

The Doon School Model United Nations
Conference 2019

Background Guide

North Atlantic Treaty Organization





DSMUN '19

Secretary General

Vikram Jain

President

Nandil B. Sarma

Chairperson

Arsh Ashdir

Deputy Chairpersons

Inderveer S. Oberoi

Vedang Patel

THE DOON SCHOOL,

Mall Road,

Dehradun-248001,

UK, India

chair.nato@doonschool.comwww.dsmun.in**Secretary General's Address**

Dear delegates,

As the Secretary General, It is my honour and privilege to welcome you all to the 13th Doon School Model United Nations Conference. DSMUN has been growing exponentially and actively augmenting the level and intensity of crises, debate and co-operation with each passing year. It is a legacy that we hope to continue and reinforce with this year's conference.

In an ever volatile, dynamic and adaptive international status-quo, it becomes increasingly vital for us as students- and thereby potential actors in the same system of compromise- to deliberate, discuss and formulate the groundwork of bi-lateral and multi-lateral ties that are to be established in the future.

With firm precedence, it would not be wrong to say that delegates, having attended this conference in the past, have developed a deeper and a more empirical understanding of diplomacy, compromise and conflict. While the Viceroy's Executive Council strives to ensure the peaceful transfer of power from the British to the Indian Union in 1946, the NATO contemplates the feasibility of occupying Antarctica. From condemning theocracies to enforcing climate laws, DSMUN will be an invigorating amalgamation of resolving and debating dissidence, dispute and disparity.

Besides whiling away my time watching typical Netflix Rom-coms, I find myself engrossed in reading about the framework and history of international and national politics. I am in- charge of the historical and political society and the editor of various publications in school. Having participated in various MUNs in India and abroad, I have had the opportunity to serve DSMUN in various capacities, and subsequently feel privileged to be given the opportunity to be at the organisational apex of the conference this year.

I eagerly await your presence at Chandbagh.

Warm regards,

Vikram Jain



DSMUN '19

Secretary General

Vikram Jain

President

Nandil B. Sarma

Chairperson

Arsh Ashdir

Deputy Chairpersons

Inderveer S. Oberoi

Vedang Patel

THE DOON SCHOOL,

Mall Road,

Dehradun-248001,

UK, India

chair.nato@doonschool.comwww.dsmun.in**President's Address**

Greetings!

As the President of the Doon School Model United Nations Society, it gives me immense pleasure to invite you to the 13th Session of the Doon School Model United Nations Conference. Being at the pinnacle of a conference that finds itself amidst the top ranks in the country, both in terms of global outreach and quality, has been an absolute honour. However, we at Doon constantly strive to outdo ourselves and promise that this edition of DSMUN will outdo all of its predecessors be it in terms of organizational skill, quality of debate or participation not just from the South Asian region but from around the world. It is with this vision in mind that I extend my heartiest welcome to each one of you to this year's conference.

The scope of this year's DSMUN will not remain confined to conventional committees. Keeping this in mind, we have expanded DSMUN's committee choices incorporating some bold and new ideas. With the introduction of highly challenging committees such as Lincoln's War Cabinet (1864), Viceroy's Executive Council (1946), Union Council of Ministers (1984) and the Rajya Sabha, we aim to pull off a conference not limited to one's imagination. This year's committees are aimed at developing informative deliberations and solutions to issues: both of global and national significance. Discussions pertaining to context of historical events allows one to explore the multitude of possibilities and find answers to the fundamental question of 'what if'. Having said so, the essential Model UN committees still remain intact providing an interesting challenge in terms of debate, wit and diplomacy to one and all.

As for myself, I am currently surviving the ISC curriculum and hold a keen interest in Politics and History. I deeply enjoy playing sports be it athletics or football. If not on the sports field, you can probably catch me commenting on Tottenham Hotspurs bleak chances of clinching a trophy. I also serve as the School Captain of the Doon School and the Editor-in-Chief of the Yearbook, one of the school's flagship publications.

Looking forward to seeing you all in August.

Warm Regards,

Nandil B. Sarma

Introduction to the committee

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization, commonly known as NATO or the Washington treaty, is a military alliance signed in Washington D.C on the 4th April 1949. The organization initially started off with 12 states, its founding members. Any country, which is located in the Euro- Atlantic area can join the organization if the required criteria are met. More members increase the strength of the organization and make it more capable to tackle issues. Presently, 29 countries bordering the North Atlantic Ocean are a part of the organization. NATO was formed during the cold war with its primary purpose being to defend member nations from the Soviet Union. Later the Warsaw pact, consisting of the Soviet Union and some of its neighbouring satellite states, was formed to counterbalance the NATO. The treaty consists of 14 articles which serve as the base on which the treaty was established.

