**NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANISATION**

**NATURE OF REPORTS AND EVIDENCES IN COUNCIL**

Evidence or proofs from the following sources will be accepted as credible in the

committee:

1. **News Sources**
2. REUTERS

Any Reuters’ article which clearly makes mention of the fact stated or is in contradiction of the fact being stated by another delegate in council can be used to substantiate arguments in the committee.

(http://www.reuters.com) However, Reuters reports claiming to quote any individual affiliated in any manner to any government may not necessarily reflect the views of that government in totality. Thus, Reuters report can be denied by any member state subject to their policy and it is only when the report is accepted by the government that it shall be admitted as persuasive proof.

b. State operated News Agencies

These reports can be used in the support of or against the State that owns the News Agency. These reports, if credible or substantial enough, can be used in support of or against any country as such but

in that situation, they can be denied by any other country in the council. Some

examples are :

(i) RIA Novosti (Russia) http://en.rian.ru/

(ii) IRNA (Iran) http://www.irna.ir/ENIndex.htm

(iii) Xinhua News Agency and CCTV (P.R. China) <http://cctvnews.cntv.cn/>

2. Government Reports

These reports can be used in a similar way as the State Operated News Agencies reports and can, in all circumstances, be denied by another country. However, a nuance is that a report that is being denied by a certain country can still be accepted by the Executive Board as credible information.

Some examples are,

**a. Government Websites**

1. The State Department of the United States of America http://www.state.gov/

The Ministry of Defence of the Russian Federation

(http://www.eng.mil.ru/en/index.htm)

**b. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of various nations**

like India (<http://www.mea.gov.in/>) or People’s Republic of China (http://www.fmprc.gov.cn/eng/)

**c. Permanent Representatives to the United Nations Reports**

http://www.un.org/en/ members/

(Click on any country to get the website of the Office of its Permanent Representative.)

**d. Multilateral Organizations**

like OPEC (<http://www.opec.org/opec_web/en/>)

3. UN Reports

All UN Reports are considered as credible information or evidence for the Executive Board.

a. UN Bodies like the UNSC (http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/) or UNGA (http:// www.un.org/ en/ga/)

b. UN Affiliated bodies like the International Atomic Energy Agency (http:// www.iaea.org/),World Bank (<http://www.worldbank.org/>),International Monetary Fund (<http://www.imf.org/external/index.htm>),International Committee of the Red Cross (http://www.icrc.org/eng/index.jsp)

c. Treaty Based Bodies like the Antarctic Treaty System (http://www.ats.aq/ e/ats.htm) , the International Criminal Court (http://www.icccpi.int/Menus/ ICC). Please note that under no circumstances will sources like Wikipedia (http:// www.wikipedia.org/) Amnesty International (http://

www.amnesty.org/) or newspapers like The Guardian (http://www.guardian.co.uk/) Times of India (http:// [timesofindia.indiatimes.com/](http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/)) be accepted in the Council.

Duly note each document’s source before its presentation in council. Please carry the required reports in soft copy (saved directly from the source and unedited). Also, the background guide cannot be used as proof in the council.

**Debate**

Opening Statements

The debate shall start with opening statements form each of the 20 members present in council i.e the 18 military representatives followed by opening statements by the Chairman and the Vice chairman. There is no time cap on opening statement\*.The delegates should make suitable arrangements if they are presenting the committee with charts, maps or other statistical data before the give their opening statements. It is mandatory for all members to give opening statements.

**\*Since this is a Competitive forum we would insist all delegates to keep opening statements short, crisp and concise.After Opening statements have been given by all 20 members, the committee shall automatically go into specific discussion of the status quo.**

There is no concept of motions in this committee. Delegates will be recognised to make statements.The delegates should make suitable arrangements if they are presenting the committee with charts, maps or other statistical data before the give their statements. This shall at all points in time be moderated by the executive board.

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

Unmoderated Session

Shall not be moderated by the executive board. All plans of actions are to drafted during unmoderated sessions Unmoderated sessions are of a definite time period of 30 mins and can be extended on the discretion of the chairman and the vice Chairman.

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

Plan of Action (PAO)

A plan of action is essentially a directive the council formulates to take concrete decisions to effectively resolve a situation. These plans of actions should be highly detailed in nature The committee can creative while forming plans of actions, keeping in mind the resources available to the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation. The committee can come up with multiple plans of actions. These plans of actions will be open to scrutiny by all 20 members of the council The plan of action will not be voted upon. For adoption of the plan of action, the Chairman and the vice chairman should agree to the plan of action.

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

Backroom lobby

Delegates can initiate backroom lobby at any given time in council. The Delegates must write in a chit to the vice chairman to initiate backroom lobby. The delegates can initiate backroom lobby with Multiple Military Representatives, Single Military Representative, Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson.

