kurdish language. It relaxes bans on speaking Kurdish and Kurdish music. However, usage of Kurdish continues to be forbidden in printed material, public gatherings, demonstrations, and education.

February, 2000 - The PKK declares a formal ceasefire and enters into peace with the Turkish government.

June 1st, 2004 - The insurgents declare an end to the ceasefire, marking the beginning of the Second Insurgency. The radical members of the PKK take power, and Murat Karayılan is chosen as the leader of the PKK.

May 31st, 2007 - The Turkish military declares possible incursion into Iraq. The Leader of the Iraqi Kurdistan insurgency, Massoud Barzani states that the Peshmerga (Kurdish military force) will defend itself.

February 21st, 2008 - Turkey launches a ground incursion into northern Iraq. The military dispatched 10,000 troops across the border. 27 Turkish soldiers and 724 PKK militants are killed

August 3rd, 2010 - Turkish police officer and 3 PKK militants were killed after a PKK attack on police buildings in Eruh.

August 18th, 2011 - Turkish F-16 fighter jets attack PKK positions in northern Iraq. Government report shows 168 confirmed hits in Iraq.

August 23rd, 2012 - 21 PKK militants killed. The PKK detonated bombs on a military convoy that killed five Turkish soldiers.

March 22nd, 2015 - Abdullah Ocalan writes a letter to Turkey. His letter expresses wish of possible peace.

July 20th, 2015 - Bombing occurs in Suruç. It killed 32 activists and injured over 100. Kurdish groups criticize Turkish government for involvement and promotion of the incident.

**Historical Analysis**

1974 marked the beginning of the conflict. Before the creation of the PKK, riots and demonstrations occurred frequently. Public outcry against the national government and its unresponsive offices further fueled the creation of the PKK. The beginnings of the protests were carried out by young activists, mainly students who sought change. In response to these protests the government showed no signs of action, hence the Revolutionaries of Kurdish, the predecessor of the PKK, announced a formal campaign for Kurdish rights. The Revolutionaries of Kurdish were much less violent than the PKK today and sought peaceful solutions, including talking to local farmers and workers about Kurdish rights. It was in 1978 that the founding congress of the PKK established its agenda focused on ensuring Kurdish rights. Due to frequent attacks from other groups, the PKK employed armed militants to

---

protect the group, and ultimately evolved into the violent insurgency today. After the Turkish coup d'état in 1980, most political groups were under investigation and crackdown, so the PKK retreated into Syria and Lebanon. The PKK remained relatively silent for the next two years until it declared guerilla war in 1984. Returning the insurgency to Turkey in 1982, they waged a war for the creation of an independent Kurdish state. During this time, many political leaders within the PKK were arrested and sent to jail. After extensive protest and demonstrations, including self-immolation by fire and a 75-day hunger strike, the PKK launched its armed insurgency on August 15th, 1984. This signaled the beginning of the First Insurgency.

Within the first few years, many attacks were carried out, killing dozens and injuring many in the process. After the Gulf War of 1991, the President of Turkey, Turgut Özal, agreed to enter into negotiations with the PKK. The negotiations led to a brief ceasefire in 1993, and the leaders of the PKK prepared pro-Kurdish reform packages for review at the next National Security Council meeting. However, with the unexpected death President Turgut Özal, peace talks were put on hold. In the weeks following, further attacks were blamed on the PKK, and the peace talks dissolved, leaving the leaders of the PKK unsatisfied and vengeful. For the next few years, the Turkish government implemented counter-insurgency strategies throughout the country. From 1992-1995, around 3000 Kurdish villages were destroyed by the national military, leaving over two million refugees in desperate of homes and a national identity. The conflict escalated to a turning point in 1998, when the PKK leader, Abdullah Öcalan, was forced to leave Syria and captured by the government. The PKK again announced a ceasefire, and on September 1st, 1999, the PKK declared a unilateral ceasefire. This signaled the end of the First Insurgency. During the ceasefire, the PKK underwent radical change. In April 2002, the PKK changed its name to the Kurdistan Freedom and Democracy Congress (KADEK). It declared the end to the guerilla warfare and announced the start of a purely political approach to the conflict. The organization changed its name once more in 2003, and rebranded themselves as the Kurdistan Peoples Congress (KONGRA-GEL). During the time of the ceasefire, the Turkish government ignored offers of negotiations due to claims of continued militant attacks in several regions of the country. However, KONGRA-GEL denied all claims and stated that it was defending the 700 camps under Turkish attack. Between 2003-2004, power struggles within the KONGRA-GEL resulted in a return to the old values of the PKK as groups claimed Kurdish political activities would not be possible without guerilla warfare. The KONGRA-GEL has since transformed itself into the Legislative Assembly of the Koma Civakên Kurdistan, an organisation which includes the PKK. It is seen as the political wing of the Kurdish insurgency. Between 2004-2012, nearly a decade of constant conflict has been extremely costly both groups. Bombings and further attacks ensued throughout this period, leaving hundreds dead and thousands injured. During the summer of 2012, the conflict with the PKK became extremely violent, as the militant group aligned with the goals of the Syrian civil war. President Bashar al-Assad, the current president of Syria, gave away control of several Kurdish cities in Syria to the PYD, the Syrian branch of