NATO stands by its founding principles and is based on the idea of collective defence. Article 5, which mentions that any armed attack against a member of the treaty will be considered as an attack against them all. It believes in protecting the citizens and territories or all of its members and it will stand united to prevent conflict.

Article 5 has only been invoked once in the past after the 9/11 attacks in the United States of America. NATO responded by assisting the USA in the war in Afghanistan. Once it was at its peak, 130,000 troops were deployed.

In recent years, NATO has had a vital role in fighting terrorism around the world. Currently, NATO is involved in operations in Kosovo, Mediterranean and Afghanistan. It is also training Iraqi forces so that they can better protect their country from ISIS.

All the member states are required to contribute 2% of their GDP to NATO for defence. The largest contributor is the United States of America. Every country also contributes to providing equipment like fighter jets and troops.

Over the course of the past 4 years, European countries and Canada have spent an approximate of more than 46 billion USD.

With time, NATO has diversified and expanded its objectives and goals. It is a huge contributor to global peace and combats several issues like terrorism and cyber terrorism and is now a huge contributor to global peace and security. It also works in cooperation with over 40 partner countries and organizations like the United Nations, the African Union and the European Union.

Agenda 1

Occupation of Antarctica

Introduction

Antarctica is a vast, uninhabited land abundant with resources. It is regarded as inhospitable because of its unpredictable weather, violent seas, strong winds and extremely low temperatures. Only 2% of Antarctica's surface is not covered in ice. It remains the world's only continent without permanent residents, but is it time for this to change? With the world population multiplying and resources becoming scarce, Antarctica is a lucrative option for nations to expand into and finally occupy. Is the 60-year-old Antarctica Treaty now outdated and in need of change? Doing so would create plenty of opportunities for countries interested in harvesting what Antarctica has to offer. Till now, Antarctica was only reserved for scientific research as it has been rightly labelled as "a natural reserve, devoted to peace and science". Under the Antarctica Treaty, activities like mining and military research are not permitted. Allowing both these activities would result in further utilization of Antarctica's potential but on the contrary climate, concerns provide a reason not to. Extracting the wealth of resources, which the world has managed to successfully reserve for hundreds of years, may be the only option to obtain oil and natural gas after a few years. Establishing settlements in the non-ice-capped parts of Antarctica could provide as a starting point for further colonization in the future. With monumental advancements due to

extensive research, the formation of settlements even in the areas covered with permafrost may be a near reality. The extreme conditions seem to be a deal breaker but with the aid of science and technology, this obstacle may be avoided. Is territorial segregation of Antarctica, something which has been done in the past, a viable idea in today's age? Till when will Antarctica be kept off limits from nations despite its plethora of resources and a broad expanse of land? Eventually, countries will start making more use of Antarctica but the question is, is now the right time?

Historical Context

Since the early 1900s, the majority of Antarctica was claimed by seven sovereign states, namely Argentina, Australia, Chile, France, New Zealand, Norway and the United Kingdom. Though these claims were only recognized between the nations making the claims and were officially suspended in 1961, it was visible that several countries were starting to show interest in Antarctica. The first Arctic base, named Omond House, was established in 1902 by the Scottish National Antarctic Expedition [1]. Their objective was to document the various unexplored features of the continent like its flora and fauna and topography.

To preserve Antarctica's resources and to maintain peace on the continent, the Antarctica Treaty was signed. It was a

result of the Cold war and was made to ensure that no superpower could claim Antarctica. Originally signed by 12 nations in Washington on 1 December 1959, the treaty consists of 14 articles which ensure that "in the interest of all mankind that Antarctica shall continue forever to be used exclusively for peaceful purposes and shall not become the scene or object of international discord." Currently, it has 53 signatories all of which have agreed to all suspend all mining and military activities along with future territorial claims.

According to Article I, any kind of military-related activity is prohibited on the continent if it is not related to science or for any other peaceful purpose. Though the repercussions of doing so are not clear, there are speculations that some countries have violated this article.

