

SSN MUN 2018

Munich Security Conference

Background Guide

Greetings delegates!

We're short of words to describe how wonderful a prospect it is to be chairing the first ever simulation of the Munich Security Conference in Chennai. We believe that an enriching experience awaits all of us-delegates and Executive Board members alike.

This simulation of the Munich Security Conference will discuss a very pertinent topic, the future of relations between the Russian Federation and the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation. We believe that as a body that emphasises and deliberates on the issue of global security, this agenda is right out of the top shelf.

This Background Guide will illustrate the relations between these two entities so far, like all Background guides must. And, the same rule that applies to all guides applies to this one as well; you are in no event expected to restrict your research to the contents of this Background Guide. We are excited to meet all of you and cannot wait to interact with you all and oversee discussions. The only humble request from our end would be to ask you to research thoroughly and extensively.

Regards
The Steering Board
Munich Security Conference

The Bear and the Compass Rose: Assessing the future of Russia-NATO relations

“All the world’s a stage and all the men and women merely players”

If there are two countries that we have to pick that took this quote seriously in modern world history, it has to be the Russian Federation (successor of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and the United States of America. Post WWII, the statesmen around the world realised the need to get rid of the concept of colonialism and both the United States and the USSR, both victors in the war that had just ended, did well to project themselves as leaders in trying to achieve the objectives that the newly formed United Nations had put forth. The significant difference however, was the way in which these countries decided to go about their work and the ideologies they had imbibed in themselves long before the war even broke out. This resulted in a series of indirect skirmishes between these two nations and their allies, which famously came to be known as the **Cold War**. Each wanted to neutralize the effect of the other's ideology and in that quest, created certain instruments to keep the other at check.

Act I: Enter the Protagonists

One of the most important developments post WWII was the creation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation. The NATO was created in April 1949, and it was created to ensure to bring in “collective defense” mechanisms for its members. The NATO charter prescribes the ideals that the organization follows. An important aspect of the Charter was Article 5, which has been used quite frequently throughout history. The number of founding members of the NATO was 12, and it kept expanding with time. The current number of members in the organisation is 29. NATO, till date, is the largest military alliance in the world, in terms of military spending with respect to the members’ GDP. The NATO, and its members in some cases, was a very prominent feature of the United States’ Cold War policies. According to them, the need for an active intergovernmental military alliance during peacetime was necessitated due to the outbreak of the War in the Korean Peninsula.

The Soviet Union, one of the other victors in the WWII as stated, was not too far behind in establishing its own military alliance to counter the West's tool. The treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance was signed in 1955 between the Soviet Union and the satellite states that belonged to it. This treaty is famously known as the Warsaw Pact and the members party to this were termed the Warsaw Pact countries. The Soviet Union had its present felt in Eastern and Central Europe after the establishment of the Warsaw Pact.

There were multiple episodes in the Cold War where these two alliances came extremely close to trading blows with each other. To name a few would be injustice to the others that would be left out. The Soviet Union, in addition to this military alliance, had an economic union named the CoMEcon. But all the instruments that the USSR came crashing down with it when the country split, in 1991, a day after Christmas. Russian Federation took the spot of the USSR in the UN among other organizations and had an ominous task to rebuild its economy, military and diplomatic ties with other nations. NATO on the other hand thrived, and the absence of opposition triggered the US to authorize one of the most violent invasions in the last few decades, the one in Iraq in the very early 1990s, which coincided with the decline and the eventual fall of the Soviet Union.

The Russian Federation went on to inherit most of the characteristics of how the USSR functioned, and was and still is seen as an opponent of the West, but in milder proportion, largely due to better diplomatic instruments being in place from both sides. Russian rebuilding was quick, with the country being one of the founding members of an economic and security alliance for Eurasia called as the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (SCO). After its formation, the SCO has been increasingly seen as a counterbalance to the NATO by some policy experts. Additionally, Russia today has one of the largest armed forces in the world, a stable economy which is much more open and is actively involved in improving technology for both civilian and security purposes.

