NORTH ATLANTIC
TREATY ORGANIZATION

DIRECTOR
Adam Billen

CHAIR
Alex Chang

AD
Olivia Wisont

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DIRECTOR'S LETTER

Dear Delegates,

Welcome to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization at PACMUN 2019! My name is Adam Billen and I am incredibly excited to be your director this year! I am a senior at The Center School and I have been participating in MUN since PACMUN 2016. Joining me is Assistant Director Olivia Wisont, a senior at Inglemoor, and your Chair Alex Chang, a senior at International Community School.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization is responsible for maintaining the freedom and security of countries across the Atlantic. It is one of the longest running military organizations in modern history, having been founded in 1949 in response to growing conflict and tension in a post-World War Europe. The body is committed to the peaceful resolution of conflict but has the ability to undertake military action through crisis management operations, either under Article 5 of the Washington Treaty or under a United Nations mandate. The body is divided into its political and military arms: the North Atlantic Council having authority over political decisions and the Military Committee taking on military operations.

We chose to address the first topic, Democratic Values, as we each have seen significant changes take place in the Atlantic region's political sphere in recent history. As nations drift further right, corruption remains rampant, and the Russian Federation's influence grows, revisiting NATO's values as a democratic body becomes increasingly relevant.

Our second topic, Resurgent Russia, comes out of a sense that Russia's need to re-establish its influence over the world represents a threat to the Atlantic. Their military aggressions in Ukraine and Georgia, coupled with their activity in the middle east and insidious attacks on Ukraine's energy systems makes this more than clear.

It is essential that actions taken by NATO in regard to both of these topics are made methodically, with careful thought taken to the global influence of the body. The decisions you make and the solutions you reach will have far reaching implications. As such, the success of our time in committee is reliant on the depth and breadth of your research. Pay close attention to how your countries current and past governments have interacted with the body and the world. Many of the issues at hand are changing day by day; stay on your toes and make sure your sources are up to date. NATO may be an alliance but that does not mean that all nations will be in agreement. Cooperation and diplomacy will be the key to success in this committee.

I look forward to meeting each of you in November. Best of luck with your research and do not hesitate to reach out to our email! We are here to help you; each of us is passionate about these topics and would love to answer questions or help you with your research. NATO was my first committee in my freshman year, and I could not be more excited to be working with you all.

Best,

Adam Billen

Director | North Atlantic Treaty Organization

Pacific Model United Nations 2019

COMMITTEE OVERVIEW

Welcome to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization for PACMUN 2019. NATO is a powerful component of global politics and debate is therefore lively, challenging, and dynamic. NATO examines some of the most important issues at play in the global community, making it both fascinating and extremely relevant. The actions of the committee affect diplomatic relations between some of the most powerful countries in the world, with its movements being constantly examined on the global stage. In order to join, countries must meet admission criteria, making NATO unique as an international body. It was originally founded in 1949 and serves to protect the freedom and security of its member states. NATO allows countries to work together for collective defense and cooperative security while simultaneously promoting democratic values. The goal of the organization is to prevent conflict, and the organization is well known for Article 5 of its founding treaty. This article enshrines the principle of collective defense, and the notion that an attack on one-member country is an attack on all has fundamentally changed the landscape of diplomacy. NATO forces consist of troops and equipment which are committed by individual allies and then placed under unified NATO command. Likewise, funding for NATO is contributed by member states and the organization is thus reliant upon members fulfilling their fiscal commitments. Although peaceful resolutions are the primary goal of NATO, if diplomacy fails then it has the military power to undertake crisis management operations. These can be under the collective defense clause, or under a United Nations mandate which is carried out either by member states or in concordance with other countries and international organizations.

NATO is an influential and distinguished organization, but it is also an alliance. Therefore, any NATO decision should be the collective will of all 29 member states.

When conducting debate this is important to bear in mind, for it is essential that all delegates work together to come up with resolutions that benefit, and thus can be supported by, all nations represented. That being said each delegate should also be aware of their domestic and international policies, as the weight of NATO actions can have far reaching consequences.

Position papers are strongly recommended for NATO and are required for delegates to be eligible for an award. Each paper should be approximately one page in length and must include sources used. Delegates should reference the Resources page under the PACMUN website for further information on position papers. It is encouraged, though not required, that papers examine past UN and NATO policy, delegates' own country policies, and potential solutions to the two topics presented. Whether a position paper is submitted or not, delegates should come to committee with an understanding of the topics and their country's positions, both of which are imperative for successful debate.

Position papers should be turned in to the committee email address, nato@pacificmun.com, no later than the time listed on the website, unless an extension has been granted by the dais.

TOPIC A
Upholding NATO's Democratic Values

TOPIC INTRODUCTION

With the shifting power structure of the world moving away from the Cold War mentality of authoritarianism versus democracy, NATO's role in global dialogue is now shifting. Due to the collapse of the Soviet Union and the main threat to NATO members being neutralized, NATO is now forced to reevaluate its place as a military alliance against a weakening Russia. Originally created to act as a bulwark in Europe against the expansion of communism, NATO is now being criticized for allowing many of the same authoritarian actions previously denounced in the USSR among

its member nations. Many within NATO have called for reform to the NATO charter, citing members such as Turkey or Hungary which have become increasingly dictatorial in recent years.

One particularly egregious example is Turkey, with the 2016 purges following the failed coup attempt leaving a bad taste in the mouths of fellow NATO nations. Horrific human rights abuses coupled with an obvious power grab and bid for dictatorship by President Tayyip Erdoğan have led many within NATO to wonder if the organization has strayed from its original purpose of ensuring democracy around the world. Issues to be found among the charter include the inability to remove members or otherwise censure them for misconduct, allowing misbehaving nations to remain despite shedding all vestiges of democratic conduct. Another criticism within NATO is the disparity in influence that large nations have over small ones. Issues of representation within the alliance frequently come up due to the nature of negotiations within NATO. NATO members are not limited to negotiations purely during NATO discussions, with nations free to discuss matters on an individual level outside of official summits. As such there have been complaints of strong-arming by the larger member nations such as the USA against smaller powers.

Redefining the role of NATO in the modern age is extremely difficult, as by all means NATO's purpose has been reduced by the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the ending of the Cold War. But while names for nations have changed since 1991, the main antagonist still remains Russia. Russia is responsible for a majority of the headaches that NATO has in the European region, with Eastern Europe being a major source of NATO military buildup. But the failure of NATO to have a meaningful impact on Eastern Europe has been a sore spot for NATO leaders, with the Russian invasions of Georgia and Ukraine perhaps disproving the theory of NATO military strength in the region. Although Georgia and Ukraine are not official members of NATO, they are extremely close to the organization and frequently participate in joint military exercises, linking the nations together against Russian aggression. Because of these ties NATO's inability to intervene has cast doubts on the usefulness of the organization, seeing as it cannot even uphold the democracies of nearby nations.