---
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the PKK. Many describe the conflict between the PKK and the government as the most violent demonstrations in decades. During this time, several ceasefires were declared, but were all unsuccessful due to the negligence of the national government and its refusal for negotiations. After years of conflict, the two groups saw the possibility of peace. In 2012, a televised interview with the Turkish President, Erdoğan, stated that the government was conducting negotiations with the jailed PKK leader Öcalan. Negotiations were initially named as the “Solution Process”. However, while the negotiations took place, several events occurred in the region of Turkey. These events were regarded as a form of sabotage with the intention to derail the negotiations. Groups of Turkish nationalists strongly protested against Kurdish rights, resulting in events such as: the assassination of three PKK administrators in Paris, the leakage of Öcalan’s conversations to the public, and the bombings of the Justice Ministry of Turkey and Erdoğan’s office. However, both the PKK and the national government condemned all three events and stated that they were determined to carry out the negotiations. On March 21, 2013, after months of negotiations with the Turkish Government, PKK leader Abdullah Öcalan’s letter to people was read amidst celebrations in both Turkish and Kurdish. The letter called for a ceasefire that included the disarmament of insurgents and the withdrawal of all PKK militant forces from Turkey. This signaled an end to the 30-year-long armed conflict. President Erdoğan expressed joy, stating that necessary reforms will follow with the PKK’s withdrawal. The PPK relocated all of its military forces into Iraq and out of Turkey. The national government promised constitutional and legal changes outlining the recognition of human rights of the Kurds following the end of the conflict.

In 1994, the PKK had around 10,000 and 15,000 fighters in its ranks. 5,000 to 6,000 of these militants resided inside Turkey while the rest were located in neighboring countries such as Syria, Iraq, etc. In 2004, the Turkish government estimated the number of PKK fighters at 4,000 to 5,000, a drastic decline compared to the decade before. 3,000 to 3,500 of the forces were stationed in Iraq. In 2007, the group is estimated to have around 7,000 to 8,000 fighters with around a third of the fighters residing in Iraq. Current numbers estimate that the PKK has around 8,000 to 10,000 fighters.

Current Situation

In late July of 2015, the third period of the Kurdish–Turkish strife between different Kurdish extremist groups and the Turkish government began after a two year-long peace process. This is known as the third insurgency. It is perhaps the most controversial and violent stage compared to the previous two insurgenices. The 2015 clash between Turkish forces and the PKK broke out after a two year-long peace negotiation, which started in late 2012. The government, however, neglected to advance further talks in light of the growing pressures in Syria in late 2014, when the Siege of Kobani caused an exceptional influx of Kurdish evacuees into Turkey. A portion of the Kurdish population blamed the Turkish government for helping the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) amid the crisis, bringing about far reaching Kurdish uproars in several regions of Turkey, resulting in many injuries and displaced families. The hostility between the groups increased during the summer of 2015 with the bombing in Suruç on July 20th. On July 21st, the PKK purportedly carried out a retribution assault
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and slaughtering a Turkish fighter and injuring two more in Adıyaman. A week after, Group of Communities in Kurdistan (KCK) representative Demhat Agit denied any PKK affiliation, stating: "these are the units autonomous from the PKK. They are nearby powers which sorted out themselves and not associated with us."22