The NATO-Russia equation:

After the dissolution of the USSR, formal ties between the Russian Federation and NATO began in 1991 itself, with directives being provided about the relations in the North Atlantic Cooperation Council's framework. Partnership for Peace was a

programme that the NATO came up with to “build trust with other European and former Soviet states”. Russia joined this programme as a member in 1994. Ties further deepened with the signing of the Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security in 1997 which would lay the roadmap for future relations between Russia and the NATO. At this juncture, the NATO saw an opportunity to bury the hatchet with Russia as the latter had forfeited ideologies like excessive state control and was becoming an open economy. Russia warmed up to NATO really well and at one point, President Putin had suggested to President Clinton in 2000 that Russia join the NATO, to which Clinton reportedly didn’t have a problem with.



But ever since the turn of the century, relations between the two main subjects of discussion have soured, albeit gradually. There have been instances of co-operation between the two no doubt, but the bigger picture reveals that all is not well with the relationship that once promised much and held good. To understand where exactly things have gone south and what the future holds for NATO-Russia relations, we need to dwell on the different regions of interests of these two factions and the conflicts that arise because of these, as well as the ever-changing political spectrum outside the NATO, directly or indirectly caused by one or more members of the Organisation and their relations with Russia.

The Theatres of Contention:

1. Eastern Europe

The biggest eyesore in terms of the relations between the parties in question was the developments in Eastern Europe, especially in Ukraine.

The region of Eastern Europe has always seen some sort of agitation or the other from the time just before the breakup of the Soviet Union. There were clashes due to ethnic differences, independence movements, movements that overthrew Governments and leaders and other conflicts which were low-key but were recurring themes from time to time. One of the biggest uprisings in the region was in Ukraine during the Euromaidan protests.

Ukraine, since its independence after the fall of the Soviet Union, introduced policies that would help it lean towards the west more than towards Russia. These policies were framed by successive Government because it was considered as the right thing to do by majority of the citizens in the country. As a result, internationally, Ukraine looked for windows to forge closer ties with the European Union and the result of this was the negotiation of the Association agreement between the two parties concerned. Ukraine, initially willing to sign the Agreement, wanted to forfeit it in the eleventh hour as President Viktor Yanukovich announced the same. Furthermore when information trickled in that the Government was looking to join the Eurasian Economic Union, which was headed by Russia. This led to the protests that came to be known as the Euromaidan protests. The protestors, who demanded for Yanukovich's resignation because of this shift in policy as well as claims of human rights violations, occupied important Government buildings and installations towards the end of 2013 and by the beginning of 2014. By February 2014, Kiev saw battles between the protestors and the Police personnel. These protests eventually led to the signing of the Association Agreement and later the ouster and exile of Yanukovich from Ukraine.

Pro-Russia protests started erupting in Crimea, off the coast of Ukraine. Protesters started occupying administrative buildings and protested against the interim Government in place. Crimea was a case of pro-Russian majority defying the Government in the mainland. The protests paved the way for Russian Special Forces to enter Crimea and make their presence felt once they received requests from the pro-Russia leaders. The referendum was held in March and deemed unconstitutional by the Constitutional Court of

Ukraine, but the results of the referendum reportedly favoured the Russian annexation. An accession treaty was signed between the Crimean leaders deemed unlawful and Russian representatives in the same month.



In addition to Crimea, there was heavy fighting between pro-Russian forces and Government forces in the Donbass region. It included the regions of Donetsk and Luhansk. The fighting was brought to an end with the Minsk Protocols, which needed only a few months to collapse, with the separatist elements conducting their own elections in the region after stymieing the official elections that were supposed to be held. Another ceasefire agreement called the Minsk II protocols was signed post that.

Multiple instances of heavy fighting and casualties have been reported from the beginning of 2017 after a relatively quiet 2016 in Donbass. NATO has always backed Ukraine after the intervention by Russia in their territory. Ukraine's quests for a membership have been renewed after this period, drawing sharp disapproval from Russia. Russia to this date maintains that there would be repercussions if Ukraine does go on to join the NATO.