HISTORY

The concept of "democratic values" is complex, as it is both difficult to define and cannot be quantified. Anthropologists have discovered forms of proto-democracy dating back to small bands of hunter-gatherers. However, the term "democracy" as it is understood today was first introduced by ancient Greeks in Athens around 508 B.C. Since then the term has expanded to encompass an array of socially connoted values. Different types of democracy have evolved, such as representative or constitutional democracies. As early as 700 B.C., range voting began in Sparta. This type of voting took place through a structure known as the Apella, in which every male citizen of at least 30 years of age could participate in an assembly of the people. While Greeks and Romans generally practiced more direct forms of democracy, the Middle Ages saw a variety of assemblies and systems of elections. The Parliament of England began with the restriction of the King's power in the Magna Carta in 1215. This document explicitly protected the rights of citizens, and eventually led to Simon de Montfort's Parliament in 1265, which was the first representative assembly in England. The rise of democratic values continued in the 18th and 19th centuries with the American revolution, the Corsican Republic, the Parliament of Great Britain, and the French Revolution.

North America was first introduced to Western-style Democracy in Jamestown Virginia in 1619 with the creation of a democratic assembly known as the House of Burgesses. Although not largely recognized another version of democracy had in fact already existed within North America before white settlers came. The Iroquois Confederacy was founded by the "Great Peacemaker" in 1142 A.D. The people of the Iroquois Confederacy, also known as the Six Nations, were unified into a League of Nations under the Great Law of Peace, eventually going on to establish a constitution. History makes clear that the concept of democracy touched nearly every continent well before the modern era.

With the idea of democracy comes the concept of human rights and liberties. The United States Constitution in 1787 and the Bill of Rights in 1791 protected civil rights and freedoms of a portion of its citizens. Similarly, France adopted the

Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen in 1789. Although this declaration was short-lived, the concept of rights and freedoms being concretely defined and protected set the foundation for modern day democratic values. Despite these strides, it wasn't until the 20th and 21st centuries that democracy as a political structure truly took off, sparking a new era of government policies and citizen protections. Along with this shift, the term democratic values began to take shape as a "political buzzword". However, while some countries define those values outright, many countries take on a vaguer approach. A Supreme Court is often used to interpret the democratic values of a particular country, usually basing this interpretation off of a constitution. The terms liberty, justice, and equality are repeatedly present when discussing what democracy means, yet there is no universally consistent definition. The United States, for example, cites the pursuit of happiness as a value of their democracy, while Japan makes no such allusions. The vague notion of what defines democratic values has shifted throughout the course of time and is represented differently across countries making it difficult to establish a universal truth. This in turn makes it difficult for NATO to hold countries accountable to upholding "democratic values".

Turkey is a prime example of this fine line. While the Republic of Turkey is technically a parliamentary democracy, it has, in the past, failed to uphold what many NATO countries may consider to be vital democratic values. The largest majority in the country, the Kurds, have no rights to self-determination, with Turkey being accused a multitude of times of committing human rights violations against the minority ethnic group. As there are no precedents or resolutions in place regarding the upholding of democratic values within NATO, nothing is being done to rectify these types of situations. This means that NATO, built on the platform of democracy, has no means of holding members answerable to them if such violations of democratic values occur.

PAST ACTION

Since its creation, the United Nations has continuously promoted democracy as one of its core values. The UN Declaration of Human Rights clearly states, "the will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government." The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966) goes on to further define democracy in terms of international law, in particular, the freedom of expression, the right to assemble, the right to vote and be elected, and the right and opportunity to take part in the conduct of public affairs. Many organizations within the UN have worked to support democracy in a multitude of countries. Indeed, about $1.5 billion US dollars is provided each year through the UNDP to support democracies around the world. In addition, the Commission on Human Rights recommended Resolution 2000/47 declaring certain elements essential to democracy. These included "respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, freedom of association, freedom of expression and opinion, access to power and its exercise in accordance with the rule of law, the holding of periodic free and fair elections by universal suffrage and by secret ballot as the expression of the will of the people, a pluralistic system of political parties and organizations, the separation of powers, the independence of the judiciary, transparency and accountability in public administration, free, independent and pluralistic media". Most recently, the UN General Assembly passed A/RES/72/164 in 2017, which specifically addressed "the promotion of democratization." In this resolution the GA called on states to increase the participation of women in elections, requested that the Secretary-General provide the Electoral Assistance Division with adequate human and financial resources, that the United Nations Development Programme continue its democratic governance assistance programmes, and asked the Secretary General to report on how to best accomplish "democratization".

These principles appear to be similar to those expressed by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. On March 31, 2019, Madeleine Moon, President of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, said about NATO: "But if that is not backed up by our values; if that is not backed up by our belief in democracy and the rule of law and our commitment to human rights, in tackling corruption, in building strong and stable societies, we are nothing." The concept of Democratic Values was written into the original structure of the NATO resolution, citing that "NATO promotes democratic

values". Yet, there have been very few resolutions passed either within NATO, or the UN itself, which elaborate on what this means or entails.

The issue of democratic values is primarily addressed in resolutions pertaining to elections. Prime among these is the NATO resolution 222 STC 18 E fin, also known as the Resolution on Safeguarding Elections in the Alliance. This calls attention to "the need to preserve the institutions that make democracies strong, including freedom of the press, freedom of speech and free and fair elections." It urges nations to examine the systems which act as the support for democracy, such as: funding for elections, increased cybersecurity measures, and developing clear protocols in regard to elections.

However, in spite of the clear promotion of democracy, the effectiveness of such resolutions has fallen short in many NATO member countries. The wording expressed by NATO establishes no requirements. It "urges" and "promotes", but fails to "enforce" for fear of infringing on countries' sovereignty. The majority of NATO's action in regard to democratic values pertains to countries joining the organization. In order to be considered for membership, countries must meet a host of requirements. Specifically, countries develop Membership Action Plans (MAPs), in which they submit individual programmes pertaining to political structures, in addition to other issues. NATO then provides feedback to these countries, through MAPs, in preparation for potentially joining NATO. In many cases, recommendations encourage democratic policies and structures within countries. NATO itself was "founded on the principles of democracy" as laid out in the Washington Treaty. However, once countries are a part of NATO, there are no precedents or resolutions regarding the continuation of democratic values, nor are there any procedures in place if member countries no longer meet the requirements that allowed them to join NATO in the first place.

CURRENT SITUATION

On July 15, 2016, Turkey's military enacted a coup d'état, attempting to overthrow the current administration headed by President Recep Tayyip Erdogan. Erdogan reacted with immense force, purging police officers, judges, and soldiers

involved with or supporting the attempted coup. The coup failed, and by the end of July, Erdogan had detained up to 50,000 citizens working in the government, private sectors, and military. The purge continues today, and anyone with near any relation to the Gülen movement, which the government continues to blame for the coup, will be arrested. As Erdogan has continued to move towards authoritarianism, questions have been raised about its place as a member of NATO, a body which prides itself on being made up of free and fair democracies.