**About the NATO**

The **North Atlantic Treaty Organization** ,also called the **North Atlantic Alliance**, is an intergovernmental military alliance between 29 North American and European countries. The organization implements the North Atlantic Treaty that was signed on 4 April 1949. NATO constitutes a system of collective defence whereby its independent member states agree to mutual defence in response to an attack by any external party. NATO's Headquarters are located in Haren, Brussels, Belgium, while the headquarters of Allied Command Operations is near Mons, Belgium.

Since its founding, the admission of new member states has increased the alliance from the original 12 countries to 29. The most recent member state to be added to NATO is Montenegro on 5 June 2017. NATO currently recognises Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, North Macedonia and Ukraine as aspiring members.[[5]](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/NATO#cite_note-5) An additional 21 countries participate in NATO's Partnership for Peace program, with 15 other countries involved in institutionalised dialogue programs. The combined military spending of all NATO members constitutes over 70% of the global total.[[](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/NATO#cite_note-sipri1-6)

**1. Structure of the NATO**

**NATO Delegations**

* **Nuclear Planning group :** The NPG acts as the senior body on nuclear matters in the Alliance and discusses specific policy issues associated with nuclear forces. The Alliance's nuclear policy is kept under constant review and is modified and adapted in light of new developments**.**
* **North Atlantic Council :** The NACis the principal political decision-making body at NATO. Each member country has a seat at the NAC. It meets at least once a week or whenever the need arises, at different levels. It is chaired by the Secretary General who helps members reach agreement on key issues.

**Military Representatives**

* **Military Committee :** The MCis the senior military authority in NATO and the oldest permanent body in NATO after the North Atlantic Council, both having been formed only months after the Alliance came into being. It is the primary source of military advice to the North Atlantic Council and the Nuclear Planning Group, and gives direction to the two Strategic Commanders.2. Composition of the NATO.

1. **Allied Command Operations (ACO)** is responsible for the planning and execution of all Alliance operations. It consists of a small number of permanently established headquarters, each with a specific role. Supreme Allied Commander Europe – or SACEUR – assumes the overall command of operations at the strategic level and exercises his responsibilities from the headquarters in Mons, Belgium: Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe, more commonly known as SHAPE.
2. Warfare development requires expert evaluation of trends and future threats, capability development, education, exercises, and the implementation of lessons learned. **Allied Command Transformation (ACT**) plays a central role in these unique missions, which aim to improve the readiness and credibility of NATO’s posture; they also contribute to allowing the NATO Command Structure (NCS) to efficiently command, control, and support current and future operations and provide a secure and stable transition to crisis and conflict, if need be.

**2. Composition of the NATO**

**MEMBER STATES:** Albania, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States of America.

**PARTNER COUNTRIES:** Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Finland, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Georgia, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Kyrghyz Republic, Malta, The Republic of Moldova, Russia, Serbia, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan.

**3. 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

**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.

**September,2014 -**NATO summit in Newport and adoption of the "Plan for Preparedness" enhancing the Alliance's capabilities in case of a threat to the territory of the Member States.

**Since 2014**

* **Managing Relations with Russia**

Managing Relations with Russia Russia’s annexation of Crimea and subsequent invasion of Eastern Ukraine in 2014 prompted a sweeping reassessment of NATO’s post-Cold War efforts to build a cooperative relationship with Moscow. In the words of then-NATO Deputy Secretary General Alexander Vershbow, “For 20 years, the security of the Euro-Atlantic region has been based on the premise that we do not face an adversary to our east. That premise is now in doubt.” Since 2014, Russia also has increased its military activities in northern Europe, particularly through reportedly deploying nuclearcapable missiles to Kaliningrad, enhancing its air patrolling activities close to allied airspace, and increasing its naval presence in the Baltic Sea, the Arctic Ocean, and the North Sea. In response to Russian aggression in Ukraine, NATO has moved to implement what its leadership characterized as the greatest reinforcement of NATO’s collective defense since the end of the Cold War. Although the allies have continued to support and contribute to NATO deterrence initiatives, some express concern about the effectiveness and sustainability of these efforts. Many analysts, including the authors of a February 2016 report by the RAND Corporation, contend that “as presently postured, NATO cannot successfully defend the territory of its most exposed members.” Some allies, including Poland and the Baltic States, have urged a more robust allied military presence in the region to “make it plain that crossing NATO’s borders is not an option.” Others, including leaders in Western European countries like Germany and Italy, have stressed the importance of a dual-track approach to Russia that complements deterrence with dialogue. For these allies, efforts to rebuild cooperative relations with Moscow may be given as much attention as efforts to deter Russia. Accordingly, NATO continues to resist calls to permanently deploy troops in countries that joined after the collapse of the Soviet Union due to concerns in these member states that this would violate the terms of the 1997 NATO-Russia Founding Act; NATO’s Enhanced Forward Presence has been referred to as “continuous,” but rotational. Former German Foreign Minister (and current German President) Frank-Walter Steinmeier encapsulated concerns about NATO’s deterrence posture in 2016 when he likened a military exercise of NATO member states and partner countries taking place in Poland to “saber-rattling and war cries.” He added, “whoever believes that a symbolic tank parade on the alliance’s eastern border will bring security, is mistaken.” NATO and U.S. officials subsequently rebutted Steinmeier’s comments. Discussions over NATO’s strategic posture could continue to be marked by these divergent views over the threat posed by Russia and by debate over the appropriate role for NATO in addressing the wide-ranging security challenges emanating from the Middle East and North Africa (MENA). On threats from the MENA region, several allies are reluctant to endorse a bigger role for NATO in issues—such as terrorism and migration—on which the European Union (EU) has traditionally taken the lead. Furthermore, many analysts contend that significant budgetary and political constraints facing many allied governments could limit NATO’s capacity to deter Russia while addressing security threats to NATO’s south.