2. The Balkans:

The Balkans have been a potboiler from the beginning of the 20th century. Most of the countries in the Balkans were monarchies. The first Balkan war

was a result of the failure of the Treaty of Berlin. The War came to an end after the Treaty of London was signed. The treaty held good for a couple of decades before its collapse came in the form of the outbreak of the Second Balkan War.

The region was also in the thick of things during WWII and during the Cold War. The split up post Cold-War was a painful one; countries waged wars to gain independence, hundreds of people were displaced, and there were reports of severe violation of human rights. The West was involved in Kosovo in particular, with the NATO intervention in the late 1990s. There was worldwide condemnation for actions of the NATO in Kosovo as it was considered by few that a war of attrition was being fought by the Organisation. FD of Yugoslavia had to contend with the NATO's onslaught, which supported the rebel faction fighting the Government. The War was finally brought to an end with the Kumanovo Treaty.

Post the wars, the ideology that was prevalent thus far was dropped, and communism was no longer the force it was in the region. Countries moved towards having open markets and adopting democracies in different forms. There has been much interest shown towards the region by both Russia and its allies and the West.

The European Union has plans to grant membership to Western Balkan countries in the long run, a move that Russia is wary and keenly observant of. The fact that Serbia, often seen as a window for Russia to gain access into Europe, is one of the nations doesn't look pleasing for the administrators at the Kremlin. The EU released six new flagship initiatives to ensure smoother transitioning of the West Balkan nations into its fold. The timing of this is interesting, as there is a general rise in Euroskepticism in Europe, among the nations that are already members of the EU.

The NATO also has similar ideas to lure these western Balkan nations into its fold, which if implemented would put Russia away from the limelight as a global power with control in the region. Much of the relations between the

NATO and Russia will depend on how respective policies on such bones of contention are formulated and implemented.

3. The SCO:

“Treaty on Deepening Military Trust in Border Regions” was signed in April 1996 between China, Russia, Tajikistan, Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan. This grouping of nations was called the Shanghai Five. A year later, the Shanghai Five signed the “Treaty on reduction of Military Forces in Border regions” in Moscow. It was a clear indication that the Shanghai Five intended to work together to benefit in the areas of coordinated border patrolling, trust and mutual assistance. The grouping met annually to discuss its strategy and evaluate the work it undertook each year. This formed the basis on which the SCO was built. Five became six when Uzbekistan was given membership after it accepted the Treaty.

In 2002, the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation was founded after the countries signed the Charter and decided to adopt it. The expansion of the SCO has been steady thus far, with sub-continental power houses, India and Pakistan, being granted full membership in 2017.

The SCO today focusses on the spheres of security, economy and political stability and cooperation amongst the members. The biggest drawback of the SCO is the fact that the individual policies of its members and their policies towards each other might at times be stormy. Countries like India, Pakistan and China have waged wars against each other in the past and the stigma has the potential to prevent extensive policy formulation and consequently might prevent the SCO from achieving its full potential. Having said that, the results of SCO's policies so far have been largely positive. There has been collective action taken in the spheres of energy security, one of Russia's important concerns. The West, NATO militarily and the EU politically, are wary of this aspect of international relations. There have been murmurs of either side trying to spoil the energy ambitions of the other.



From the Russian perspective, the SCO provides an additional element by which to ensure the Central Asian countries along its soft underbelly remain tethered in strategic alignment to Moscow. Through additional institutions such as the loose, Russian-led federation of former Soviet republics known as the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), and its mutual defense extension, the Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO), Russia is able to exert political and military leverage over three SCO members (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan) and somewhat offset China's economic influence within the SCO.

Though some believe that the SCO is a counterbalance to the NATO, the ideals of the organisation beg to differ. The SCO focusses on diffusing regional problems, which could indirectly affect NATO's chances or the West's prospects in Eurasia.

4. Africa:

Russia has been subject to a plethora of economic sanctions by countries from Europe. The West has always held Russia accountable and sanctions came in for Russian involvement in Eastern Europe, and now very recently because of the developments in the Middle East and the new radical policies brewing from the office of the POTUS.