Another NATO member whose democracy has deteriorated after admittance is Hungary. Under nationalist, supermajority leader Viktor Orban's leadership, a series of changes to the judicial system that allowed him enough control to push through his own constitution. He began allowing ethnic Hungarians living abroad to vote in elections, but forced ones living in Western countries to vote at embassies or consulates rather than by post as those in Eastern countries, who overwhelmingly support Orban, are allowed. In 2016 a childhood friend of Orban's purchased the largest opposition media group and shut it down, while Orban transformed the state-owned media into a propaganda machine. Moves like this have become typical under what Viktor Orban has called his "illiberal democracy". Because of this, Hungary has been downgraded from being a 'free' country under US think tank Freedom House's report to being a 'partly free' one. Hungary is the first EU member country to be downgraded to this level. In addition, the country has fallen from the 23rd spot in the World Press Freedom Ranking to the 87th since Orban's election. This steady fall, combined with Orban's increasingly close relationship with Putin, again raises questions about its place within NATO.

Poland has shown signs of going in a similar direction as Turkey and Hungary after the election of the Law and Justice party in 2015. Examples include judicial reform that allows the head of the judicial branch to appoint, dismiss, and discipline presidents of ordinary courts. This has effectively placed the National Council of the Judiciary under parliamentary control, when it was formerly independent. Moves like this signal trouble for the nation's democracy, and delegates are encouraged to find ways to address the issue of maintaining NATO's democratic values at each stage of authoritarianism: early on, such as in Poland's case, at a point close to pure authoritarianism, as in Hungary's illiberal democracy, and in a case where the

leading power has concentrated power through force and suppression of all parts of society, as in Turkey's case.

Importantly, each of these countries' democracies regressed after being admitted to NATO. It is undoubtable that each of these countries would not have been admitted to NATO with the current state of their democracies. This begs the question of whether countries should be held accountable to the requirements of the Membership Action Plan after being admitted. Some countries have deployed some resources to fight this move away from democracy. The US Department of State mobilized $700,000 in funding for independent media in Hungary, barred the travel of corrupt Hungarian leaders, have criticized the Polish government's moves to damage the structure of their judicial system and independent media, and ended the processing of Turkish visas to the US in response to Erdogan's crackdown in 2016. However, even these actions are relatively insignificant and will not shift the tides of illiberalism and Nationalism. Up to this point NATO and its member nations have largely chosen not to take aggressive action against offending countries. The outcry from NGOs like the Freedom House is certainly there and the international media has brought that outcry forward, but no decisive action by national or international governments have been made.

Threats outside of NATO member nations' direct purview also demand immediate attention. Potentially most significantly, Russia's proven ability to interfere and influence foreign elections poses a substantial threat to all of NATO's democracies. The 2016 US Presidential election shows this clearly, and as the 2020 Presidential election cycle begins it is essential that NATO and the US learn lessons from past election cycles and develop a strong defense against current and future attacks on member nation's democracies.

CASE STUDIES

CASE STUDY 1: 2016 US ELECTIONS

In 2016, Russian hackers began a widespread campaign to influence the US presidential campaign. It included aggressive invasions of employees and computer

networks within the Democratic National Committee, disinformation campaigns on social media including fake ads, and direct contact with the Trump campaign.

On March 19th, a phishing email was used to infiltrate Hillary Clinton's campaign chairman's email account and steal all 50,000 emails. In April, digital attacks on the DNC continued to escalate as phishing emails continued to be used to infiltrate staffer's accounts. On April 12th through 15th, hackers used stolen credentials to install malware on the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee's computer network and copy folders titled "Benghazi Investigations". Hackers continued to infiltrate democratic campaign committee's emails throughout the campaign season.

The DNC itself has attributed the ease at which Russian actors were able to hack their staffer's emails and servers to their position as a nonprofit group, strapped for cash and unable to invest in more than a standard email spam-filtering service. It was not until seven months into active infiltration by Russian actors that the DNC installed a robust set of monitoring tools.

At the same time that Russian hackers were invading democratic campaign office's computer networks and email systems, they were running a massive disinformation and ad campaign with the goal of dividing voters and sowing confusion. Fake ads included everything from "I say no to Hillary Clinton / I say no to manipulation" to "Hillary Clinton Doesn't Deserve the Black Vote". Hackers also used social media and hacked emails to coordinate rallies in support of Trump, going as far as to wire money to a Clinton impersonator to attend multiple pro-Trump rallies.

As this was happening, the Obama administration took a series of actions. Firstly, President Obama pulled Putin aside directly at a summit to ask him to stop interfering. His administration also attempted to ask leaders in congress to sign a statement condemning the efforts. Leaders did not agree until October of 2016. In the end, Russian diplomats were removed from the US, sanctions were imposed on two of Russia's top intelligence services, and the State Department closed two waterfront estates that the Russian state used for intelligence activities.

These two aspects could be responded to in a variety of ways including, but not limited to: direct sanctions on the actors of the attacks, increased spending on cyber defense, connections between the public and private sector to incentivize the

deterrence and elimination of misinformation campaigns, and international/intel-sharing surrounding digital misinformation and hacking attempts.

CASE STUDY 2: A COUP IN TURKEY

In July 2016, after a failed coup, Turkish President Erdogan shut down large numbers of media outlets, in a move that rang the alarms of a failing democracy around the world. In what many allies around Europe have called an attempt to use the coup as an opportunity to crush dissent, Erdogan began aggressively jailing any citizens with connections to Fethullah Gulen, a cleric now based in the US that the government claims have instigated an infiltration of public institutions.

This purge of citizens began on July 19th, 2016 when across the Education Ministry, the Interior Ministry, the Board of Higher Education, the Finance Ministry, the Prime Minister's Office, the Directorate of Religious Affairs, various security forces, judicial institutions, religious institutions, and the military over 35,000 citizens were fired or arrested. The political and social purge continued on the 27th, when Erdogan shut down 131 media organizations and issued arrest warrants for 89 journalists. By August 5th, nearly 9,000 police officers, 10,000 soldiers, 2,745 member of the judiciary, and 167 staff at the Turkish Scientific and Technological Research Council had been fired or detained. On August 17th, as total detained or fired citizens climbs over 60,000 the government begins freeing tens of thousands of prisoners to make room for more prisoners related to the Gulen movement or the failed coup. The purge continues through September 19th when 28,000 teachers are fired, bringing the total count of fired or arrested citizens over 100,000.

The purge continues today, and Erdogan's political party, the Justice and Development Party, has continued to consolidate power. However, hope remains for Turkey's democracy, and mayoral elections in Istanbul resulted in an opposition leader being elected. International reactions to Turkey's move towards authoritarianism have been limited in action, and NATO has made no moves to remove them from the alliance even as the government continues to violate NATO's core value of democracy. However, Erdogan's decision to cement a $2 billion deal for

the s-400 missile defense system from Russia has caused their removal from the United States' F-35 combat aircraft program. Turkey's move away from democracy begs the question of whether a nation violating the terms of the MAP framework that it was admitted on should be allowed to stay in the body.

