



NATO PACMUN 2017

DIRECTOR **KAVYA IYER**
ASST. DIRECTOR **GRACE ZOU**
CHAIR **NICOLE TURTLE**



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Director Letter	2
Sources: Topic A	14
Sources: Topic B	14

TOPIC A: TURKISH REFERENDUM

Topic Introduction	3
History	3
Past Action	4
Current Situation	4
Bloc Positions	5
Case Studies	6
Guiding Questions	7

TOPIC B: MILITARIZATION OF NORTH KOREA

Topic Introduction	8
History	8
Past Action	10
Current Situation	11
Bloc Positions	11
Case Studies	12
Guiding Questions	13



PACIFIC MODEL UNITED NATIONS NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Dear Delegates,

Hello and welcome to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization! My name is Kavya Iyer. I am a senior attending International Community School. I am pleased and excited to be the Director of NATO this year, joined by my Assistant Director Grace Zou and Chair Nicole Turtle. We're ecstatic to see six months of preparation culminate in a single weekend!

There has been a whirlwind of news surrounding NATO recently, especially since the inauguration of the United States President Donald Trump. The belief of the president at this time is that NATO is unnecessary, and yet the committee serves a crucial role in international security. NATO continues to focus on countering terrorism and strengthening cyber security. Instead of remaining a strictly military alliance, this organization has evolved into helping refugees in war-torn areas in Eastern Europe and the Middle East, dismantling dangerous nuclear weapons from the wrong hands, and of course, committing "to the peaceful resolution of disputes."

NATO's basic mandate of "collective defense," simply explained as "all for one, and one for all," ensures the stability of relations between member states for years to come.

Our two topics for this year are the Turkish Referendum & North Korea's pressing ICBM crisis. Both are very unstable issues that could change at any moment. What we have written about in our background guide could have completely changed by the time you read this in October 2017! It is your job to keep your research relevant and specific.

NATO is known for its high-level of debate and conversation. We recommend this committee for intermediate to advanced delegates.

We sincerely hope you enjoy our two extremely relevant and pressing topics which we've spent hours researching and continually updating-- and choose NATO as your committee for PACMUN 2017!

Best, wishes

Kavya Iyer

Director, NATO

INTRODUCTION: TURKISH REFERENDUM

In 2007, the Economist Intelligence Unit index of democracy listed Turkey as number 88 on its list of 160 sovereign states. Countries were ranked based on their average rates of democratic liberties, including political participation, functionality of government, and electoral process. Turkey's parliamentary democracy has it listed as a "hybrid regime"-- but ten years later, that has changed. With President Erdogan gaining power and threatening to tip the balance of a secular state as Turkey's founders originally wanted, the delegates of NATO must decide how much jurisdiction it has - if any - to monitor over Turkey's unstable government. After all, NATO was created to curb the spread of Communism across the world, and the rise of a dictatorship within a NATO member could be a cause for concern. With its recent civilian riots and coups along with the government seeking deeper ties with Russia, it is clear that NATO should use their power to ensure peace and stability in the Anatolia region. When researching this topic, look especially towards past NATO action used with Russia.

HISTORY

The Anatolia Peninsula, which comprises roughly all of modern day Turkey, has played a significant role throughout the long history of empires who have ruled it, most notably the Byzantine, Roman, and Ottoman empires.

The Ottoman Empire ruled over Anatolia for centuries. It became one of the largest empires of history in the 16th and 17th century when the Sultanate started conquering surrounding areas. The Ottoman Empire flourished economically and culturally as it became a central trading hub for the Eastern and European powers and served as the center of the Islamic world. However, in the late 1700s, the Empire lost many of its strategic territories in the Balkan Areas and its economic and political influence began to shrink. Within its borders, the Ottoman Empire faced growing political instability such as corruption and a string of weak rulers. The Sultanate attempted to modernize with a series of reforms in the 19th century to catch up to their European counterparts, but the rising nationalism between the various ethnic groups of the Empire countered these movements and as WWI ended, the Ottoman Empire finally fell to the European Powers.

In 1922, the Allied powers were expelled from Anatolia and the Republic of Turkey was formed under the Ankara-based Turkish regime. Turkey introduced several reforms as the government changed from the constitutional

monarchy of the Ottomans to a parliamentary republic with a secular constitution. In 1945, Turkey joined the United Nations and after the Korean war in 1952, it joined NATO as well. In 1946, Turkey held its first multiparty elections, transitioning from its previous single party period. However, this was faced with upheaval as several military coups d'états occurred, the most significant being in 1960, 1971, and 1980.

Turkey has a unitary structure in terms of administration and this aspect is one of the most important factors shaping the Turkish public administration. When three powers (executive, legislative and judiciary) are taken into account as the main functions of the state, local administrations have little power. Turkey doesn't have a federal system, and the 81 provinces are subordinate to the central government in Ankara. Local administrations were established to provide services in place and the government is represented by the province governors and town governors.

