



NORTH  
ATLANTIC  
TREATY  
ORGANIZATION  
TOPIC BULLETIN

MICHAEL CAI, CHAIR  
LAURA ZHANG, VICE CHAIR

**Contents:**

Letters from the Chairs ..... 3

Topic A: Ukraine in the EU ..... 4

    Introduction ..... 4

    Topic History ..... 5

    Current Situation and Possible Solutions ..... 6

    Questions to Consider ..... 8

    References ..... 8

Topic B: Militarization of the Arctic ..... 10

    Introduction ..... 10

    Topic History ..... 10

    Current Situation and Possible Solutions ..... 7

    Questions to Consider ..... 13

    References ..... 13

Topic C: Transparency..... 14

    Introduction ..... 14

    Topic History ..... 14

    Current Situation and Possible Solutions ..... 15

    Questions to Consider ..... 16

    References ..... 16



# Bergen Academies MUN

- THE EIGHTEENTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE -

## SECRETARIAT

MICHAEL DUGAN  
SECRETARY GENERAL

AKSHARA DHADDA  
CHARGE D' AFFAIRS

CHRISTINA XUE  
DIRECTOR OF EXTERNAL  
RELATIONS

ANGELA YOU  
DIRECTOR OF EXTERNAL  
RELATIONS

ELIZABETH HIGH  
DIRECTOR OF INTERNAL  
RELATIONS

RUTH PARK  
DIRECTOR OF INTERNAL  
RELATIONS

MEGHAN PRESSIMONE  
DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONS

KEEMIN LEE  
DIRECTOR OF COMMITTEES

PETER PARK  
DIRECTOR OF CRISIS

VICTORIA STAADA  
DIRECTOR OF CRISIS

DAVID SONG  
DIRECTOR OF JOINT CRISIS

GERARD VALENCIA  
DIRECTOR OF JOINT CRISIS

ANDREA BUCCINO  
FACULTY ADVISOR

MARK KRAMER  
FACULTY ADVISOR

Dear Delegates,

My name is Michael Cai and I will be serving as your chair for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization committee at AUN XVIII. I am currently a senior in the Academy for the Advancement in Science and Technology at the Bergen County Academies, and have participated in Model UN since my freshman year. My first conference was at AMUN XV in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization committee, and I have since attended numerous college and high school conferences such as PMUNC, YMUN, and WAMUNC. Outside of Model UN, I have an interest in biology and engineering, and am also an avid runner as part of BCA's cross country and track team.

Sincerely,

Michael Cai, Chair, NATO  
[miccai@bergen.org](mailto:miccai@bergen.org)

Dear Delegates,

My name is Laura and I will be one of your chairs. I hope you are all extremely excited to discuss pressing world issues, debate solutions to problems, and brainstorm new ideas in this year's NATO committee. This year our topics cover a wide range of current events and will require all of you to make your case. I expect to see excellent oratory skills, teamwork, leadership, and above all; diplomacy. As UN delegates and NATO members, your role is to work together to create an efficient plan for the topics we have presented you with.

Now, for a little bit about myself. I'm the Director of Events for the BCA Model UN Team and have been to over ten conferences since freshman year. I'm a sprinter on the track team here and Allyson Felix is my queen. I can pretty much get into any type of music as long as it's not country. I happen to have a strange passion for 1940's typewriters, peacock mantis shrimp, and hooded seals so feel free to ask me about those. I also find corny jokes really funny even though I try my best not to laugh at them. Overall, I expect some great ideas, some crazy drama, and some epic MUN puns.

Best of Luck,

Laura Zhang, Vice Chair, NATO  
[lauzha@bergen.org](mailto:lauzha@bergen.org)



## ***Introduction:***

There has been large controversy over whether Ukraine deserves EU membership. Recent issues with Crimea and Russia have polarized the people of Ukraine. Some citizens believe EU membership is the answer while others have sided with Russia. Delegates must determine a solution and remobilize the deadlocked Ukraine. For some time now, the NATO alliance countries have considered extending membership to Ukraine. Ukraine has maintained active participation in NATO activity within the region and has even applied for NATO membership. Because of the need to preserve political non-alignment and peace among its citizens, Ukraine retracted their membership application. In 2013, controversy arose when the Ukrainian president, Viktor Yanukovich, suspended an alliance with the European Union because he favored an agreement with Russia. The people in favor of the