BLOC POSITIONS

Authoritarian Nations: Hungary, Turkey

Hungary and Turkey are the main culprits of authoritarian actions, with the elections of Viktor Orbán and Recep Erdoğan respectively marking the rise of authoritarian sentiment and a move away from democracy. Despite the fact that on paper these nations have democratic structures, Hungary and Turkey have increasingly moved away from democratic principles, including Numerous human rights abuses and abolishing the rule of law in certain cases. This flies in the face of NATO's charter, which specifically requires members to "to demonstrate commitment to the rule of law and human rights", leading to calls from certain countries of revoking Hungary and Turkey's status as NATO members until democracy is restored.

Moving Towards Authoritarianism: Denmark, Poland

Due to the rise of more authoritarian, far-right movements, these countries are at risk of shifting towards isolationist and overall undemocratic regimes. As seen in the election of the Lega Nord in Italy, the Danish People's Party in Denmark, and the Law and Justice Party in Poland, sentiment in Europe seems to be shifting towards nativism, Euroscepticism, and populism, all of which threatens the basic tenets of democracy that NATO is determined to uphold. This shift towards nationalism threatens the future of NATO itself, as the European community could destabilize to the point of total disunity.

Promoters of Democracy: France, Germany, United Kingdom, United States

These nations are dedicated to the spread and continuing influence of democracy, being the strongest contributors to NATO. It is in their best interests that NATO continues to prosper and act as a bulwark against undemocratic regimes, due to their interests aligning with Western democratization. A particularly strong example is the United States' calls for Turkey to stop aligning with Russia, a clear enemy of NATO. This is due to the United States wanting more countries to fall in line with NATO, instead of grouping themselves into the Russian bloc. These countries are therefore staunchly against nations such as Belarus, who threaten NATO by being geopolitical allies for Russian interests.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. To what extent does your country adhere to the Democratic Values outlined by NATO and the United Nations?

2. Should there be a procedure in place for removing countries from NATO that have failed to uphold democratic values?

3. What would the repercussions be of removing countries from NATO? What would the repercussions be of allowing countries within NATO to continue to violate democratic values?

4. Is the current framework for allowing countries to join NATO adequate? Is it still reflective of NATO's actions?

5. Does the United Nations have the authority to define and moderate democracy?

6. What obligation, if any, does NATO have to protect the democracies of countries outside of the alliance?

7. How has Russian interference in democratic elections undermined nations' sovereignty? What response should there be from NATO in order to preserve this sovereignty?

FURTHER RESEARCH

HTTPS://FREEDOMHOUSE.ORG/REPORT/NATIONS-TRANSIT/2018/HUNGARY

A report on the declining freedoms in Hungary which are directly influenced by the election of Viktor Orbán as Prime Minister and the rise of the right-wing populist Fidesz party

HTTPS://WWW.BROOKINGS.EDU/BLOG/ORDER-FROM-CHAOS/2017/10/04/THE-SERPENTINE-TRAJECTORY-OF-TURKISH-RUSSIAN-RELATIONS/

Detailing the history of Turkey-Russia relations and the increasingly close ties that Russia has under the authoritarian Erdogan regime

HTTPS://OPEN.LIBRARY.UBC.CA/MEDIA/DOWNLOAD/PDF/831/1.0090886/2/1469

Documents the division of labor between the EU, NATO, CE, and OSCE in promoting democracy in Europe to counter authoritarian governments

HTTPS://WARONTHEROCKS.COM/2017/08/HOW-TO-DEAL-WITH-AUTHORITARIANISM-INSIDE-NATO/

A history on undemocratic regimes within NATO and ways that NATO has dealt with them previously, as well as methods to deal with currently undemocratic regimes

TOPIC B

Russian Aggression

TOPIC INTRODUCTION

Russia's economic strength is directly tied to the global strength that it exhibited during the Cold War under the banner of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. With the Soviet economy's cycle of booms and busts gradually reaching a trend of more bust than boom, the bearish economy tanked the Soviet Union's

ability to project its power onto foreign nations. Perhaps the most ill-advised of these Soviet incursions onto foreign nations was the Soviet-Afghan War, which nearly bankrupted the USSR and hurt the prestige of the formerly invincible Red Army. Facing calls from other Soviet republics of being "a Russian war fought by non-Russians against Afghans", the Soviet Union's hasty retreat only emboldened nations in their view that independence from the Soviet dictatorship was possible.

Russia has inherited the Soviet mentality of brinkmanship and military strength affirming its status as a world superpower, with the domination of smaller nations acting as a continuing affirmation of the Russian mandate to rule over the former Soviet Republics. Unlawful Russian incursions into foreign nations both physically and digitally serve as a reminder to the world that Russia is still relevant on the global stage, despite the Russian economy showing the same signs of slowing down that the Soviet economy did. Russia's current path mirrors much of the Soviet Union's hyperfocus on projecting its own power at the sake of the lives of its citizens.

Instead of guaranteeing the democratic values enshrined in the Russian constitution the current administration under President Vladimir Putin has rendered the notion of human and civil rights almost farcical in nature, with frequent crackdown on "undesirable" journalists and protestors making Russia an authoritarian state. But Russia is not just limited in censoring its own citizens. Russian hackers, working under the auspices of the FSB and FIS, have attacked foreign nations, all in an attempt to guide international politics to a direction favorable for Russia. Working to undermine democracies throughout the world has antagonized many nations and made Russia a near-pariah state, isolating it from its geographical neighbors. Incursions into the Ukrainian power grid shut down a majority of the government offices in Ukraine during the 2015 incursion into Crimea, and subsequent attacks in 2017 with Petya ransomware crippled the nation yet again. Such overt attacks are engineered by Russia to be deliberately traceable back to Russian organizations, reminding the world that Russia is still relevant. Despite the often-unscrupulous methods used, Russia's continuing attacks prove just how tenacious the nation is at maintaining its superpower status, and in fact may act as a signal to the world that Russia is here to stay in the geopolitical game.

HISTORY

The formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (the USSR) followed the success of the Bolshevik party in the Russian Civil War and the reconquering of much of the former Russian Empire. It originally consisted of Russia, Belorussia, Ukraine, and the Transcaucasian Federation (now Georgia, Azerbaijan and Armenia), although it was heavily dominated by Russia. The USSR slowly grew to encompass Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. Its gaining of membership and veto power within the United Nations Security Council in 1945 has been a key piece of political leverage for both the USSR and now the Russian Federation. During the Cold War, Soviet power was at its height as it leveraged its communist influence against the capitalist influence of the West and grew its nuclear stockpile to become the largest in the world. The formation of the Warsaw Pact in 1955 secured the USSR's military power abroad. That power peaked in Afghanistan from 1979 to 1989 as it backed communist governments with nearly 100,000 troops against the mujahideen, a collection of insurgencies backed by the US. The USSR's planned economy was unstable but had become one of the largest in the world, relying on the vast stores of oil and natural gas within its borders.