In search of greener pastures to conduct business, Russia has had to turn to the continent of Africa. Africa had deep ties with the Soviet Union, with many being educated in philosophies of the latter from the continent. Russia has taken after its predecessor with more than decent ties with nations in the continent.



Russia has trade set up extensively with countries like Uganda and Zimbabwe. Since the turn of the century, Russian trade with the continent has increased tenfold. In addition to the trade of raw materials from Africa, Russian weapons are seen as a lucrative alternatives to emerging nations in Africa. This is largely due to the fact that the prices of US weaponry are high and they come riddled with political favours to be satisfied. A classic case in point would be Nigeria's arms import from Russia; Nigeria placed orders for Cobra helicopters from the US which was rejected and the response was the cancellation of the training programme by USA in Nigeria's fight against the Boko Haram. Russia supplies copters now in addition to training the country's personnel. Russia also places emphasis on the history between the continent and the Soviet Union. It has turned out to be one of the best strategies in terms of diplomacy and fostering ties with these nations.

The NATO has been very active militarily in Africa. An example of their activeness would be the intervention in Libya led by the US, UK and France. The ongoing civil war in Libya was worsening by the day, and the Security Council passed resolution 1973 calling for ceasefire and prevention of further violations of Human Rights in the country. This resolution was held

as a reason by the NATO alliance to intervene and overthrow Gaddafi's regime in the country during a turbulent period in most Middle Eastern and African countries known as the "Arab Spring".

Politically, member nations of the NATO and the organisation itself have close ties with the African Union, the organisation responsible for greater cooperation between the states in the continent. They have greatly aided in capacity building and training in the continent. NATO and the AU have gone on record to admit that they have been holding discussions to develop environments to aid the areas of counter-terrorism, countering improvised explosive devices, the Women, Peace and Security agenda, building integrity, and support to AU peace-support operations. The Warsaw summit in 2016 also saw significant development in ties between the two organisations.

Africa is an interesting region to look at with respect to the agenda, as both Russia and NATO have similar aims (on paper) and methods to achieve the same.

5. The Korean Peninsula:

The Korean War was a war that started in June 1950 and is an event that still continues to indirectly influence NATO and Russian policies in Eastern Asia to this day. It was fought between North Korea, supported by China and the USSR, and South Korea, with the support of mainly the USA and her allies.

From 1910 to 1945, Korea was a Japanese colony. A provisional Korean government was formed in the Republic of China, while communist insurgents in Korea continued to resist the Japanese invasion at the time. In 1945, after the USSR joined the war against Japan on the Eastern Front, Korea was finally liberated, and Korea was divided into two parts, with the USSR controlling the north and USA controlling the south. This was agreed to be for a period of 5 years. However, after a series of uncontrollable riots, the U.S. government decided to hold an election under the UN auspices to create an independent Korea. The Soviet and Korean communists refused to cooperate with the elections, claiming that they

wouldn't be fair. This led to several key politicians boycotting the elections, and eventually Korea was divided into two parts.

In 1950, Kim Il Sung, the leader of North Korea was confident that South Korea could be invaded with minimal resistance, and launched an invasion with the blessings of USSR and the newly created People's Republic of China.

Initially, the North Korean army almost succeeded in invading Korea, with the southern forces numbering just over 22000 soldiers, from the original 95000, and leaving them only a tiny bit of area in the south-Eastern region of Korea. The tides turned when the United States of America decided to assist the South Koreans in the war, and deployed troops and military advisors to the region to help with the war efforts. Although the US backed South Korean forces were able to take the lead for a brief period of time, eventually the People's Republic of China deployed troops to help the North Korean forces, and the war ended in a stalemate. Till date no official peace treaty has been signed between North Korea and South Korea



Since the two nations are technically still at war, tensions in the area are extremely high. The United States of America has placed heavy economic sanctions on North Korea, and nobody from the USA is allowed to trade or deal with any entity in North Korea. Recently North Korea ran several missile tests, thus further escalating the situation. North Korea claims that the missiles are purely for self-defence purposes, citing the heavy presence of US troops and navy in the region as a threat to its existence. Relationships may have recently thawed after President Donald Trump became the first sitting US. President to meet with the leader of North Korea, and both countries agreed to arrange further meetings to discuss relationships between the two countries. North Korea and South Korea too have recently started improving relationships, with the countries sending both

delegations and cultural representatives to each other. Notably, both countries competed in the Winter Olympics under the same banner.