On July 24th, Turkey declared a military operation against the PKK and ISIL. Turkish forces focused in on regions in Iraq and Turkey, asserting their intent to incur many fatalities on the PKK fronts. The resulting pledge of arms caused the PKK to fully pull back from the peace talks and report a full-scale defiance. The same day, Turkish police carried out a crackdown across the country on PKK agents, capturing hundreds. The tension then heightened, with PKK affiliated groups organizing assaults on the nation. The Turkish military elevated their defenses and carried out several missions including bombardments and operations in the east of the nation, such as the Siege of Cizre in September 2015. In October 2015, the PKK proclaimed a one-sided truce quickly after the 2015 Ankara bombings for the November general election. A month later Turkish forces stated that various towns and regions in Eastern Turkey were now under the control of the PKK. As per the Turkish government, between July 2015 and May 2016, 2,583 Kurdish insurgents were slaughtered in Turkey and 2,366 in northern Iraq, while 483 were executed among Turkish security forces.23 The PKK stated that 1,557 Turkish soldiers were killed in 2015 amidst the conflicts in North and South Kurdistan. According to the International Crisis Group, 1,856 individuals, including more than 319 civilians, were slaughtered in Turkey between July 2015 and August 2016. The Kurdish legal counselor Tahir Elçi, likewise, was among the thousands of casualties. The conflict continued to escalate throughout 2016 with bombings and attacks from both groups. The detainment of players from both sides fueled further tension between the PKK and the Turkish army, such as when the police apprehended 73 PKK terror suspects in March 2016.24 The failed military coup in the summer of 2016 has only exacerbated the tensions between the two groups. Continual conflict between the two groups has only led to further bloodshed and needless deaths. Frequent airstrikes over the regions bordering Iraq and Syria are also causing international tensions and possible detriments for Turkey. The situation is indeed dire, and 2017 will undoubtedly be a critical moment for the Turkish-Kurdish conflict.

Turkey

The Turkish forces, comprising of Turkish Land Forces troops, Gendarmerie agents (government security and law enforcement group) and Police Special Operations groups, are supported by whatever remains of the Turkish Armed Forces.25 This is further supported by a system of "village guards", a pseudo-feudal system inside Turkey's small towns and villages. Moreover, there has been a revival of sorts of the Jitem, an anti-terrorism service, which has been charged with numerous slaughters in the 1990s.

PKK

In 2008, as indicated by the data given by the Intelligence Resource Program of the Federation of American Scientists, the quantity of human resources for the PKK comprises of roughly 4,000 to 5,000 aggressors, of whom 3,000 to 3,500 are situated in northern Iraq.26 With the new conflicts from 2015 and onwards, citizens and journalists noticed that an unbelievable trend is occurring as many more people are beginning to support the PKK, namely in large of ethnically Kurdish urban areas in the Southeast of Turkey, with expansive quantities of neighborhood youth joining the PKK and its

---
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affiliated groups. The PKK bases stay relatively fluid in Northern Iraq as frequent Turkish bombs in the region make it impossible to establish a permanent base. Furthermore, its headquarters is suspected to be in the Qandil Mountains in Iraq and Iran.

Past UN/International Involvement

Shockingly, international participation in the Turkish-Kurdish conflict remains relatively scarce considering the number of people affected and the timespan of the conflict. However, the limited involvement of most organizations include public denunciations and suggestions. Some organizations still took part in the issue, such as:

EU

With the ongoing differences in rights between Kurdish and Turkish populations, the European Union (EU) has persistently criticized the country for a lack of respect to human rights and cultural rights, as well as the continual refusal of political dialogue with the PKK. Moreover, the different institutions of the EU question the greater implementation of Turkey’s anti-terror legislation as well as its criminal laws. The EU sees these legislations as a barrier to the peaceful negotiations that the Kurdish groups originally wanted.

The EU consistently calls for an immediate stop of warfare between the two groups and urges for an enduring ceasefire. Furthermore, it also urges both sides to reinitiate the peace talks to ensure Kurdish rights in Turkey. EU foreign policy chief Federica Mogherini stated: “There is a need to restart the Kurdish peace process. The European Union recognizes that PKK is a terrorist organization, but there is a need to re-engage from the Turkish authorities’ side with the Kurdish political representatives and the ones that express their position in a peaceful way.”

NATO

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg expressed a sense of unanimity with Turkey in mid-2015. His sentiments were stated in a meeting in Brussels. Furthermore, the Secretary General also stated that NATO is watching the developments “very closely”.

UN

Within the United Nations (UN), many have expressed concern with the ongoing conflict in Turkey, placing emphasis on violation of human rights and unlawful abuses in the Kurdish regions south-east of Turkey. Furthermore, as the UN High Commissioner of Human Rights stated, the UN is alarmed by the Turkish government’s refusal of letting UN research teams survey the area. The commissioner, Zeid Ra’ad Al Hussein, stated: “More and more information has been emerging from a variety of credible sources about the actions of security forces in the town of Cizre during the extended curfew there from mid-December until early March,”

After such claims were made, the Turkish government gave an open invitation to several UN agencies for the purpose of dismantling the rumors. However, it is undeniable that the southeastern regions of
Turkey are filled with conflict. As the commissioner claimed, the conflict between Turkish forces and the PKK has led to deaths of unarmed civilians, of which included women and children, and caused damage to the existing infrastructure of local villages. Indeed, the UN has expressed open disapproval, but no UN forces have officially been involved yet.