agreement with the European Union were called Euromaidans and started a large uprising after the suspension. Euromaidan protesters forced Yanukovich to flee the capital city of Kiev. The events that followed consisted of a new president as well as the annexation of Crimea. Ukraine was polarized, with the eastern side leaning towards an alliance with Russia, and the western side still striving for the EU. Russia's invasion into Crimea sparked outrage and amidst the chaos, a war erupted between the postrevolutionary Ukrainian government and the pro-Russian insurgents. Ukraine's public opinion of NATO has changed drastically over the past few years. Originally in 2008, nearly the majority of the Ukrainian population viewed NATO as a threat. However, due to political unrest and recent intrusions from Russia into Crimea, the Ukrainians have changed their views and now



see NATO as a source of protection. Many Ukrainians fear Russia and believe that Crimea was taken by force. Ukraine renewed its membership application in 2014 and it is currently pending approval. Ukraine is able to provide many benefits to NATO but its history of political unrest as well as tensions with Russia may be detrimental to the organization.

## ***Topic History:***

Crimea has served as the center of dispute within the Ukrainian-Russian conflict. In 1783, Crimea became a part of the Russian Empire when Crimean Khanate was annexed. In the years that followed, Crimea circulated in and out of Russian/Soviet Union control. In 1954, Crimea was no longer under Russian SFSR control and had been transferred to Ukrainian SSR under orders given by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union. Around 1991, an independent government was restored within Crimea and this lasted for a few years under the

Soviet Union until the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the independence of Ukraine. The newly independent Ukraine allowed Crimea to maintain their autonomous status. At the time, the Supreme Council of Crimea affirmed Crimea's sovereignty to Ukraine. In 1995, Ukraine limited the autonomy of Crimea. This would serve as the basis for future issues.

In 2008 and 2009, issues erupted between the Ukrainian Foreign Minister and Russian forces. In 2008 the Ukrainian Foreign Minister, Volodymyr Ohryzko accused Russia of illegal Russian passport distribution within Crimea. In 2009, anti-Ukrainian actions erupted within Crimea from the local Russian residents. Crimea is populated by a majority of ethnic Russians. There exists a small minority of ethnic Ukrainians and Crimean Tatars (muslims). Furthermore, Crimea is home to the largest population of Russians within Ukraine.

In 2010, Victor Yanukovich won the Ukrainian presidential election with a majority of votes coming from Crimea and eastern Ukraine. He was heavily favored due to his pro-Russian ideals. A few years later in late November 2013, the Euromaidan protest movement was born when Yanukovich



suspended the signing of the Ukraine European Union Association Agreement. This agreement was meant to serve as a bridge between the EU and Ukraine. It established political and economic connections in an attempt to foster stronger relations. The Crimean Autonomous Parliament strongly supported Yanukovich's decision and condemned the Euromaidan protests. The Crimean government instead urged people to "strengthen friendly ties with Russian regions."

In late February of 2014, the Euromaidan protests succeeded in causing Yanukovich and his ministers to flee the capital. Consecutively, the Party of Regions and other factions voted to remove Yanukovich from office upon the basis of his incompetency. Arseniy Yatsenyuk became the new president of the temporary caretaker government until new elections were held. However, this was only the beginning of an allout internal struggle. Pro-Russian citizens mainly in Crimea began to protest as well. A series of revolts erupted in Crimea and on February 27, a group of special Russian forces took over the building of the Supreme Council of Crimea.

On March 14, a referendum was illegally held in Crimea to determine the public opinion. The

results of the referendum were an overwhelming 95% of citizens who were in favor of Russian annexation. On March 18, the Treaty on Accession of the Republic of Crimea to Russia was signed by representatives of Crimea and the Russian Federation. 6 days later, the Ukrainian government ordered a complete withdrawal of armed forces from Crimea. In July of 2015, the Russian prime minister declared that Crimea had been fully integrated into Russia. Ukraine of course did not just back off. From the moment the agreement was signed, the Ukrainian government began to cut off Crimea. Buses and services to Crimea were removed and many Russian products were boycotted.

## ***Current Situation and Possible Solutions:***

Currently, Ukraine is a priority country in the European Neighborhood Policy. This policy maintains that the EU works with nearby countries to establish political association and the closest



possible economic integration. EU is working to reform the unstable state of Ukraine through a support package of 11 billion euros. Germany, France, Austria, Belgium and the Netherlands remain firmly against EU membership for Ukraine and have repeatedly blocked any attempts. Dutch voters in particular are against this membership with a recent poll showing over 76% of Dutch voting no to the question “Should the EU extend membership to Ukraine?” The EU’s other 27 members have already ratified the Association Agreement.