6. The Middle East:

Ever since the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, the Middle East has been in political turmoil. Power vacuums generated by the rise and fall of governments in quick succession, coupled with extremism in the region and external interest in the various resources of the region have ensured that the region is extremely unstable. The creation of Israel in 1948 further led to a series of wars and conflicts in the vicinity, and during the heights of the Cold War the Middle East was subject to courting attempts by both the USA and the USSR, in an attempt to have a strong hold over power in the region. Currently, NATO, UN, and Russian troops have a strong presence in the Middle East. The US has several bases in the surrounding regions, and are involved in counter-terrorism activities, mainly against the Islamic State and other such organisations, and in the Syrian Civil War, with most of the NATO nations having a strong Anti-Assad stance in the War. Russia, however, is strongly pro-Assad, and have sent troops to not only back the Assad government, but also try to combat the IS. Currently there is a ceasefire in the region from July 2017 till today, although tensions in the region are escalating.

7. Europe and Euroscepticism:

A sceptic is ‘a person inclined to question or doubt accepted opinions’, according to the Oxford Dictionary. Coincidentally enough, the Greek word “skepsis” is from where the word “sceptic” originates from. The term Euroscepticism hence describes anything which raises questions and concerns over the EU. It is loosely used to describe anything that questions the legitimacy/functioning/utility of the EU as an institution. These days, a Eurosceptic has gone from being a single person to a representative of a much larger movement expressing disdain towards the EU. However, Euroscepticism is different from Anti-Europeanism which is against the culture of Europe as a whole.



According to a study by the Pew Research Center, favourability of the EU has shown wide variations, with countries like Greece & France having a majorly unfavourable view (of 71% and 61% respectively). The same study also noted that the views of EU aren't simply divided on the basis of Left & Right ideologies in each country. Cross-sectioned further, there are differences across gender on views of the EU, and differences on the degree of power that must be retained with the Union.

Euroscepticism is generally measured by the Eurobarometer. In 2016, the countries viewing the Union most unfavourably were Greece, France, Spain and the United Kingdom. Euroscepticism has seen a steady rise owing the potential exit of the United Kingdom from the European Union. The shift of the United Kingdom's policies began in 1988 when the president of the European Commission, promised the Trade Unions Congress, that Europe's single market would be strengthened by tougher labour and social regulations. This led to the start of Euroscepticism in Great Britain.

Over the years the average net positive ratings of the EU has fallen from as high as 60% in 1991 to 5% in 2013. While the salience of Europe remained low, public anxiety over immigration has been fuelled to new heights since the general election by the acute refugee crisis in Europe arising particularly from the conflicts in Syria and Iraq, and political instability across the Middle East and North Africa. As of late 2015, according to data published by the office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, some 900,000 refugees and migrants had arrived in Europe by sea in the course of the year, with more than 200,000 arriving in October alone. The large inflows into EU member states like Germany and Sweden, as well as a more specific crisis at the French port of Calais from where migrants attempt to enter Britain, have produced a far more favourable climate for populist Eurosceptics who aim to conflate identity and

security crises with opposition to the EU.

A favorable BREXIT vote in June 2016 has led to the opening of a Pandora's Box leading to a destabilization of the European project. Within hours of the announcement of BREXIT, France's National Front leader Marine Le Pen and Dutch eurosceptic political leader Geert Wilders were demanded in-out referendums in their own countries.