PAST ACTION

Prior to the Turkish referendum of 2017, several experts on the Special Procedures panel of the United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC) published a statement in April of 2017 warning Turkey of the possible detriments to human rights brought about by the state of emergency as declared in 2016. In the published statement, the UN Special Rapporteurs asserted that the declared state of emergency should not in any way overshadow rights protection, and that the actions of the Turkish government during the state of emergency "cannot be justified by reference to Turkey's longstanding international human rights obligations."

Turkish Foreign Minister Huseyin Muftuoglu later said in response that the UN's statement was "worrisome," and the issuing of the statement a mere three days before the referendum, in addition to the "political" nature of the comments made, were indicative of a "deliberate" approach on the part of the UN towards the political state of Turkey.

CURRENT SITUATION

On April 16, 2017, the latest referendum calling for 18 proposed amendments to the Turkish constitution was passed with over 25 million votes. The eighteen amendments grapple mostly with changing the power balance between the executive and legislative branches of Turkey's government, and thus moves the government from a parliamentary towards a partially presidential system. Some of the amendments call for the abolition of the prime minister and military court, increasing the number of members in parliament, and allowing the president to become less of a neutral executive power.

Turkey has been in a state of emergency since July 16th, 2016, when sectors of the Turkish military attempted to unseat President Recep Tayyip Erdogan. Riots broke out in the streets of Istanbul and Ankara, with over 240 people losing their lives as the military fought against loyalist parties. It was after this devastating coup that Erdogan began reacting furiously towards any opposition his government faced. The day after the coup, Erdogan instated the state of emergency, which allows the government to bypass parliament's orders. In such a volatile and chaotic environment, a referendum that blurs the lines between governmental branches could result in even more bloodshed.

A majority of Turks voted "yes" for this referendum in order to see Turkey become a stronger world-power and finally reach stability. With a more powerful executive branch, some citizens, such as people belonging to current President Recep Tayyip Erdogan's own AKP party, believe that he will be able to improve Turkey's long-floundering economy, and increase security against terrorist threats from ISIL and Kurdish fighters. Supporters of the referendum believe it places sufficient checks-and-balances within a system with the ability to impeach the president if necessary, and are tired of the power struggle between the Prime Minister and President that causes a halt in any legislative progress.

However, because Turkey was founded as a secular country, parties such as the CHP and HDP believe Erdogan's plan to decrease the separation between religion and state go against the basis of what the country stands for. Erdogan has become increasingly militaristic, they claim, and by allowing him to possibly stay in power until 2029 leads Turkey towards a dictatorship. During the summer coups, Erdogan's violent response to protests and riots along with his control over the press further adds to the frustration that many Turks feel.

BLOC POSITIONS

Neutral/Cautious - France, Greece, Germany, Belgium & Italy

Many countries were cautious in their statements in reaction to the controversial Turkish Referendum vote. Mainly, each statement recognized the Turkish People's right to choose their own government and how deeply divided the country seemed to be. Greek leaders appeared to be hopeful that the vote would strengthen ties between their two countries. Other countries however, such as Germany, Italy, and France expressed concern with the irregularities of the voting. One thing that they all seemed to agree on however was that it was up to Turkey's President to heal the rift between its citizens.

Disapproving - Netherlands, Albania & Denmark

After the final Turkish Referendum vote, some countries diplomatic relations with Turkey soured. During the campaign, countries such as the Netherlands and Denmark were accused of Nazi-like tactics by both Referendum campaigns after refusing to permit Turkish campaign within their borders, despite such events considered illegal by both Turkish law and foreign law. However, in other countries such as Albania, relations started to sour afterwards as Erdogan reviews controversial matters such as capital punishment. Many EU members have released concerns regarding these issues.

Supportive - US, Hungary & Turkey

Unexpectedly, the Turkish Referendum results have received some western allies. Most notable was the United States. After the results of the final poll, the Turkish President received a call from US President Trump, congratulating him on his victory. However, though relations seem pleasant, the State Department has issued a statement recognizing the irregularities in the voting process. Turkey's population remains split on the issue as President Erdogan celebrates his narrow victory.

CASE STUDIES

Case Study #1: BREXIT

Though referendums happen often across the globe, only a few have the economic and social consequences that Brexit (British Exit) has had. On the 23rd of June, 2016, all eligible voters across the United Kingdom (made up of England, Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland) were able to vote on whether they wanted the UK to leave or remain in the European Union. 'Leave' won by 52% to 48%.

Immediately after the results were reported, the UK faced some challenges both within their country and as a member of the global community. David Cameron, the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth since 2010, resigned due to his failure in winning the referendum. He was replaced by ex-home secretary Theresa May. In the days following the news, the pound greatly reduced in value, and still remains lower in comparison to the dollar and euro.

Britain's official campaign to leave, "Vote Leave", argued that leaving the EU would allow the UK to retain more financial and reputational independence. Britain pays an annual membership fee of 8.5 billion pounds to the EU-- leaving would come with an immediate trim of the budget. Leaving the Union appealed to many people against immigration-- with the EU's lax poli-

cy on open borders, some citizens felt as though closing borders on the island would increase security. Finally, exiting the European Union would reinstate Britain's role as an independent power in the global community, rather than a member of a union.