Furthermore, a recent implication may further delay Ukraine’s admission into the EU: Brexit. With the EU’s priority focused on Britain, Ukraine will have to be put on hold. The entire European Commission may have to devote the next few years to Britain leaving fewer officials to stay in contact with Ukraine. Additionally, Britain is one of the strong pro-Ukraine members and their absence may tip the scale towards pro-Russian Italy and Germany. The loss of economic connections to Britain will not only harm the EU, but Ukraine as well.

The EU could consider non-membership with connections by continuing its current relationship with Ukraine. They will continue positive economic and political connections. Ukraine will be treated as a member only will not have an official EU membership. Pros are that there will be no extreme opposition. Membership is unofficial so as to maintain minimal rebellion. However, cons are that Ukraine will remain polarized. Unofficial membership puts the EU and Russia at a stalemate so the existing protests will not subside.

#### Membership

The EU will extend membership to Ukraine. It is uncertain whether or not Ukraine will accept but if Ukraine does, the EU and all its members must directly deal with Russia. The EU will have to come up with a solution to the Russian troops within Crimea. Many countries within the EU and NATO already have a bad relationship with Russia. Furthermore, they will have to face opposition in pro-Russian regions of Ukraine. The advantages will be that pro-EU regions of Ukraine will





receive protection from EU membership.

The EU may also consider non interference. Some countries have taken the choice to step back. NATO will have to find external indirect ways to ease the situation. For the most part however, Ukraine will continue towards the civil war which may erupt and battle it out to decide on Russian alliance or EU membership. Some delegates may argue that this method will cause many deaths and chaos in Ukraine. Others may argue that NATO interference could worsen the situation.

## ***Questions to Consider:***

1. Should Crimea be recognized as an independent region aligned with Russia?
2. Should NATO take direct military action against Russian troops within Crimea?
3. What actions should NATO encourage the EU to take at this time?

4. What are long term and short term solutions to the problem?
5. Should NATO's responsibility to aid Ukraine take priority over a country's unwillingness to be involved with Russia? (To clarify: Many NATO countries have negative relationship with Russia and may prefer to sit out.)
6. If Ukraine is opposed to direct interference should national sovereignty or international security come first? (National sovereignty: respect for an individual country's borders, rights and laws; International security: the protection and safety of multiple countries)

## ***References:***

1. <http://www.eeas.europa.eu/ukraine/>
2. [http://www.eeas.europa.eu/enp/index\\_en.htm](http://www.eeas.europa.eu/enp/index_en.htm)
3. <https://www.rt.com/news/338095euopposeukraine-membership/>





4. <http://www.rferl.org/content/ukrainenetherlandseu-associationagreementwhatnow/27659450.html>
5. <http://www.kyivpost.com/article/opinion/oped/max-hunderbrexitsblowtoukraines-euhopes418641.html>



## ***Introduction:***

Some countries such as Russia have been looking to establish military forces within the arctic. Delegates will debate the use of the arctic and how to deal with countries pursuing militarization. Furthermore, the arctic countries will battle it out and make their case for why they deserve their own territory in the Arctic.

The world consumption of oil was 33 million barrels in the year 2013. These dwindling sources of energy have made clear that it is imperative for countries to begin seeking new areas to access more resources. The Arctic has presented itself as the optimal location with its large amounts of oil and natural gas. Of the 19 geological basins making up the Arctic region, only half have been scoured for oil and gas. The amount of oil the Arctic can provide represents 13% of the undiscovered oil in the world. The Arctic not only can give humans access to more resources, but it is also an important shipping route, a home to various wild fish populations and a source of

precious metals. Various countries have recognized the potential in the Arctic and one of them, Russia, is already taking steps. In June 2007 Russian geologists discovered that the Amerasia territory in the Arctic was linked to Russian Federation territory. This discovery allowed Russia to further latch onto the region. Recent advances in Russian attempts to establish a military force within the region have become threatening to other countries. Therefore, it is vital that The North Atlantic Treaty Organization, an international government alliance formed in 1949, address the issue of militarization and economic development of the Arctic.