* **U.S. Policy: Shifting U.S. Priorities and the Benefits and Costs of NATO Membership**

Since NATO’s founding, successive U.S. Administrations have viewed U.S. membership in, and leadership of, NATO as a key pillar of U.S. national security strategy. As outlined above, throughout NATO’s evolution, U.S. leadership has given the United States a strong voice in formulating strategic objectives for NATO that align with U.S. national security objectives. U.S. military objectives in Europe also have shifted over time, especially since the end of the Cold War. Today, about 74,000 U.S. military service members, including two Brigade Combat Teams (BCTs), are stationed in Europe, compared to more than 400,000 troops at the height of the Cold War. Throughout the 1990s and 2000s, United States European Command (EUCOM) shifted its activities in Europe to non-warfighting missions, including building defence capacity and capability in former Warsaw Pact states and logistically supporting other U.S. combatant commands. Events in recent years, particularly Russia’s actions in Ukraine since 2014 and increased military activities near NATO borders, have tested the strategic assumptions underpinning EUCOM’s posture. While President Trump has criticised NATO, his Administration’s National Security Strategy and National Defence Strategy both identify European security and stability as key U.S. national security interests and emphasise the U.S. commitment to NATO and Article 5. Administration officials and many Members of Congress underscore that the Administration has requested significant increases in funding for U.S. military deployments in Europe under the European Deterrence Initiative (EDI, previously known as the European Reassurance Initiative, or ERI).Proponents of NATO argue that U.S. membership in and leadership of NATO brings a range of important benefits to the United States. These include, but are not limited to, the following:

* **Peace, stability, conflict prevention, and deterrence.** Many analysts believe that NATO has played a vital role in keeping the peace in Europe for the last 70 years and preventing a repeat of the two World Wars of the first half of the 20th century. NATO proponents add that a divided NATO with a less committed United States could benefit Russia’s widely acknowledged efforts to undermine NATO and the EU.
* **Treaty-based defence and security support from 28 allies, including many of the world’s most advanced militaries,** including a nuclear deterrent and missile defense systems based in Europe. Despite the criticisms of European defense spending trends, non-U.S. allies still possess significant military capabilities, which they have deployed in support of U.S. security objectives.
* **An unrivaled platform for constructing and operating international military coalitions.** Through its history, NATO has developed an integrated command structure to carry out collective defense and crisis management operations that is unprecedented in terms of size, scale, and complexity. This includes advancing allied interoperability by designing command and control systems, holding multinational training exercises, and creating policies for standardising equipment amongst its members.
* **U.S. military bases in strategically important locations.** U.S. leadership of NATO has allowed the United States to station U.S. forces in Europe at bases that enable quicker air, sea, and land access to other locations of strategic importance, including the Middle East and Africa.
* **Economic stability.** The EU, which includes 22 NATO allies, is the United States’ largest trade and investment partner. By promoting security and stability in Europe, NATO helps protect this extensive economic relationship that accounts for 46% of global GDP.

Nevertheless, questions about the value of NATO to the United States have led some to reassess the benefits and costs of U.S. membership. Critics of NATO highlight a number of costs incurred by the United States—both qualitative and quantitative—due to its leadership of NATO. These include the following:

* **Loss of autonomy**. Whether at the strategic or the operational level, forging agreement with 28 other governments is undoubtedly more difficult than maintaining full national control. Analysts note, for example, that U.S. military planners’ negative experience working with European counterparts during the NATO intervention in Kosovo in 1999 (European allies’ reportedly rejected bombing targets proposed by U.S. commanders) was a key factor behind the U.S. decision to conduct initial military operations in Afghanistan outside the NATO command structure. Some have argued that ad hoc coalitions of like-minded allies under unified U.S. command could be more desirable than working within established NATO structures.
* **Heightened risks to U.S. forces.** Some critics argue that the Article 5 commitment to defend a NATO ally in the event of an attack could draw the United States into a conflict that it might otherwise avoid. Others note that Article 5 commits an ally to respond to an attack by “taking such action as it deems necessary.”
* **Continued European dependence**. Some critics contend that European allies’ dependence on the U.S. security guarantee limits their incentive to invest in defence capabilities that would make them more capable partners for the United States. At the same time, President Trump’s criticisms of NATO and individual allies have caused some in Europe to question the United States’ continued reliance as a security partner.
* **Provoking Russia.** Some critics of NATO argue that NATO’s post-Cold War enlargement to include former members of the Warsaw Pact and the Baltic states represented an unnecessary and counter-productive provocation of Russia and ensured long-term rivalry between Russia and “the West.”
* **A negative budgetary impact**. U.S membership in NATO carries with it certain financial commitments, including annual contributions to NATO’s Common Fund (about $570 million in 2018). The U.S. missile defence capability in Europe is also under NATO command, and the United States contributes an estimated $800 million annually to additional NATO capabilities such as Allied Ground Surveillance and strategic airlift.

**4. Consultations with Partner countries, other non-member countries and contact countries**

Cooperation with non-member countries of NATO is an integral part of the Alliance’s security policy and plays a fundamental role in its day-to-day work. Through its pursuit of cooperation and different forms of partnership with non-member countries, NATO not only increases security and stability for its Partner countries but also reinforces its own security. Partnership and cooperation are therefore part of a two-way process benefiting both Partner countries and member countries. It provides the opportunity for each of them to discuss security issues and cooperate in different fields, helping to overcome divisions and potential areas of disagreement that could lead to instability and conflict.

Regular consultations on relevant political issues take place with Partner countries in the context of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, with Russia through the NATO-Russia Council, with Ukraine through the NATO-Ukraine Commission, and with participants in NATO’s Mediterranean Dialogue through the Mediterranean Cooperation Group. NATO has also offered a framework for cooperation with countries of the broader Middle East, through the Istanbul Cooperation Initiative, and maintains a consultative forum for cooperation with countries in the Balkans, through the South-East Europe Initiative. The principles which guide consultations in these forums are modelled on those which have long formed the basis for consultations within the Alliance itself and are conducted with the same openness and spirit of cooperation. The role of each of these institutions and the manner in which Partner and other non-member countries participate in the decision-making process with respect to NATO-led operations or actions to which they contribute are described in more detail in Part VII. Finally, there are provisions for NATO consultations with any active participant in the Partnership for Peace, if that Partner perceives a direct threat to its territorial integrity, political independence or security. The process of cooperation at the national level is reinforced by cooperation between NATO and a number of other multinational organisations with a critical role to play in security-related matters. NATO does not therefore work in isolation.

In addition to the tasks in which it plays the leading role, it acts to support and complement the work of other organisations in laying the foundation for a safer, more stable and more peaceful international environment in which economies can prosper and individuals flourish. In particular, NATO has undertaken military operations to support the principles and resolutions of the United Nations. It is working closely with its European member countries in developing an effective strategic partnership between the Alliance and the European Union. And the Alliance works closely in different contexts with the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), the Council of 41 Europe and other international organisations and non-governmental organisations. These various relationships are described in Part IX. Although NATO has no formal institutional links with individual countries outside the framework of the bilateral and multilateral structures described above, the Alliance’s role in the security of today’s world leads many other countries to seek up-to-date information about NATO policies and activities, to remain in touch and to consider participating in specific projects. The various operational roles undertaken by the Alliance have also served to increase interaction with countries contributing to such efforts.

In such cases, in accordance with guidance issued by the North Atlantic Council, cooperation is considered on a case-by-case basis. Decisions are taken in the light of mutual benefits, potential costs, the priority given to cooperation with Partner countries and the extent to which the values that the Alliance represents are shared. Contacts and exchanges take place with a number of countries, referred to as “contact countries”, that have indicated their wish to establish dialogue with the Alliance. For a number of years, NATO has participated in a regular exchange of views at all levels with Japan. More recently, the Alliance has also responded positively to China’s interest in informal contacts. Regular contacts at all levels with other countries like New Zealand and Australia have also been developed.

In some cases these dialogues may be complemented by participation in specific NATO activities or joint participation in events. The NATO-led operations in the Balkans, in the Mediterranean and in Afghanistan as well as the training mission in Iraq agreed upon in June 2004 provide concrete examples of practical cooperation between the Alliance and countries that are neither members of it nor linked to it through formal partnerships. Countries that have contributed forces to these operations include Argentina, Australia, Chile, New Zealand and the United Arab Emirates