In Article IV it is mentioned that all prior territorial claims are officially stalled until the treaty is dissolved. No new claims are permitted; however, the United States of America and Russia reserve the right to claim territories in Antarctica. Also, there is no limit to the number of research stations that can be established there. Several countries are constantly increasing the number of stations on the continent to create a strong toehold so that if they can efficiently harvest Antarctica's resources. Several countries have positioned their stations near mineral-rich areas giving them a strategic advantage over other countries. In areas

like West Antarctica which is highly contested for by countries because of its abundance in resources, countries try to maintain physical proximity. This gives them quicker access to the area as well as a base for things like mining and territorial claims in the future. An estimated amount of 200 billion barrels of oil is said to be reserved in the continent. This is far more than Abu Dhabi or Kuwait.

Currently, there are about 105 research stations spread across the continent from which 75 are permanent year-round stations while the remaining 30 are only functional during the summer [3]. More bases are also being constructed. The USA has the largest station named the McMurdo station. It has 5 active stations, which is more than any other country in the world. Russia ranks second with one less station.

Since then 42 countries (as of October 2016), all of which are signatories of the Antarctic treaty, have set up stations on the continent [2]. Although no permanent human residents live on the continent, during the six months season of summer, an approximate population of 4000 people reside there. This number decreases to 1000 during the winter.

Article V states that nuclear explosions and the disposal of radioactive materials are strictly (prohibited). Antarctica could have served as an ideal place for countries to test nuclear weapons as it is mostly

deserted and is away from any civilization. A small nuclear reactor did actually exist in Antarctica at the McMurdo base. This reactor was removed after 10 years as it decontaminated the area around it because of leaks and cracks in the reactor.

Article VII allows signatories of the treaty to inspect or observe the stations, equipment and airstrips of any country. Giving countries the right to check each other's station is a way to keep countries from violating the treaty. Countries like China that have been suspected of using their stations for military research have been increasing their activity in the area. But despite these suspicions, other countries because of their expense and inconvenience have not prioritized these inspections.

Another organization exists to protect the overall environment of Antarctica. Belgium, Canada, France, Italy, Norway, Poland, Ukraine, United Kingdom and the United States are all members of the Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources. The goal of this organization is to conserve and protect marine life and to ensure the environment is not harmed in any way.

Big power's like Russia, the United States of America and China are using various strategies to get their way around the rules and regulations and still somehow assert themselves in Antarctica.

The Russians have sent their navy to the region after 30 years. The supposed reason behind this is conducting hydrographic surveys for improving the mapping of the sea. The same hydrographic surveys are also conducted to search for offshore oil. There is a very little chance that this is coincident. In Russia's 2010-11 Antarctic strategy, Russia has stated that its motive is to "strengthen the economic capacity of Russia... through complex investigations of the Antarctic mineral, hydrocarbon, and other natural resources"

China, though a late entrant in Antarctica, has established its desire to exploit Antarctica's resources. It has built a station at Dome Argus, which is the highest location on Antarctica. Its increasing investments in the continent showcase its interest in the continent. Recently, China announced that it is going to increase its harvest of krill, which are small crustaceans that the Antarctic ecosystem is highly dependent on. Huge containers filled with krill will be shipped from Antarctica leaving whales, penguin and seals with an insufficient amount left. It has also expanded one of its base, Taishan, and is building its fifth base near Ross sea despite not having secured environmental approval for it.

To match up to China and Russia's endeavours, the USA has responded by allocating USD 2 billion for new ice breakers. This will contribute to the

military infrastructure of the area. China, USA and Russia along with many other countries are preparing and making arrangements for the time when the Antarctica Treaty may no longer exist to restrict countries from furthering their own interests without keeping Antarctica's environment in mind. The multiple research stations and other resources that countries allocate to their Antarctica research programme is all done so that countries can position themselves better for the day when Antarctica's resources are available.

Antarctica is slowly being militarized using scientific research as a disguise. Countries claim that the equipment and stations are being researched but are not revealing the military use behind some of the equipment. For example, a station located near the South Pole can increase the accuracy of global satellite navigation systems, and along with that the accuracy of missiles hitting a target.

Course of discussion

The consequences and benefits of occupying Antarctica should be thoroughly researched upon and discussed in committee. Countries should decide their stance on whether activities like mining and military research should be legalized. The countries should also think of the impact of the solution they propose on the climate, and may also include measures to ensure that the climate and environment are not harmed

and taken care of. Most of the laws pertaining to Antarctica are made so that the environment and peace in the continent are not disturbed. Harm to Antarctica's climate can have a global impact. Melting ice caps in Antarctica are causing sea levels to rise by a drastic amount. This is causing problems at coasts all over the world.