## ***Topic History:***

Under international law, no country owns the North Pole or the Arctic Ocean that surrounds it. The five Arctic countries; Canada, Denmark, Norway, Russia, and the United States, have exploration and resource rights to areas within 200 nautical miles of their coasts. The Arctic provides a means of independence for Greenland with its energy and mineral resources. In



1991, the Arctic Countries adopted an Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy. In 1996, foreign ministers of the arctic states agreed in the Ottawa Declaration, to form the Arctic Council with a mandate to undertake a broad programme to include all dimensions of sustainable development. According to the United Nations Environment Programme, “The Arctic Council is a high level intergovernmental forum that provides a mechanism to address the common concerns and challenges faced by the Arctic governments and the people of the Arctic addressing all three of the main pillars of sustainable development; the environmental, social and economic.” The UN Convention on the Law of the Sea which aims to resolve such territorial claims. Signatories have ten years to submit a scientific case for extending their continental shelf beyond the 200 nautical miles.

In 2013, Russia announced their plans to establish a major northern naval base and organized several naval expeditions to the Arctic. Reportedly, some of these ships contained construction materials to build a Soviet-era naval base that was shut down in 1993. This sparked the debate over whether the Arctic should be used

for militarization. In the past years, Arctic countries have become more assertive in their claims over the Arctic land as it contains valuable resources. Aside from Russia which has a well established underwater system in the area, Canada has also started creating small but permanent military bases in the more remote regions of the Arctic.

## ***Current Situation and Possible Solutions:***

At the Lisbon Summit of the NATO military bloc, a new Strategic Concept was developed and it outlined the role of NATO in regards to the Arctic. NATO’s role is to protect energy security throughout the world and this now encompasses the Arctic.

There are various disputes over what land should be up for grabs. Furthermore, some countries believe certain passages should be international seaways and should not be controlled over by a single country. For example, Hans Island is an issue between Canada and



Denmark since it lies within an international strait.

As stated above, upon ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, a country has a 10-year period to make claims to an extended continental shelf. If this claim is validated, the country is granted exclusive rights to the area's resources. Norway, Canada, Russia, and Denmark have launched projects to investigate Arctic seabeds and gather data to make their claims. The US has signed but not ratified this law yet.

Many countries have already begun to establish military bases in the Arctic therefore, it would be too complicated to force these countries to remove their establishments. Also, since Russia's actions in the Arctic pose a large threat to others, allowing countries to maintain their own military bases gives them protection and safety. Militarization will allow countries to guard their rightful borders. The disadvantages however are that the Arctic countries will gain a large monopoly on the Arctic trade and resources. Other countries will only have access to minimal

international straits and their lack of land to establish military bases puts them at a severe disadvantage. Countries may argue that militarization will turn the Arctic into a warzone where countries violently battle over resources and a large percent of the world is excluded from the resources the Arctic holds.

In contrast, by removing militarization, the Arctic will become a peacezone and countries can launch educational expeditions and information gathering projects. The Arctic serves as a large basin of new wildlife and resources. Scientists can collect a wide variety of data that can be highly beneficial to multiple countries. Without militarization, these projects can be safely conducted and all countries will have a fair opportunity to harvest their share of the Arctic. Countries in support of this option however must come up with an efficient way to convince Arctic countries to remove their military bases. Failure to do so could result in an extremely prolonged period of the Arctic being shut off to everyone until military bases are removed.



## ***Questions to Consider:***

1. Should countries be allowed to make their own claims on certain areas of the Arctic or should all countries (including nonArctic countries) be allowed to access the Arctic?
2. How should NATO respond to the threat Russia poses with it's advanced military base that already exists in the Arctic?
3. Who should determine which country deserves what region and how will this be determined?
4. Many startup companies wish to conduct research in the Arctic. Should they be allowed to and if yes, which companies will receive priority?