**Possible Solutions**

The conflict between the PKK and the Turkish government is a multifaceted problem. As members of NATO, delegates wield significant influence on military decisions and alliances. And, as NATO continues to move into the 21st century, its role is certainly being redefined as a peace keeping organization. As such, it is of utmost importance to resolve the conflict in Turkey, as Turkey is one of the member states within NATO. The peace of the nation-state is crucial for the credibility and resolve of NATO.

The issue originates from ethnic tension and lack of ethnic rights. As Turkey is a member state of NATO, delegates have access to a range of military capabilities. First and foremost, delegates should look for ways to encourage the continuation of peace negotiations. The numerous claims of human rights violations against the Kurdish population also needs to be addressed. Of course, this is the political aspect of the conflict. As for the military situation, members of NATO will have a greater degree of influence through possible peace missions and participation. Furthermore, the problem of Turkey intruding into Iraq is also a concern to discuss. Other aspects to think about include monetary aid, political aid, etc.

The ideal solution however, is not military intervention nor monetary aid, but negotiations between Turkey and the PKK. As history proves itself, foreign intervention will undoubtedly introduce further conflict. Perhaps NATO will take on the role of a mediator between the two parties. Whether it be military interventions, monetary aid, or other forms of aid, the decision ultimately lies with the members of NATO. The committee must work coherently to resolve the conflict as swiftly as possible.

Although not all NATO member states will find exact points of relevance to their home country, delegates must remember that Turkey is a member of NATO, and hence, all member states have a role in de-escalating the conflict between the PKK and the Turkish government.

**Bloc Positions**

**Germany**
The ambassador to Turkey has stated Germany’s support in the conflict against the PKK. The ambassador, Martin Erdmann has emphasized that a permanent solution is to be found through political talks instead of military action. He stated: “Fighting against the PKK and defending itself against the PKK is Turkey’s most natural right. However, according to the German federal government’s conviction, this problem can reach a final and permanent result only on a political platform.”[^30]

**United Kingdom**
The ambassador to Turkey, likewise to Germany, expressed disapproval for the PKK. He further urges the insurgent organization to seize all attacks against Turkey. As Ronald Lindsay, the ambassador to Turkey stated: "Let me emphasize that we condemn PKK terrorism absolutely. But we don’t just

[^30]: Moustakis, 2015, supra
make statements – we are also actively clamping down on PKK financing in the U.K., and doing our utmost to disrupt their international network and operations.”

United States
In 2016, Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter speculated that a militia in Syria, supported by the US, has connections with the PKK, though both the US and NATO labels it as a terrorist organization. Furthermore, the US seems to be in support of the Kurdish cause, especially through evidence of photographs and videos of missions against ISIL in 2016. US troops were seen to wear badges of militant groups associated with Kurds.

France
The government of France has condemned Turkey for its country-wide bombings in 2016. It has also urged the nation-state to “end its assault on Kurdish fighters in northern Syria.” The foreign minister of France expressed sentiments that called for the settlement of the Kurdish-Turkish feud as it has only gotten more complicated with the Syrian civil war in recent years.

Discussion Questions

1. What are some causes of the ethnic tensions between the Turkish and Kurdish peoples?
2. How have nearby countries such as Syria and Iraq been affected?
3. How has the conflict impacted the Middle East and Europe?
4. How have other international organizations been involved in the conflict?
5. Which countries/organizations/interest groups are supporting the Turkish government, and which are supporting the Kurdish population?
6. How has the conflict impacted NATO? (economically, politically, socially)
7. Why does the Turkish government refuse to enter into negotiations with the PKK?

Additional Resources

http://nato.int/cps/en/natolive/57772.htm
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North Atlantic Treaty Organization Topic B

Reassessing NATO’s Role in Modern Society

Overview

NATO’s rebirth in the 21st century can be seen as that of an aid organization, a democratization and political forum, and/or an anti-terrorism intelligence data network. As such, NATO must expand and redefine its identity from a 1960’s anti-communist organization to a cooperative and working organization of the modern global community. Global politics is changing, and the world’s organizations along with it. NATO cannot simply be the old vanguard of the democratic west; it must become an organization dedicated to global justice and democracy. Currently, the role of NATO is rather ambiguous. Born from the era of the Cold War, what is the philosophy behind the contemporary organization? Another question stems from the addition of new member states. Though NATO has added numerous states in the recent years, should the organization approach further nation-states to join the military pact? These are the main focuses delegates should address.

Timeline

April 4th, 1949- 10 West European nation-states, the United States, and Canada signed the Washington Treaty, creating the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). The 5th Article of the treaty states: "The parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all..."

May 6th, 1955- West Germany, the democratic part of the split Germany, joined NATO. This triggered the creation of the Warsaw Pact coalition. It was created eight days later by the Soviet Union, consisting of eight other east European nations such as Hungary, Poland, Romania, etc.