If Antarctica were to be occupied, how should the land be divided between countries and which countries should get a share of the land? This is another question, which should be given importance. The execution and process of distributing territories, if decided to do so, should be peaceful and should have measures in place to avoid conflict at all cost. A lot of countries have their eye on Antarctica and so to avoid any global disputes a sensible solution should be thought of. Is it just to give the territories to the countries which first claimed them be given the land or should the land be segregated on the basis of some other factors?

Establishing settlements in Antarctica is a task, which demands a lot of money. Not every government is ready to devote such huge sums of money to fund such a purpose when the money can be used for other more urgent and necessary uses like education and healthcare. But this does not restrict those countries from voicing their opinions on what they feel is right and if occupying Antarctica is a good idea.

Possible blocks

Out of the 29 countries, which are members of the NATO, 9 are consultative signatories of the Antarctica Treaty. These countries are Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, France, Spain, United States, Norway, Poland, the United Kingdom. Another 9 members are non-consultative signatories. These countries are Romania, Portugal, Canada, Denmark, Estonia, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, and Slovak Republic.

If not renewed, the Antarctica Treaty is will expire in 2048. Once that happens issues will escalate between the three blocs, who are the pre-treaty claimants, reserved claimants, and non-claimants. As mentioned earlier, there are 7 countries, which claimed territories in Antarctica before the existence of the treaty. Out of those 7 countries, France, Norway and the United Kingdom are members of NATO. These three countries may want to stick to the territorial claims made earlier and may not be in favour of giving other countries a share of their pre-claimed land. According to Article IV of the Antarctica treaty, the United States of America is one of the two countries, which have reserved the right to claim land in Antarctica. Though this right has not been exercised in the past, doing so will serve as cause unrest among the other pre-claimants. The remaining countries who don't have any territorial claims or rights to claim land are non-claimants.

Non-claimants like Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Germany, Italy, Poland and Romania also have research stations in Antarctica and may want a piece of the continent for themselves too.

There several reasons why a country might find in its best interest to support the colonization of Antarctica. This can be if the said country either has the possibility of territorial gains or if the country is very closely allied with a claimant country (possibly the United States). Additionally, countries, which have signed the Antarctica treaty and receive little militaristic or territorial gains from its removal, might want to oppose the move. That said the policy of most countries on this issue is not very well defined, hence the delegates are free to determine their own stance. Marks on foreign policy would be awarded on the basis of how well you are able to secure your national interest.

References

<https://www.nato.int/nato-welcome/index.html>

https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_17120.htm

<https://www.state.gov/e/oes/ocns/opa/c6528.htm>

<https://www.ats.aq/e/ats.htm>

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Research_stations_in_Antarctica

Bibliography

[1]- <https://oceanwide-expeditions.com/blog/a-look-into-the-international-research-stations-of-antarctica>

[2]- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Research_stations_in_Antarctica

[3]-

<https://nettarkiv.npolar.no/sorpolen2011.npolar.no/en/did-you-know/2011-12-10-many-countries-have-research-stations-in-antarctica.html>

<https://www.ats.aq/e/ats.htm>



DSMUN '19

Agenda 2

Discussion on the Dissolution of Article 5

Introduction

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was built up in 1949, where the United States of America and the other Western European Nations met up to shield each other from the socialist risk of the Soviet Union. The Nations put together the Treaty with respect to the idea of Collective Security. The Nations at first met up on the grounds that every one of them were against socialism in their methodology. Now, the Second World War had quite recently finished. Numerous countries were influenced gravely by the War. While some got more power, others felt compromised by different countries. The Soviet Union developed as one of the significant forces as of now. The rate of spread of socialism was expanding ceaselessly. Numerous countries were yielding to the weight from the Soviet Union to change to a Communist country with a Communist government heading it. This impact was known as the Domino Effect. While the Soviet Union was a Communist significant power, USA was an industrialist popular government and was a noteworthy power as well. They saw the spreading of socialism as a danger to the world. The need to find a way to stop this impact was felt. In this manner, after much exchange the NATO bargain was marked in 1949.