2. <http://www.eurodialogue.eu/energysecurity/The-MilitarizationoftheArctic>
3. [http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2013/12/07/sundayreview/whoownsthe-arctic.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2013/12/07/sundayreview/whoownsthe-arctic.html?_r=0)

## ***References:***

1. <http://thediplomat.com/2013/10/thecreeping-militarizationofthearctic/>



## ***Introduction:***

Transparency is commonly defined as a government or organization's obligation to share information with its citizens or members. Transparency at its foundation is something necessary for the success of a government's or organization's goals and security. However, transparency also includes limitations towards covert operations, which could even be considered illegal if not supervised, making these 'covert operations' less covert. The global trend towards transparency even in nondemocratic nations poses a threat to the current rigidity to transparency found in NATO. According to Jan Libich's model of transparency, a transparent organization should publish:

- Its aims and *raison d'être* (what the organization wants to achieve)
- Data and analyses that are necessary for making informed decisions.
- Information about the decision making process and the decisions themselves
- Financial data

- Information necessary for accountability

## ***Topic History:***

Most recently, NATO has also been following the trend towards transparency, publishing and releasing a large amount of documents and classification of information including: '*NATO Security Policy*' (June 2002), '*The Management of NonClassified NATO Information*' (July 2002), '*NATO Strategic Communication Policy*' (September 2009), '*Policy on the Public Disclosure of NATO Information*' (November 2008), etc. However, most documents and information that is released in NATO's communication policy are disclosed and made available when it "has permanent value and is at least 30 years old; has been declassified by competent authorities in accordance with the NATO Security Policy and has been examined by competent authorities in the member nations and approved for public disclosure" meaning that all NATO information requires at least 30 years to be made publically.

Moreover, NATO's communication and transparency model do not follow the above



mentioned criteria stated by Libich, despite slight progress towards releasing information towards its aims, finance, and accountability reports. Almost none of the reports published by NATO concern present activities and does not even disclose its common budget nor documents needed for accountability (NATO does however publish its civilian and military budget totals.) NATO is perhaps one of the most rigid organizations, which is especially shocking given its democratic member states.

## ***Current Situation and Possible Solutions:***

Recently, various organizations have urged NATO to release more information on the funding and various uses of funding specifically the Netherlands Court of Audit (NCA) which advises the International Board of Auditors for NATO (IBAN). Furthermore, many NGO's have appeared to alarm for the problem of NATO's insufficient transparency, most notably 'NATO

Watch'. According to Tsvetelina Yordanova, a good model for transparency should disclose information about the following:

- The constitutive acts of the organization; its member states or other subjects of the international law;
- The strategic documents of the organization, revealing its aims and intentions;
- Information about the plans to reform the organization;
- The structure and the personnel of the organization;
- The procedures for the nomination of the management of the organization and the mechanism of the conflict of interest policy;
- Analyses, statistics, reports, papers and other information, created by the organization, which is valuable in the decision-making process;
- Drafts of important documents like treaties, decisions, etc.
- Decision making process – open official meetings of the main bodies (through open doors, online





- broadcasting, public minutes, records or other)
- Voting records of member states;
  - The decisions made either partly or fully
  - The budget of the organization (in program format), including the amount of the annual installments of the member countries
  - Existence of a transparency friendly procedure for access to documents.  
It is up to the delegates to decide which pieces of information if any should be provided to the public bearing in mind the possible drawbacks of a more transparent NATO.

## ***Questions to Consider:***

1. What are the drawbacks and benefits of making NATO a more transparent organization?
2. The UN is generally more transparent than NATO, does their role in the world differ from that of NATO causing this?

3. Which if any pieces of information listed above should be included in a possible reform of transparency, keeping in mind the possible drawbacks.

## ***References:***

1. [www.transparency.usi.ch/files/media/yordanova\\_the\\_transparency\\_-\\_security\\_dilemma\\_in\\_national\\_and\\_international\\_context.pdf](http://www.transparency.usi.ch/files/media/yordanova_the_transparency_-_security_dilemma_in_national_and_international_context.pdf)
2. [http://www.nato.int/nato\\_static/assets/pdf/pdf\\_archives/20120327\\_C-M\\_2008\\_0116\\_INVPublic\\_Disclosure.pdf](http://www.nato.int/nato_static/assets/pdf/pdf_archives/20120327_C-M_2008_0116_INVPublic_Disclosure.pdf)
3. [www.nato.int/nato\\_static/fl2014/assets/pdf/pdf\\_archives/AC\\_324D\\_2014\\_0010.pdf](http://www.nato.int/nato_static/fl2014/assets/pdf/pdf_archives/AC_324D_2014_0010.pdf)
4. [http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics\\_111582.htm](http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_111582.htm)
5. [http://www.rekenkamer.nl/english/NATO\\_Transparency/NATO\\_Transparency\\_and\\_public\\_Accountability:20048](http://www.rekenkamer.nl/english/NATO_Transparency/NATO_Transparency_and_public_Accountability:20048)
6. <http://natowatch.org/node/1718>