March 10th, 1966- The President of France withdrew the nation-state from NATO’s integrated military structure. The NATO headquarters subsequently relocated from Paris to Brussels. France rejoined NATO in 1993.

December 9th-10th, 1976- NATO refused proposals by the Warsaw Pact regarding the renunciation of nuclear weapons and restrictive membership.

November 19th, 1990- The end of the Cold War signaled a de-escalation of tension between NATO and the Warsaw Pact. The two military alliances subsequently declared a joint nonaggression declaration. In the eight months following, the Warsaw Pact was disbanded while NATO remained.

March 24th, 1999- Airstrikes were conducted over Yugoslavia, specifically Kosovo. This signaled the first time NATO has authorized airstrikes against a sovereign nation-state without approval from the United Nations.

Sept 12th, 2001- After the terrorist attacks of 9/11 on the United States, NATO invokes Article 5, of the treaty, which details the concept of collective defence, for the first time in its history. The organization sent warning and control system aircrafts to the United States.
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Aug 11th, 2003- NATO signals its first deployment outside of both Europe and North America, deploying troops in Afghanistan for the Kabul-based peacekeeping mission. It resulted in one of the deadliest ground combat missions for NATO in terms of overall casualties.

April 2nd, 2004- Former communist states Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia join, increasing the size of NATO to 26 member nation-states. The addition of the aforementioned states came five years after the addition of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland.

December 8th, 2005- NATO foreign ministers drafted and approved plans to further expand the organization’s peacekeeping efforts in Afghanistan by deploying more troops and allocating more resources.

August, 2008- NATO declared that formal relations with Moscow will be difficult unless Russia withdrew its military troops out of Georgia. Subsequently, Russia ceased all military cooperation with NATO.

November, 2010- During the NATO summit in Lisbon, member states agreed on a new strategic plan for the organization. Furthermore, the meeting came to an agreement regarding the creation of a missile defense shield for Europe. NATO found newly-gained compromise and understanding with Russia in the process.

Current Members

Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, the United Kingdom and the United States. Greece and Turkey, Germany, Spain, the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland, Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, and Albania and Croatia.

Dates of Enlargement

First Enlargement February 18th 1952: Greece, Turkey

Second Enlargement May 9th 1955: West Germany

Third Enlargement May 30th 1982: Spain

Fourth Enlargement March 12th 1999: Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland

Fifth Enlargement March 29th 2004: Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia

Sixth Enlargement April 1st 2009: Albania, Croatia

Historical Analysis

In 1945, the European continent was under the pressure of communism. The Soviet Union slowly crept across the Eastern European landscape, replacing former Nazi institutions. Slowly, Western Europe and North America mobilized. At Brussels in 1948, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, France, and the UK signed an alliance pact. In Washington in 1949, the alliance expanded to Canada, the United States, Portugal, Italy, Norway, Denmark, and Iceland. Such was the creation of NATO.
Lord Hastings Ismay, the first Secretary-General\textsuperscript{33}, remarked that the alliance’s purpose was to subdue the Germans, to isolate and protect against the Russians, and to incorporate the US into the definition of the Western World. All the nations were in an union, with an attack on one seen as an attack on all. Furthermore, throughout the tumult of the 1950’s, 1960’s, and 1970’s, with nuclear proliferation, the Cuban Missile Crisis, Korean War, Vietnam War, and the Space Race, the existence of NATO seemed to be essential\textsuperscript{34}. However, controversial additions stirred the balance of the organization. The once-feared Germany joined the alliance, and Greece, emerging from civil war, was also hastily incorporated. Turkey, a democracy on the fringes of the European continent, uncomfortably close to the communist fervor of Central Asia and East Europe, also joined. The alliance soon incorporated what is seen as “The West” – the democratic, developed, and liberal countries of the Atlantic World.

And yet, through the 1970’s, the policy of détente (the easing of hostility) was initiated. The United States and Russia began a policy of cooperation. Co-existence and participation, rather than aggression, was seen as the path to the future. NATO still expanded, with the inclusion of post-Franco democratic Spain – it was still an alliance representative of the democratic spirit. The tension of the past several decades seemed to have eased into a stiff, yet bearable friction. In 1989, the Berlin Wall fell. The Western and Eastern ends of the German republic reunited, despite European fears over the threats of a strengthened and empowered Germany. Then, the Soviet Union dissolved, and the Eastern Republics slowly assimilated into the West’s sphere of democracy and liberalism – into organizations such as the European Economic Community, or European Union\textsuperscript{35} (EU) and NATO. For the first time in NATO’s history, its existence became essential to the greater “Western,” and arguably global, goal of democratization, development, and global integration. NATO fulfilled a crucial role for Western geopolitical objectives in the 20th century. It ensured the preservation of Western democratic Europe, and the integration of the United States into the peace seeking international system. Today, most countries around the world seem willing to integrate into the West’s philosophy of governance and life. Russia and China may pose countenance to its objectives, trying to assert their own dominance over world affairs. Yet, they have failed to amass a bloc of nations mighty enough to counter the West. The SCO\textsuperscript{36} (Shanghai Cooperation Organization) cannot counter neither NATO nor the EU, and BRICs\textsuperscript{37} (Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa) includes nations amenable to the Western ideal – India and Brazil. Dictatorships in other regions around the world are more or less locked in an existential race with the West – they neither seek to challenge the West nor to compete with it for influence. It can be argued that NATO’s goal is to deal with the threats of Russia in the European geopolitical scene, yet with the EU and the UN, it can also be argued as unnecessary. NATO may provide a counter-terrorist role in today’s global stage, but such is much less formidable an adversary as an ideological combat between two blocs of nations.