NATO was the essential peacetime military alliance the United States went into outside of the Western Hemisphere. The Pact was a defining moment in the belief system of USA. After the Second World War, the world saw USA change its position from "Nonintervention". Subsequent to framing the NATO, USA

had formally attached its security to that of countries in Europe— the mainland that had filled in as the glimmer point for both world wars. This implied the country would be effectively associated with the rising clash with the Soviet Union. The first individuals from NATO were Belgium, Britain, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal and the United States. The Marshall Plan was presented which was a strategic activity that given guide to well disposed countries to enable them to remake their war-harmed frameworks and economies.

NATO has a prelude comprising of 14 Articles which structure the premise of the Pact. Out of these, Article 5 clarifies why NATO was framed at first. It is additionally the theme of dialog for the board. Article 5 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 and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defence recognized by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the Party or Parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other Parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area."*

The plan for the board is the "Disintegration of Article 5". Presently, the article 5 has been the foundation of NATO and its belief system. The Article was first shaped to stay away from the spread of Communism by the Soviet Union. A portion of the nations which saw socialism spread were Poland, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Albania, Bulgaria, East Germany, Hungary, and so

on. The NATO, under the terms of Article 5 attempted to prevent these nations from being focused on. While some of them couldn't be spared from the socialist takeover, others were spared from the takeover. Nations under the authority of USA acted to all in all secure the countries. Along these lines, the Article 5 has had its disappointments and accomplishments before. In the ongoing past, the Article 5 has been utilized in numerous zones of contention. The Article was summoned amid the 9/11 assault in 2001.

As of late, the NATO has been included with countries to determine many problems that are begging to be addressed.

1. In October 2018, President Trump reported his goal to pull back the US from the Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces Treaty (INF) because of long stretches of rehashed claimed settlement infringement by Russia. Hysterical European campaigning in late 2018, specifically with respect to German Chancellor Angela Merkel, effectively anticipated a prompt gap between NATO partners over how to react to the US's arranged withdrawal. On the off chance that the issue would heighten later on, the European NATO part states would see the breakdown of an arrangement that has been fruitful

In keeping up harmony among countries.

2. Toward the finish of 2018, the administration of Pristina dubiously embraced enactment to start a change of its 4,000-in number Kosovo Security Force into an ordinary armed force. In spite of the fact that this measure will

probably take the best piece of 10 years to come into operational impact, NATO had more than once communicated its distress with such a move, taking note of worries over planning and the potential that it will feed strains with neighboring Serbia. However NATO's political contrasts were on open showcase when, in the wake of Pristina's choice, the US communicated its help for Kosovo's sovereign appropriate to build up a power with a command for the nation's regional protection

The Member conditions of NATO are still to reached a resolution with this progressing issue.

3. The US is by and by comprehended to be surveying the nature and degree of its responsibilities in Afghanistan. The possibility of extreme slices in the US commitment to the NATO-drove non-battle Resolute Support mission is a reason for genuine worry among NATO partners and accomplices. Despite the fact that the ramifications of any US choice to actualize reductions will be basically operational, the administration of this procedure will be profoundly political. NATO is likewise confronting issues in Iraq where the Alliance intends to give non-battle preparing and fabricate the Iraq armed force.

Along these lines, the NATO has assumed a basic job in keeping up harmony among countries since its underlying arrangement. Indeed, even in the ongoing past, it is seen confronting serious issues in many clash zones over the globe. A portion of the issues have been referenced previously.

The course of events of the plan will extend from the underlying years after the development of the NATO till present. The council will concentrate on the working and the adjustments in NATO since 1949. The board of trustees is required to talk about and banter about the significance and importance of NATO in the cutting edge world. The talk on the disintegration of the Article and its impact on different countries ought to be examined and the board of trustees is required to achieve a typical agreement and discover conceivable answers for the current issue.

The 29 unique Nations, assume a basic job in the working of NATO and its concept of Collective Security. These countries hold their specific position with NATO.

Roles of Specific Nations

Turkey-Turkey has been in participation with NATO since 1952. NATO has been effective in keeping up security and solidness in the country and has been fruitful in incorporating it with the Euro-Atlantic people group. Turkey additionally underpins NATO's change endeavors, which are pivotal for NATO's prosperity. It is in this way making generous commitments to the NATO Response Force. A Force Command at high preparation level is built up in Istanbul.