Despite the propitious rise of the Soviet Union in the Cold War period as a global superpower and the very real chance for global domination under the banner of communism, economic downturn soon struck the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Poor planning, economic malaise, and corruption led the USSR into an "Era of Stagnation" from the period of 1964 to 1985, threatening the prestige that it had accumulated over the years. This would eventually lead an opening up of the Soviet economy under Gorbachev's policies of *glasnost*, *perestroika*, and *uskoreniye*, westernizing the USSR in a desperate attempt to catch up to capitalist nations. However, strife among the CPSU between Gorbachev's liberal faction and the Yeltsin hardliners culminated in the coup attempt of 1991. Gorbachev saw the writing on the wall for the USSR, and on December 26, 1991, he officially dissolved the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The Russian Federation, as the USSR's strongest power

both militarily and economically, was forced to assume old Soviet debts, crippling the fledgling nation's economy. Compounding Russia's debt crisis was a messy series of privatizations, forcing Russia into a financial crisis in 1998. After nearly recovering from the 1998 crisis, Russia was once again plunged into financial ruin, this time caused by international backlash against the invasion of Crimea and falling natural gas and oil prices worldwide. The current state of the Russian economy is dire, with international sanctions and falling revenues forcing national austerity.

The Soviet, and in turn Russian, economy is inexorably linked to military power. At the height of the Cold War the USSR was matched submarine for submarine, bomber for bomber, and ICBM for ICBM, with every facet of production turned to the goal of narrowing the nuclear gap. Such brinkmanship was ultimately disastrous for the Soviet central economy, as more and more resources were pulled away from improving the lives of citizens in favor of posturing on the world stage. The current Russian administration under Putin has revived the Soviet tradition of military grandstanding, apparently learning little of the dangerous effects that overinvestment in the military has on the economy. A lack of funding is what defines the current Russian armed forces, with maintenance low and new upgrades rarely produced beyond the prototype scale. Such is the case with the Su-57, Russia's new 5th generation fighter. Budget cuts reduced the initial order of 334 fighters being reduced to a paltry 12. The *Admiral Kuznetsov*, flagship aircraft carrier of the Russian Navy, has been docked indefinitely pending a lack of funds for repairs after a drydock explosion, stripping Russia of its sole carrier. Russian military force projection is at an all-time low due to budget cuts, paradoxically at a time where Russia needs its military more than ever. As seen by the invasion of South Ossetia in 2008 and the invasion of Crimea in 2014, Russia now relies on whatever scraps of the military it can muster to prove to the world that it is still a relevant power, even in the face of its paper-tiger status.

Russia may be most well-known for its backing of the Assad regime in Syria, but its influence in the Middle East expands far beyond that regime. Iran, Egypt, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Libya, and Algeria have all either recently purchased arms from, are currently making plans to purchase arms from or have the potential to purchase arms from the Russian Federation. The Dais has decided not to

address the Middle East in committee this year, as the topic of Resurgent Russia within Europe is already large and discussion of NATO's policies in the Middle East easily command being a separate topic. Beyond the Middle East, Russia's intervention at the height of the conflict between Georgia and the region of South Ossetia within its borders raised alarms. South Ossetians had sought to break away from the greater Georgian state and when full conflict broke out, Russia intervened, pushing Georgian troops out of South Ossetia and declaring it independent. Few other countries recognize South Ossetia as an independent state. After Western parties won elections in Ukraine in 2014, Russia annexed Crimea, strategically significant Ukrainian territory which reaches into the Black Sea. The international backlash was immense, sparking aggressive economic sanctions from the West and the suspension of cooperation with NATO. Pro-Russian separatists backed by the Russian Federation and pro-Ukraine rebel groups backed by the Ukrainian government have been fighting in the East of Ukraine since, resulting in over 10,000 lives lost and the displacement of thousands more.

PAST ACTION

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization has always had a tenuous relationship with Russia. However, over the past few decades tensions between the two have escalated. This has been due to a multitude of reasons, but the result has been an increase in resolutions pertaining to Russia being passed by NATO. The majority of these center around political and military defense on behalf of NATO countries.

The NATO Resolution 222 STC 18 E fin is specifically focused on Russian interference in elections. It cites concern over "Russia's aggressive actions," going on to state that Russia's actions "are undermining Euro-Atlantic security and the rules-based international order". It also denounces "Russia's recent targeting of elections and referenda in Allied and partner countries". The resolution specifically urges countries to increase their cyber and election security, putting in place more effective infrastructure and procedures to counteract Russian election interference.

In the past, attempts have been made by both NATO and Russia to establish more positive interactions. In 1997, NATO and Russia signed the Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security, creating the NATO Russia Permanent Joint Council. In 2002, the Council was upgraded, creating the NATO-Russia Council (NRC). Relationships were strengthened when Russia joined the Partnership for Peace program in 1994. This was quickly followed by NATO and Russia signing the Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security on May 27, 1997, at the NATO Summit in Paris, France. This acted as a road map for would-be NATO-Russia cooperation. In this Act, both parties agreed to not view one another as adversaries and that, "based on an enduring political commitment undertaken at the highest political level, will build together a lasting and inclusive peace in the Euro-Atlantic area on the principles of democracy and cooperative security". Indeed, in June of 2011 NATO and Russia participated in a joint fighter jet exercise, seemingly making great strides towards cooperation.

Despite these efforts, subsequent NATO actions have spoken volumes about the current relationship with Russia. In 2014, Russia's aggressive actions in Ukraine and the annexation of Crimea led to a strong NATO response, when it condemned Russia's "illegal military intervention in Ukraine". In April of 2014, the NATO foreign ministers announced that they would suspend all practical cooperation with Russia, a response to Russia's aggressive actions in Ukraine. At the NATO Wales summit, the NATO-Ukraine Commission adopted a Joint Statement that "strongly condemned Russia's illegal and illegitimate self-declared "annexation" of Crimea and its continued and deliberate destabilization of eastern Ukraine in violation of international law." Tensions continued to mount when NATO created a "Spearhead Force" in December 2014, designed to enhance NATO presence in Eastern Europe. The NATO Secretary General quickly increased the number of troops in Eastern Europe to 40,000. NATO-Russian tensions continued to increase when, in November of 2015, Turkey shot down a Russian warplane, citing that it had violated Turkish airspace. Russia denied having done so. In 2016, at a NATO summit in Warsaw, NATO approved a plan which deployed military forces to the Baltic states and Eastern Poland. It also increased sea and air patrols in an effort to reassure allies following Russia's annexation of Crimea.