Much of NATO’s funding comes from the US, and much participation is also American. It is mostly America that possesses overseas military bases in NATO and non-NATO countries. Perhaps NATO has simply become a tool of US policy in the modern age, a way for it to maintain its hegemonic status through influence, without the need caused by an adversary. However, the lack of an adversary in Europe makes the US a non-essential tool to European freedom and democracy. A lack of demand for US support will seemingly diminish American influence in the region. Hence, NATO is an effective policy tool for American objectives in such an age. Yet, American interests should not compromise global ones. This begs NATO’s existence. An interesting way of seeing NATO in the modern age is as a protector of democracy, of “Western” ideals. Yet, many NATO countries have amicable alliances with non-NATO countries, such as South Korea, Japan, the Philippines, India, Australia, New Zealand, and
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other states. If NATO is a military alliance for democratic ideals, then surely there is a place for Japan, the Philippines, and South Korea. Yet, this has not occurred. One may alternatively interpret NATO as a regional alliance. However, do not the EU, the AU, and ASEAN suffice as regional alliances?

There are regional and global cooperative organizations – EU, the AU, ASEAN, the UN, the UNSC, the IMF, and the World Bank. There are military alliances between groups of countries that are far more flexible and far more utilitarian and realistic than NATO. In 2016, the Western Democratic Ideal holds more appeal to the people of the world than it ever has. Fringe groups espousing nationalism and xenophobia may exist, but no country can pose the existential threat that Nazi Germany once posed – and it is unlikely that Russia, and the extremely pragmatic rulers of China, will seek to exert world domination or execute horrendous ethnic genocide. Rather, their only goals will be to right what, in their perspectives, are historical and political wrongs. Global alliances and politics such as the UN – the modern international order – will make a new World War Three an unlikely possibility. NATO may be simply a preservation of a Cold War mentality in the post-Cold War world. A more pragmatic approach to modern day politics would be the fostering of connections around the world. NATO in many ways is ideologically, geographically, and culturally too myopic to exist in 2016. Terrorism and rogue states still are in 2016. The breaching of the Berlin wall in 1989 threatened to wash away many of the concepts and institutions around which the West had gathered during the Cold War. In essence, people were uncertain of the future, post-Cold War. Policy-makers and other analysts were tested to the limit by questions which were either impossibly abstract or only barely concrete. Without a clear, convincing military danger, there is no rationale for the complex and expensive organizations—principally NATO—the West had maintained during the Cold War. What should be NATO’s structure, missions, and membership? Cold War NATO was built around a relationship between the United States and its west European allies; a relationship which was complex and mercurial, but which nevertheless lasted for decades.

In more recent times, NATO is defined by its activities in Afghanistan, taking over peacekeeping missions and employing many of its troops. Moreover, in the summer of 2016, NATO continues its activities near the Russian border, prompting the Russian military to undergo retaliatory measures. This has prompted the building of military and the growing tension between two radically groups. The core remnant of the Warsaw Pact is seemingly challenged by the old institutions which led to the creation of the aforementioned Pact. However, the clear cut goal of NATO is not clear, further contributing to the need for a reform in the aims and goals of NATO in contemporary society.

Current Situation

The addition of any member must be ratified by all existing member states, as stated in Article 10 of the North Atlantic Treaty: “The Parties may by unanimous agreement, invite any other European State in a position to further the principles of this Treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area to accede to this Treaty. Any State so invited may become a Party to the Treaty by depositing its instrument of accession with the Government of the United States of America. The Government of the United States of America will inform each of the Parties of the deposit of each such instrument of accession.”