8. Major Eastern Actors:

The erosion of the Western domination and the power shift from the West to the East first became evident in Japan in the 1960s and then in South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore – in the 1970s. From the 1980s onward, China and India also started to grow strongly and rapidly. Major shifts of power between states, not to mention regions, occur infrequently and are rarely peaceful. In the early 20th century, the imperial order and the aspiring states of Germany and Japan failed to adjust with each other. Today, the transformation of the international system will be even bigger and will require the assimilation of remarkably different political and cultural traditions. Asia's growing economic power is translating into greater political and military power, thus increasing the potential damage of conflicts. Within the region, the flash points for hostilities -- Taiwan, the Korean Peninsula, and divided Kashmir -- have defied peaceful resolution. Any of them could explode into large-scale warfare that would make the current Middle East confrontations seem like police operations.

Looking at the economic angle of the entire power we realize that China is the most obvious power on the rise. But it is not alone: India and other Asian states now boast growth rates that could outstrip those of major western powers. The sanctions against Russia destroy the economic growth of the West while shifting not just Russia, but many toward China. This is the shift of wealth and power to the east, the rise of the Yuan and its use in a growing number of global transactions in the place of the dollar. At the moment Russia is turning its economic head towards China and the developed world doing its best to do so too. And still the east is gaining ground and its share of global cash flow continues to expand. This is set to continue strongly in the broader-term, albeit near-term there is still an economic decline for China from which it will rise faster and stronger than the USA.

An event which went largely unnoticed, the European central banking cabal from the City of London, sent British royalty Prince William to China to quietly sign a deal to become a founding member of the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB). This surprising new development is a clear indication that the royal Bank of England is placing its financial bet and future on China and the East as its rock solid anchor. Much of the world has been looking to move away from and abandon the long-time global financial stronghold of the US Federal Reserve, its World Bank and US dollar standard.

Not just the AIIB, in recent times a lot many more banks have come up in the East such as the NDB, BRICS Bank etc which have their own development agenda and mark a question on the existing institutions such as IMF, World Bank and ECB, all of which are all Western centric, or so to say. The “Easternization” of economic, technological, and military power is ending the long uncontested Western dominance

9. Afghanistan:



Afghanistan has been the centre of attention for NATO and Russian/Soviet forces since the Soviet-Afghan War in 1979. Even though there was no direct involvement of US or NATO troops till 2001, US aid of the mujahideen forces and the anti-communist rebels in Afghanistan was crucial in keeping the soviets from having a strong presence in the region. More recently in 2001, the US army and

NATO troops were deployed to Afghanistan as a part of their “War on Terror” announced by President George W. Bush. After the collapse of the Taliban regime, the NATO troops still stayed in Afghanistan to maintain peace in the region and try to eliminate all Taliban cells, and even though the number of troops in Afghanistan has reduced recently, there still is a strong presence in Afghanistan and surrounding countries.

Conclusion:

With many of these platforms available for either party to flex their muscles against each other, it seems to be seen as to how policies are formulated by two of the most important players with regards to security strategy of the globe. At the end of the day, it is the power wielding individuals who have a major influence on policies and that is precisely why the Munich Security Conference assumes much importance as a global brainstorming meet.

Rules of Procedure for the Simulation:

This simulation will take up a slightly different approach with respect to Rules of Procedure that govern it. The changes prescribed would be as follows:

1. The Committee will do away with the traditional transition between formal-informal debate.
2. Sub-topics of the agenda can be discussed by raising Special Speaker List-type motions. The motion will be considered as elapsed when there are no more speakers willing to speak on the sub-topic considered.
3. The default speaker time would be 3 minutes per speaker.
4. Unmoderated caucuses can be called for at the end of discussions of any sub-topic. The motion will be voted upon based on the discretion of the Steering Board.
5. All points, motions and yields are applicable at all times unless stated otherwise once committee is convened.

We will explain a few other rules regarding documentation when we get there during the course of the Conference. We request you to be aware of the changes prescribed above. In case of any clarification, please feel free to contact one of us.

Aravind N - aravindn.1396@gmail.com

Ansull Lakhotia - ansullyuvi98@gmail.com

Shashank Ravishankar - shashank.k.ravishankar@gmail.com