The increased strain on relationships with Russia has paralleled the mounting tensions between Russia and the United Nations as a whole. In December 2018, the UN General Assembly adopted Resolution A/73/L.47, which urged the Russian Federation to withdraw its military forces from Crimea and end its temporary occupation of Ukraine's territory. It also condemned Russia's increasing military presence in parts of the Black Sea. This Resolution was preceded by the passing of the United Nations General Assembly Resolution 68/262 in March 2014. This resolution, called the "Territorial integrity of Ukraine," was a response to the Russian annexation of Crimea. It affirmed the General Assembly's commitment to the territorial integrity of Ukraine, specifically within Ukraine's internationally recognized borders.

Overall, mounting tensions between NATO and Russia have created an international crisis, with increased NATO military presence invoking Russia's ire. The Cold War-esque situation has both sides fearful of escalation, yet neither side appears willing to back down. NATO's actions have done little to relieve the strain, as their recent acceptance of Montenegro to NATO only furthered the rift, while Russian officials have accused NATO of a series of hostile actions and threats.

CURRENT SITUATION

Beginning in 2008, a series of direct military interventions placed Russia back on the map as one of NATO's greatest threats. This series of interventions began in August 2008 when a five-day armed conflict between Russia and Georgia shook the stability of Europe and the sovereignty of Georgia. The lead up to this conflict began with the pro-Russian regions of Abkhazia and South Ossetia within Georgia. The region of Abkhazia went to war with the Georgian military and won in 1993, followed by South Ossetia overwhelmingly voting to become an independent state in a referendum in 2006. In 2007, Russia chose to withdraw its troops stationed in Georgia, but retain a military force in Abkhazia and South Ossetia for peacekeeping purposes. These events, combined with many years of post-Cold War/Soviet Union

tension between Russia and Georgia, climaxed when Georgia accused Russia of shooting down an unmanned drone in Abkhazia in April 2008. Russia more troops into the region in two waves, readying for what it believed would be a military intervention by the Georgian state; once when they were first accused and a second when a UN investigation confirmed that accusation. When Georgian president Mikheil Saakashvili sent its own large military force into the region, Russia responded rapidly, dominating Georgia's military. A ceasefire was reached on August 12th when Russia stopped its assault only thirty miles short of the country's capital, ending the five-day conflict. The Russian state now officially recognizes Abkhazia and South Ossetia as independent states, but close to zero other countries have joined them. The conflict raised questions about how the international community should respond to Russian aggression and in particular whether Georgia should be a member of NATO.

Later, in November 2013, mass protest erupted in Ukraine's capital, Kiev, in response to the Pro-Russian government's decision to step away from plans to sign an association agreement with the European Union. Protesters blamed the abandonment of the plan on pressure from Putin's government, and demanded the ousting of the Pro-Russian government. In February 2014, the leader of the Pro-Russian party fled to Russia and the more Western, Pro-EU/NATO opposition party took power. The next month, Russian forces invaded and annexed Crimea, a strategically significant portion of Ukraine that reaches into the Black Sea. The US, EU, and other NATO allies and member nations responded with increasingly severe sanctions on the Russian state, seeing the encroachment as a vicious attack on Ukraine's sovereignty. By April, pro-Russian separatists in Eastern Ukraine had seized the cities of Luhansk and Donetsk in the Donbass, facing off against Ukraine's military and volunteer militias in the region. The region escalated into war, with evidence overwhelmingly pointing to the Russian state aggressively backing the pro-Russian separatists. By October, Petro Poroshenko, running on a Pro-Western platform, won the presidential election and secured a majority government in Parliament. Two fragile Cease Fires, Minsk I and II, were agreed upon but are violated nearly every day, resulting in over ten thousand lives being lost. The most significant escalation of this conflict occurred on November 25th, 2018, when Ukrainian naval

vessels attempted to pass under a bridge that the Russian state had built over the Kerch Strait, which connects the Black Sea to the Sea of Azov. Russia blocked the Ukrainian ships with a large cargo ship and followed the Ukrainian vessels when they turned around to leave the area. The pursuit escalated, and the Russian ships fired on, rammed, and eventually captured the three Ukrainian vessels along with 25 Ukrainian sailors. In response to this, Petro Poroshenko declared martial law in 10 of 25 of Ukraine's provinces, granting the military significantly more power. The sailors remain captive in Russia to this day, even after international tribunals demanded their release. In May 2019, the TV star of a show in which a schoolteacher becomes the president of Ukraine after posting an anti-corruption rant, Volodymyr Zelensky, became the president of Ukraine, running on a pro-Western, anti-corruption platform. In July, he secured an absolute majority in parliament, presenting a more unified front against Putin's Russia. One of the most significant questions around Ukraine's future is if it will secure membership within NATO. It is currently part of the Membership Action Plan and Zelensky has clearly expressed his ambitions to join the growing alliance. Some members of the alliance have expressed concerns that its membership could cause the Russian state to escalate the conflict in the East, as it sees more of its buffer between the West and itself move towards the EU and NATO. Other nations have expressed concerns that not admitting Ukraine could cause political unrest within the country, as citizens see nationwide efforts to join the body be ignored. Some are concerned that its admittance could result in the use of Article 5, forcing a multinational response against Russia, which some fear could result in a large-scale military engagement.

In addition to these direct military engagements in Georgia and Ukraine, Russia has repeatedly violated terms of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty, resulting in the withdrawal of both the US and Russia. Missiles formerly banned by the treaty are now being developed by both countries and represent a significant escalation since the formation of the treaty at the end of the Cold War. As of the time of writing, an explosion in Russia has been connected to 'SCC-X-Skyfall' a missile that Putin has touted as having near infinite range through the use of a nuclear propulsion unit. However, there are no accounts of the missile being tested successfully. New events will surely unfold between the writing of the background

guide and the writing of position papers. As such, delegates are encouraged to stay up to date on new missile testing and what it means for NATO's response to Russian aggression.

Putin's administration has also been ramping up its cyber-warfare capabilities and Russian actors, governmental and non-governmental, have been responsible for a hailstorm of cyber attacks. Among these attacks are highly sophisticated attacks on Ukraine's power grid, the "NotPetya" attack which resulted in upwards of $10 billion in damages, and attacks on Estonia in 2007 that first demonstrated the true damage, chaos, and confusion that cyberwarfare could cause. NATO has made it clear that member nations see cyberwarfare as one of the most existential threats to collective security and democratic integrity. Recently the body has created a Rapid Response Team, agreed to set up a new Cyberspace Operations Centre, and have begun cooperating with the European Union on building cyber-defense capabilities. Delegates are encouraged to look into their countries' current commitments to cyber-defense and offence and consider how they line up with NATO's newly placed priority on the sector.