Germany: Germany, which was generally a vital individual from the NATO, as of late has been a theme of dialog. At the 2014 NATO summit, Germany joined the remainder of its partners in consenting to burn through 2 percent of

its total national output on guard by 2024. After five years, it is not even close to achieving that objective. A month ago, the nation's Social Democratic account serve declared that safeguard spending will hit 1.25 percent of GDP by 2023. Germany's underinvestment in guard has for quite some time been a subject of worry among NATO watchers. The issue has spoilt the US-German relationship to an enormous degree of late.

Luxembourg: The country has been related with NATO since 1949. Regardless of being NATO's littlest part by surface region, Luxembourg has made numerous essential commitments to the Alliance throughout the years, including by keeping up a skilled military power. Luxembourg's appreciation towards the United States and the European Western Allies persevered all through the Cold War, giving the stone strong establishment to its solid help of the Alliance and energy to do its bit.

Slovakia: The Nation has been an individual from NATO since 2004. As of late, Slovakia's activities have been recommending a closer arrangement with Russia. An unmistakable compassion toward Russia is being seen by different countries. As of late, Slovakia's Defense Ministry, which is going by an individual from the SNS, delayed a hotly anticipated choice to supplant Slovakia's armada of maturing Russian-made MiG-29s with Swedish Gripen warrior planes or U.S.-made F-16s. The move was broadly censured, including by individuals from the service's own authority just as accomplices in the alliance government. Slovakia even declined to emblematically oust one Russian representative in a show of solidarity with the EU. The

progressive change in Slovakia's position with NATO involves dialog.

Czech Republic: The country joined NATO in 1999. In the underlying 2 years, the country confronted a great deal of issues. Czech Republic experiences experienced issues satisfying its commitments towards the partnership and has confronted overwhelming issues in rebuilding its Cold War heritage military into an association perfect with the union structure. Different countries perceived the need Czech Republic's participation since NATO required their well performing military. They additionally discovered that, despite the fact that Czechs are very disparaging of the present condition of the Czech military, they hold an abnormal state of trust in the military. Despite the fact that the country comprehended and acknowledged the prerequisite of supporting different countries, there were issues with the unmistakable comprehension of Article 5 of NATO. Without a reasonable information of the association between NATO's tranquility tasks and European security, and missing open discussion on these issues, a misconception between Czech Republic and NATO was apparent.

France: France was one of the soonest individuals to have joined NATO yet the country pulled back from the Pact in 1966. In 2009, they came back to NATO in full membership. France has assumed a basic job in fortifying the Alliance's prevention and guard pose. The French military contribute fundamentally and consistently toward the Western partners' proportions of consolation propelled in 2014 and the forward nearness measures propelled in 2016. As respects upgraded

Forward Presence, France gave a heavily clad, automated joined arms brigade organization group of 300 staff including Leclerc tanks and infantry battle vehicles, coordinated more than eight months over interchange a long time in a worldwide battalion in Estonia (2017, 2019) and Lithuania (2018, 2020) close by the United Kingdom and Germany, separately. France has likewise assumed a noteworthy job in helping NATO with battling fear based oppression in a significant number of the contention zones. As fear based oppression is one of the real world worries in the cutting edge age, the endeavors being made by France to help NATO was valued by different countries. France has devoted 1.81% of its GDP to the NATO spending plan in 2018, versus 1.78% in 2017 and 24.17% of its protection spending plan in 2017 to significant acquisitions and innovative work versus 24.44% in 2016. France has resolved to expand its safeguard spending to 2% of its national riches in 2025. To help this responsibility, the military programming bill 2019-2025 incorporates an exceptional exertion of €198 billion for military over its initial five years. Right now, France will give 1.91% of its GDP to protection spending. France has contributed through its tasks in Sahel and in the Levant to the general security of the Alliance and of Europe. It has sent 300 staff to Estonia in the improved Forward Presence to add to the discouragement mission of deterrence decided in Europe.

Italy: Italy has been one of the establishing individuals from NATO. Italy has constantly assumed a dynamic job in the Alliance, particularly amid the numerous emergencies that described the time of the Cold War. After the

breakdown of the Berlin Wall and the resulting disintegration of the Soviet Union, Italy has completely bolstered the broadening procedure that has prompted the present Alliance enrollment. Italy, in 2002, advanced conclusively the methodology of NATO to Russia, touching base to the establishment NRC (NATO-Russia Council) amid the summit at Pratica di Mare. Also, Italy is unequivocally dedicated to reinforce NATO's association relations with the nations of the Partnership for Peace, Mediterranean Dialog, Istanbul Cooperation Initiative and the supposed "Accomplices over the - globe", just as other universal associations. Since 2001, Italy upheld the exercises of NATO and the universal network everywhere in Afghanistan, first as a major aspect of the ISAF mission in January 2015 as a component of the mission Resolute Support.