As of current, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Montenegro and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia have expressed interest in joining the organization. NATO maintains its “open door” policy, welcoming all nation-states.
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The accession process comprises of seven stages:

1. Talks with a NATO team: Nation-states interested in joining NATO send groups of representatives for talks held at the NATO Headquarters in Brussels. These groups undergo lengthy discussions with NATO experts resulting in formal confirmations from interested countries. This demonstrates commitment and shows a willingness to meet NATO’s obligations in political, legal, and military aspects, as stated by the Washington Treaty. Generally, the talks take place in two sessions with each country. The first talk is centered around political, defense, and military issues, giving interested countries an opportunity to fulfill preconditions for membership. The second session is much more technical, including discussions over resources, security, legal rights, and the contribution of new member states to NATO’s budget. The latter is based on the size of the country’s economy relative to other member countries. Furthermore, security measures must be taken; invitee countries must ensure the protection of classified NATO files through the cooperation of intelligence agencies and the NATO Office of Security. Once all of the aforementioned conditions are met, changes are rather permanent in that the discussions will yield a timetable for invitee countries, outlining the reforms they must carry out to join NATO.

2. Sending letters of intent to NATO with reformed timetables: During the second stage of the accession process, the invitee countries must provide confirmation of their acceptance to the reforms set out by NATO in the form of a letter of intent. The letter will outline the acceptance of different obligations and duties as new member states. Along with a formally submitted timetable of reforms, the letter of intent is crucial for the accession of any invitee nation-state.

3. NATO signs the accession protocols: Once all the preconditions are met, NATO prepares the Accession Protocols outlined in the Washington Treaty. In essence, these protocols are amendments and changes to the Treaty. Furthermore, these protocols are all signed and ratified by the existing members of NATO.

4. Accession protocols are then ratified by NATO: After the preparation of the accession protocols, the next step in joining NATO consists of ratification by the existing member-states. The existing members ratify the protocols in accordance with their own national governmental procedures. For instance, the United States will require a two-thirds majority to pass legislation in the Senate.

5. Invitee countries accede to the North Atlantic Treaty: The Secretary General invites joining members to agree to the North Atlantic Treaty by notifying the US government, which is the depository of the Washington Treaty. Once the US government is notified of the invitee countries’ acceptance of the Treaty, the formal process of accession quickly occurs.

6. The invitee member-states accede the North Atlantic Treaty: Once the aforementioned steps are completed, the individual member-states then accede to the North Atlantic Treaty in accordance with their own governmental procedures, similar to step 3.

7. Becoming a member: Once the invitee countries deposit and solidify their terms of membership with the US State Department and accedes the North Atlantic Treaty, the invitee countries formally join NATO and become participating member states in the alliance.

The ideologies of the 20th century stemmed from the equality of military might and political power between nation-states. Any deviation from this belief meant a displacement of power, leading to conflict and tension. Undoubtedly, this was the reality that unfolded throughout Europe. The creation
of military pacts and alliances demolished the balance between different hegemonic powers. This tension due to an imbalance of power was known as the Cold War. Citizens around the world feared for imminent nuclear doom, either triggered by the Soviet Union, the United States, or both. However, seeing the dramatic results of such a power imbalance, what is the reason for NATO's existence in modern society? Surely it cannot be one of aggravation of non-member states. Perhaps the answer lies in possible expansion. The restrictive nature of NATO has led to a tight and small circulation of weapons and international influence, most notably vested in countries such as the United States, UK, France, etc. However, as the global community continues to expand and increase in size, perhaps a more unified landscape is required to foster further peace and facilitate better trade between nation-states. The existence of NATO is unique, with member states pledging under the same political, legal, and military pact. The addition of new member states will certainly bring an overhaul to the economies of the existing members. For better or worse, the addition of new member states is inevitable as the world continues to progress into the 21st century. Perhaps NATO will ultimately become an unifying organization for more than just Europe, the US and Canada. Unlike the UN, ASEAN, and other organizations, NATO has far more heritage and history than most other organizations, and exercises more freedom in the way it operates. Adding new member states will ultimately contribute to the overlying theme of redefining NATO. The modern position and goal of NATO is one of ambiguity and mystery. Without further action, NATO could potentially assimilate into another UN body, losing its unique identity as well as the position it holds in the global community. What separates NATO from other organizations?

Past UN/International Involvement

The single most important treaty is the North Atlantic Treaty, sometimes called the Washington treaty as it was drafted in D.C., on April 4th, 1949. The beginning of the Treaty signals the basic affirmations and guidelines for its members, and creates the sense of a true alliance. As stated in the Treaty:

“The Parties to this Treaty reaffirm their faith in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all governments. They are determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law. They seek to promote stability and well-being in the North Atlantic area. They are resolved to unite their efforts for collective defense and for the preservation of peace and security. They therefore agree to this North Atlantic Treaty.”

The importance of this document lies in the unity of military, political, and legal might it provides.