CASE STUDIES
CASE STUDY 1: SANCTIONS

Following Russia's invasion and annexation of Crimea, the international community put into place a wide range of sanctions targeting the Russian state. These sanctions had the primarily goal of forcing Russia to slow down its invasion without direct military intervention by inflicting damage to its economy. They were coordinated by NATO at a summit in Wales in tandem with the European Union and other NATO allies and were paired with a $20 million-dollar aid package. They include sanctions which force state owned Russian enterprises out of Western markets, an embargo (ban) on exports of advanced oil exploration and production equipment to Russia, and an embargo on exports of specific military and dual-use goods. The combined force of these embargos exploited an already struggling Russian economy, putting the nation into a recession by 2015 and causing a fall in oil

prices, a good which is absolutely essential to the Russian economy. The sanctions were effective in this sense, and the Russian military not pushing further into Ukraine is largely attributed to them.

However, these sanctions did have negative drawbacks. Firstly, the Russian state responded with a ban on food imports from Western nations, causing damage to those nations agricultural sectors. Secondly, the embargo on exports of certain military and oil exploration and production equipment damaged Western markets that were formerly able to sell their products in Russian markets. Thirdly, Russia entering a recession led to decreased demands for international imports, damaging any countries which had industries reliant on demand from Russia. This decrease in demand for imports is only partially due to Western sanctions, as the Russian economy was facing increasing economic difficulties before any sanctions were in place.

Even with these three sources of damage to Western markets the vast majority of EU member states were able to find other markets for their goods and avoid even having a net decrease in exports as of roughly one year after sanctions were put in place. The only nations that appear to have been severely impacted and not been able to effectively divert their trade were Finland and Lithuania, with Lithuania maintaining positive growth due to domestic demand.

NATO has continued to seek a sanction-based approach in recent months. After the conflict in the Kerch Strait, sanctions were placed on over one hundred people and entities related to the incident. This follows the current pattern of NATO avoiding direct military intervention in Ukraine. However, this approach can still be changed, and delegates are heavily encouraged to carefully weigh the effectiveness of current sanctions as Russia continues to push its military force in Ukraine, develop stronger weapons of mass destruction, and digitally attack Western institutions.

CASE STUDY 2: BLACKOUTS IN UKRAINE

On December 17th, 2015 Northern Kiev, the Capital of Ukraine, lost power. The cause of the attack quickly became clear: a highly sophisticated, effective cyber

attack originating from Russia. The attack began with phishing emails used to infiltrate the networks of companies relating to Ukraine's power grid with BlackEnergy malware. With BlackEnergy in place, Russian hackers remotely disabled power substations and then using KillDisk, a second type of malware, destroyed IT infrastructure, deleted files on affected computers, and attacked local call-centers to deny citizens of updated information on the blackout. The attack was clearly highly coordinated and planned far in advance; the hackers used infiltration strategies specific to each company's system of servers after months of intel gathering, something that had never been done before.

The source of the attack being from Russia cannot be entirely confirmed, but Ukrainian security services have identified it as the source, and it seems highly likely that they are correct. The attack took place soon after pro-Ukrainian forces attacked sub-stations that powered grids in Russian annexed Crimea. Contradictory to the theory that the attack on Kiev's power was in retaliation to that attack, the attack had been in the planning stage before the attack on Crimea occurred. However, Ukrainian operatives have noted that the attack on Kiev appears to have been rushed and believe that Russian forces may have rushed the already planned attack display it as being in retaliation to the attack on Crimea. Others also note that hackers could have chosen to destroy substation equipment rather than simply shutting it down; indicating that the attack was more about sending a message than it was doing actual damage. This could support the theory that the attack was in retaliation to the attack on Crimea; or any number of other reasons that the Russian state would feel it necessary to send an aggressive message. It is relevant to note here that Ukrainian Security Forces have made it very clear that they are absolutely sure that the attack originated from Russia. In response to this and similar attacks, the United States Agency for International Development has dedicated $10 million to investments in Ukraine's cyber defense industry, experts from NATO member nations have developed a cybersecurity course in Ukraine, and NATO has significantly increased investment in cyber security as a whole. That includes NATO's Cyber Rapid Reaction teams, an agreement to set up a Cyberspace Operations Centre, cooperation with the EU on cyber security, and closed partnerships with private industries around cyber security. The effectiveness of these particular

measures is difficult to gauge, but we know that cyber attacks in Eastern Ukraine have not slowed down since the attack in 2016, as Luhansk and the Donbass remain hotbeds of cyberwarfare.

This attack demonstrates the power that cyber attacks already wield, and any conversation of Russian aggression would be remiss without a plan to deter or defend against both digital and military attacks from the Russian State. Some countries, like the United States, have chosen to build up their own arsenals, having recently launched attacks on Russia's power grid. However, NATO as a body has broadly decided on an approach that emphasizes the importance of building up cyber defense capabilities, rather than offensive capabilities. Cyber attacks are a new challenge for NATO and delegates are encouraged to be inventive with solutions and consider all possible directions, including a more aggressive approach emphasizing building up offensive capabilities.

BLOC POSITIONS

Nordic and Baltic Region: Denmark, Estonia, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway

Focused mainly on deterrence of Russia at its northernmost territory, this bloc is comprised of two groups, the Nordic group with Denmark, Norway, and Iceland (along with non-NATO members Sweden and Finland) and the Baltic group with Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia. Although these two groups are distinct in their cultures, their shared goal of checking Russian aggression in the north makes for a unified front. The Baltic group is more immediately concerned with stopping Russia due to sharing a direct border and being smaller in both military strength and population, while the Nordic group is more worried about a potential incursion starting from Finland westwards, as seen in the Winter War during World War 2.

The Mediterranean: Italy, France, Portugal, Spain

This bloc is NATO's primary task force for dealing with threats in Northern Africa and the Middle East, being comprised of geographically disparate nations such as France, Italy, Portugal, and Spain. Not as concerned with stopping Russia due to the physical distance between Russia and them, this bloc's main focus is acting as NATO's southernmost bases for foreign deployments, especially those such as anti-piracy campaigns in the Horn of Africa and Gulf of Aden. These efforts are less about reigning in Russia directly and instead promoting NATO's efforts as a peacekeeping force and ensuring global security to sway non-member nations towards NATO as a whole.

[Balkans:](#) Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Greece, Hungary, Montenegro, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia

Made up of many nations which were previously Warsaw Pact members and thus directly under the rule of Soviet Union, this bloc is perhaps the most vehemently anti-Russian group in NATO. Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Greece, Hungary, Montenegro, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia are part of this bloc, making this the largest and most varied bloc in all of NATO. Hungary is a special case, having its distinct cultural heritage from other Balkan nations, but is placed in this bloc due to the overall location and threats being similar to the Balkans. The main goal of this bloc is to support pro-European sentiment and quash pro-Russian separatist movements such as Crimea in Ukraine, Abkhazia and South Ossetia in Georgia, or Transnistria in Moldova.

[Central Europe:](#) Belgium, the Czech Republic, France, Germany, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Poland

Belgium, the Czech Republic, France, Germany, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and Poland make up the Central European bloc. Most of the nations in this bloc are more developed than most of the other blocs, with economic power being a key strength. These nations also have some of the most substantial militaries in NATO, with France, Germany, and Poland being major contributors in the overall

size and strength of a unified NATO coalition. The role of these nations in NATO is to act as a deterrent to Russia based on their military and political might, and some of these nations such as Poland make up the most vehement detractors of Russian expansion.