Denmark: Denmark is one of the founding members of NATO. For Denmark NATO is the central forum for Foreign, Security and Defence Policy dialogue and cooperation across the Atlantic. All decisions in NATO are made according to the "Consensus-principle". Since 1949, NATO has been the cornerstone of Danish Security and Defence Policy. During the Cold War NATO directly guaranteed the security and independence of Denmark. After the Cold War, organisations such as NATO, UN, etc has been the central framework through which Denmark has safeguarded security political interests and promoted peace, security and respect for human rights. Denmark was involved in NATO's Northern Command. In 1951, Allied Command Europe was divided into three regions: the northern, central and southern regions. The Northern

Region initially included Norway, Denmark, the North Sea and the Baltic. Then in 1961, it became an integrated NATO Command called Allied Forces Baltic Approaches – or BALTAP – that included Schleswig-Holstein, Germany. The base was in Karup, Jutland, which was acceptable to Denmark since the commander, who was a Dane, was double-hatted with national responsibilities. Denmark also participated in STANAVFORCHAN, NATO's permanent maritime presence in the English Channel from 1973 onwards. It had national bases such as the land commands in Jutland and Zealand, which also supported NATO's strategic defence. Denmark organised the first NATO Conference of Senior Service Women Officers of the Alliance in June 1961. It was such a success that delegates from Denmark, the Netherlands, Norway, the United Kingdom and the United States agreed that similar conferences should be held on a regular basis.

Delegates ought to know having itemized comprehension of the positions of different part conditions of NATO. Their position in regards to their approaches and connection with NATO ought to be talked about in the advisory group. There ought to be a smooth progression of discussion and discourse where every country will be allowed to demonstrate its point on the motivation of 'Dissolution of Article 5'. Representatives are relied upon to watch the adjustment in position of different countries with the issues going on. The scope of research to be accomplished for the Agenda must be from the beginning of NATO to its association and activities in the present issues. Delegates could take a gander at

the contention zones over the globe to get more data with respect to NATO, its activities and the adequacy of Article 5. Delegates ought to have an unmistakable comprehension of the inclusion of their specific country with NATO and their relations. Investigation into the past exercises of the country with NATO will add to the profundity of the point. Likewise, any continuous or tentative arrangements of the countries with NATO could be considered. Delegates could think about the genuine understandings of NATO previously and as of now to comprehend their position in the discussion. Delegates must ultimately reach a resolution. Please note that the resolution will be passed only after the agreement of all the nations that are a part of the committee. Delegates must target the sub-topics of NATO and have a detailed discussion on them.

The emergency, the board tasks and missions executed by NATO previously and the progressing activities are to be talked about. The significance of Article 5, its points of interest and weaknesses for different countries ought to be talked about. The board of trustees ought to talk about the security challenges being looked by NATO and techniques that could be utilized to guarantee the security of countries in struggle zones. In the ongoing occasions, there have been numerous clear moves in the position of countries in regards to association with different countries and their collaboration. Representatives are relied upon to have done their exploration on the distinctive locales where countries have concurred on participation and comprehension. As of late, NATO has been seen making vital strides for exercises occurring in zones which don't

fall under the district of countries which are a piece of NATO. Representatives must talk about whether NATO ought to do as such and the impact of this on the individual countries.

NATO's role in conventional arms control

NATO's policy on combating human trafficking in human beings

Gender balance and diversity in NATO

NATO's stance on Science for peace and security

These are a portion of the issues that will be talked about in the board to locate the most ideal goals with respect to the 'Disintegration of Article 5'

Agents must comprehend and assess the utilization of Article 5 and its importance by and by. Additionally, delegates must assess the impact on their individual countries just as different countries, if the dissolution of Article 5 happens.

Representatives must take a gander at the outside approaches of their individual countries. An inside and out research on the position of the country in NATO will assist the representatives with understanding the discussions better.

It is useful to take a gander at the relations between the countries and NATO to see the progressions that have occurred in the comprehension between them extra time. Knowing about the present issues including the NATO in the different clash zones will add to the profundity of discussions in the committee. A smooth movement of contentions is normal and all representatives are mentioned to adhere to their position and go to a typical

accord to discover a resolution to the agenda,'Dissolution of Article 5'