Possible Solutions

Redefining the Mandate

The ultimate goal of this session of NATO is to redefine its status in present day; it needs to redefine the articles on which it was based. In addition to changing existing articles, adding new articles and amendments to specify the direction and goals of NATO is something that is crucial and necessary. Perhaps countries can focus on their own agendas through this process. Whether it is advancing military, economic, or social status within NATO, the chance to redefine and renew the founding principles of the organization is one that could change the political landscape of any member state. As there are several articles and documents that led to the creation of NATO, each country can and should...
work towards the addition or the amendment of one or more documents to suit the goals of NATO in modern times. One aspect that countries can focus on is the possible revision on the process of adding new member states. Depending on the direction of NATO, perhaps it is more beneficial to seek and incorporate new nation-states, or limit and close off NATO as an exclusive organization with a central focus other than being a military pact.

Potential Members

Within Europe
With the exception of two countries, the U.S. and Canada, NATO operates within Europe, and all its member states are European countries. Perhaps new potential members should only be European member states. For instance, the addition of Ukraine could be beneficial to the political and social influence within the region. Ukraine has suffered under the oppression of modern day Russia. Furthermore, Russia also poses a constant threat to NATO. The first and founding member of the bygone Warsaw Pact has proven its unwillingness to cooperate with NATO in the past. Perhaps the addition of Ukraine and aligning it to NATO principles could be a strategic way to gain a foothold within the region. Furthermore, the addition of other European states such as Georgia, Sweden, etc. could also be beneficial to NATO. The expansion to include these new member states will undoubtedly translate to a large increase in economic and political influence in Europe. Perhaps NATO will expand into an organization that can both replace and improve the existing EU. With Britain's recent resignation from the EU, there is room for NATO to grow as potential doubts arise over EU membership. To unify Europe under NATO could also be the ultimate goal of adding new potential member states.

Beyond Europe
To expand beyond Europe is not a new concept to NATO. The U.S. and Canada slowly became influential member states within the organization. Perhaps further expansion beyond Europe is the direction NATO is headed. To become an organization that encapsulates more than just military actions. For instance, the addition of Mexico as a potential member state could be pivotal for NATO. The country encompasses both a large landmass and valuable resources. The addition of Mexico would be a step to incorporate the entirety of the North Atlantic Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) into NATO. Perhaps the aim of adding Mexico is for economical purposes. With a potential shift from a militaristic to a more economic organization, Mexico will be a crucial member, due to its resources such as copper, tin, and petroleum. However, the addition of Mexico would also entail absorbing the conflicts that exist within the country. The perpetual struggle between drug cartels and the government could heavily influence the way Mexico participates in NATO, and reflect poorly on the organization, due to the country's widespread corruption. Some could argue that the addition of other nation-states outside Europe could bring further complications and difficulties, especially in regions where there are drastically different political ideologies. Hence, it begs the question: should NATO focus solely on European countries, or perhaps look towards the international community in terms of membership expansion?

The possible end goal of NATO could be to become something that the UN cannot even fathom: a functional organization with capabilities in all aspects and the true ability to make an impact in different countries. Or, this is perhaps far too radical for the present NATO to adopt. It is perhaps the most comprehensive topic NATO has faced. Redefining an organization with decades of history is delicate but necessary. NATO must stand out in the face of new global trends and
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organizations. In the face of terror, capitalist centered economies, and nuclear technology, what is the true role of NATO? It is crucial to note that perhaps the addition of new member states might bring new solutions to the floor. Through the process of accession, other member states will surely find ways in which invitee countries either align or derail with the general direction of NATO. Furthermore, the addition of new states will surely increase the influence of NATO and the political and military might it possesses. Should NATO undergo radical reform and change itself from a military based alliance to an economic and or politic based organization? If not, should NATO just assimilate into one of the other international organizations such as the UN and become an extension of committees such as the Security Council? Undoubtedly, that is a possible outcome if NATO continues to operate without a clear ideology. That is the current situation of NATO. It is merely drifting in a time where changes are often radical and rapid, and organizations are left behind if they cannot keep up. The ways to redefine NATO are endless. But, the reform process must be undertaken in order to keep up with the changes of the 21\textsuperscript{st} century. Delegates must keep in mind of NATO’s history and background when approaching such a vast and abstract topic.

**Discussion Questions**

1. What distinguishes NATO from other international organizations?
2. How has NATO evolved through the decades?
3. What are some challenges NATO will face in the upcoming decades?
4. How will NATO redefine itself in the 21\textsuperscript{st} century?
5. Will the addition of new member states aid or hinder the growth of NATO?
6. What possible nation-states should be considered to join NATO?
7. How have individual countries impacted the development of NATO?
8. What is NATO’s impact on the global community compared to other international organizations?
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