The Anglosphere: Canada, United States, United Kingdom

Canada, the United States, and the United Kingdom make up the Anglosphere, and are allied to each other not only in NATO but also in other alliances such as Five Eyes and the UKUSA Agreement. The United States in particular is a major contributor to NATO's continuing success through economic and military support, being NATO's number one contributor to military spending by far. However, apart from the United States these nations are mostly removed from any European conflicts, especially Canada which is isolated geographically from Europe and the United Kingdom, which is shifting away from European affairs post-Brexit. Despite their status
as world powers the sheer distance from Russia means that the power of this bloc is relatively equal to the other blocs, which have the strength in numbers to equalize the power balance.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What is your country's relationship with Russia? How might this be affected by NATO actions?

2. Does your country support the increased NATO military presence in Eastern Europe in response to Crimea and Ukraine? Why?

3. What obligation, if any, does NATO have to keep Russian aggression in check?

4. Does NATO have the authority to interfere in countries that are not part of the alliance in order to curb or respond to Russian aggression?

5. What role does NATO policy on enlargement play in its relationship with Russia?

6. What methods for combatting Russian aggression would your country approve of?

7. What economic repercussions could be incurred from NATO's response to Russian aggression?

FURTHER RESEARCH

[HTTPS://PESD.PRINCETON.EDU/?Q=NODE/274](https://pesd.princeton.edu/?q=node/274)

An overview of the situation in South Ossetia and Abkhazia in Georgia, providing a background to Russian military occupations and other "frozen conflicts"

[HTTPS://JSIS.WASHINGTON.EDU/NEWS/CYBERATTACK-CRITICAL-INFRASTRUCTURE-RUSSIA-UKRAINIAN-POWER-GRID-ATTACKS/](https://jsis.washington.edu/news/cyberattack-critical-infrastructure-russia-ukrainian-power-grid-attacks/)

An investigation into the Ukrainian power grid hack and methods used by the hackers, giving insights into other ways that Russia may move to disrupt governments for its own purposes

[HTTPS://WWW.RAND.ORG/CONTENT/DAM/RAND/PUBS/TESTIMONIES/CT400/CT468/RAND_CT468.PDF](https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/testimonies/ct400/ct468/rand_ct468.pdf)

Defines the concept of Russian "hybrid warfare" and the use of non-military assets to capture areas of strategic importance to destabilize NATO and pro-Western regimes

HTTPS://WWW.BROOKINGS.EDU/BLOG/UP-FRONT/2015/04/02/THE-RUSSIAN-ECONOMY-IN-2050-HEADING-FOR-LABOR-BASED-STAGNATION/

Provides a look into the future of Russia's declining economy and Russia's path to demographic-related stagnation despite political posturing on the global stage

HTTPS://OTHJOURNAL.COM/2019/01/17/COUNTERING-THE-NATO-THREAT-A-LOOK-AT-RUSSIAS-MILITARY-ADVANCEMENTS-AND-CHALLENGES-TO-FUTURE-DEFENSE-PART-1/

Documents Russian military breakthrough and the threat that new Russian technologies have for NATO and Western forces, along with ways to counter them

CITATIONS

Topic A

- https://time.com/4581070/turkey-erdogan-fired-dismissed-suspended-sacked-officials-total/
- https://www.cnn.com/2015/11/26/middleeast/recep-tayyip-erdogan-fast-facts/index.html
- https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2019/jul/24/hope-democracy-turkey-istanbul-mayoral-election
- https://www.nytimes.com/2019/06/21/world/asia/erdogan-turkey-courts-judiciary-justice.html
- https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/10/13/nato-members-are-supposed-to-be-democratic-what-happens-when-turkey-isnt/
- https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2019/05/29/climate-fear-hungary-inside-dying-democracy-propped-eu/
- https://beta.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2019/02/07/hungarys-democracy-just-got-a-failing-grade/
- https://foreignpolicy.com/2018/02/05/hungary-and-poland-arent-democratic-theyre-authoritarian/
- https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/jan/30/poland-democratic-spring-fightback-citizens
- https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2018/04/nato-hungary-authoritarianism/557459/

- https://www.nato-pa.int/news/democratic-values-crucial-nato-it-faces-new-challenges-70
- https://www.nato-pa.int/download-file?filename=sites/default/files/2018-11/RESOLUTION%20452%20%20-%20SAFEGUARDING%20THE%20ELECTIONS.pdf
- https://www.un.org/en/sections/issues-depth/democracy/index.html
- https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_17120.htm
- https://www.britannica.com/topic/democracy
- https://www.pbs.org/native-america/blogs/native-voices/how-the-iroquois-great-law-of-peace-shaped-us-democracy
- https://undocs.org/A/RES/72/164
- https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2018/09/20/us/politics/russia-trump-election-timeline.html?auth=login-google
- https://www.cnn.com/2019/07/24/politics/russia-trump-election-interference/index.html
- https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news_158911.htm

Topic B

- https://www.nato-pa.int/download-file?filename=sites/default/files/2018-11/RESOLUTION%20452%20%20-%20SAFEGUARDING%20THE%20ELECTIONS.pdf
- https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_111767.htm
- https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/news_108501.htm
- https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-26838894
- https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news_112695.htm
- https://www.reuters.com/article/us-nato-summit-idUSKCN0ZN2NL
- https://www.un.org/press/en/2018/ga12108.doc.htm
- https://www.cnn.com/2019/07/22/europe/ukraine-elections-zelensky-putin-intl/index.html
- https://beta.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2018/11/29/why-did-ukraine-impose-martial-law/
- https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-48409370
- https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Fb9U1uoYCOc
- https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-18010123
- https://www.history.com/news/russia-georgia-war-military-nato
- https://www.cnn.com/2014/03/13/world/europe/2008-georgia-russia-conflict/index.html

- https://www.cnn.com/2019/08/17/europe/russia-nuclear-summer-skyfall-intl/index.html
- https://www.cnn.com/2019/08/12/europe/russia-military-blast-radiation-intl/index.html
- https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_78170.htm
- https://www.nytimes.com/2019/06/15/us/politics/trump-cyber-russia-grid.html
- https://www.wired.com/story/russian-hackers-attack-ukraine/
- https://www.usatoday.com/story/opinion/2019/07/06/deter-russian-cyber-attack-cold-war-column/1587711001/
- https://www.reuters.com/article/us-ukraine-cyber-attack-energy/ukraines-power-outage-was-a-cyber-attack-ukrenergo-idUSKBN1521BA
- https://www.wired.com/2016/03/inside-cunning-unprecedented-hack-ukraines-power-grid/
- https://www.politico.eu/article/ukraine-cyber-war-frontline-russia-malware-attacks/
- https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news_159840.htm?selectedLocale=en