On the other hand, the "Stronger In" party argued that abandoning the free trade policies which were established to bolster financial security for members of the EU would cause the British economy to crumble. Without the immigrant workforce, it was estimated that nearly 3 million jobs would be lost. The loss of cheaper labour could also restrain the country's economic growth. In regards to immigration and heightening security, some pro-EU voters reason that without the collective force of the Union (similarly with NATO), combatting terrorism would be more difficult. Lastly, the thought of the UK becoming an independent world power could imply outdated connotations of the island's imperialist, colonialist history.

It's valuable to look deeper into the numbers of who voted for which option. Scotland, which debated leaving the United Kingdom itself just a few years earlier, overwhelmingly chose to stay (62% to 38%). People with a higher education were more likely to vote to remain. Cities with a higher population density and/or immigrant population were also more likely to want to remain in the EU. However, when it came to the various ages of the voters, older people were much more likely to vote leave. 60% of citizens of age 65 and higher throughout the UK voted to leave. On the contrary, while 73% of people ages 18-24 voted to remain, this age group had the lowest voter turnout.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Who voted for which choice, and how could their geographical location, age, level of education, and other factors play into their vote?
2. How do financial and social factors influence voters' opinions?
3. How will the referendum affect future generations?

INTRODUCTION: MILITARIZATION OF NORTH KOREA

Ever since its formal inception in 1948, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, or more commonly, North Korea, has never failed to present an unpredictable and at times, concerning image to the international community. With issues ranging from human rights violations to a radical dictatorship, outside countries have no shortage of worries regarding North Korea. Yet the issue with perhaps the most immediate and worrisome consequences of all is North Korea's escalating efforts towards military conflict. Having expanded their arsenal to include weapons such as inter-continental ballistic missiles and a potential a hydrogen bomb, the reason behind the country's rapid militarization may remain unclear, but one thing is for certain: North Korea is preparing itself for war. The task of determining what course the international community should take with regards the topic of North Korea's militarization rests in the hands of the United Nations.

HISTORY

The Korean Peninsula has been separated since the end of World War II, when United States and Soviet Union representatives met to discuss the terms of the Japanese surrender in 1945. The border split the Peninsula in two roughly equal halves, with the United States occupying the Southern half and the Soviet's occupying the Northern half. As the Cold War began between the US and Soviet Union, tensions escalated between the two Korean halves and it became clear through a multitude of political, economic, and social differences, that there was no hope for a unified Korea.

During the Soviet Occupation of the Northern Korea, Soviet General Shtykov worked to break class systems and build the economy by nationalizing key Korean industries. Though this led to stronger connections between Korea and the Soviet Union, many North Korean citizens fled to the South in fear of the radical changes. Following the uprising of the Jeju islanders, in May 1948, the South declared its statehood, prompting the North to do the same on September 9th, 1948, with Kim Il-sung as the first premier. Soviet military forces withdrew in 1948 with Shtykov instituted as ambassador and American forces followed suit a year later.

Kim Il-sung strongly supported a unification of the two separate Korean states, and with support from Ambassador Shtykov and Soviet leader Joseph Stalin, Kim launched an assault on the South, beginning the Korean War on June 25th, 1950. Soon the US and USSR became involved and the war turned

into what is now recognized as the first armed confrontation of the Cold War. More than 1 million people - soldiers and civilians alike - were killed during the conflict, and much of North Korea's infrastructure was destroyed. Even today, a heavily guarded demilitarized zone separates the North and the South.

For the next 20 years, the two states refused to discuss peace. War threatened to break out when tunnels under the demilitarized zone were discovered after a number of border skirmishes and assassination attempts on South Korean political leaders. Talk of peace was attempted through secret meetings between the two states that culminated in the 1972 July 4th North-South Joint Statement, establishing principles of working toward peaceful reunification, yet ultimately failed due to the differences in opinion over a unified Korea.

During this time, North Korea established its independence from both the USSR and China, adopting a self-reliance economic policy. Production levels rose, and economic growth increased. With their growing economic prosperity, relations between North Korea and other countries improved, especially with Japan. However, North Korea soon severed their political and trade relations with China, intent on building their self reliance. This led to an economic decline in 1987 and an almost complete collapse following the Soviet Union's dissolution. Relations between China and North Korea increased soon after, but China could not meet the demand for food, and famine soon began to spread throughout North Korea. In the mid 1990's, flooding severely damaged crops and infrastructure which served to worsen the economic crisis and growing famine.

In 1994, Kim Il-sung died of a heart attack and Kim Jong-il took control after a declared 3 year national mourning period. The Agreed Framework, negotiated between the then US president, Bill Clinton, and Kim Jong-il, halted all North Korean nuclear weapon development. A military first policy was instituted by Kim with the purpose of strengthening the military while discouraging coups. The policy was met with much international speculation. In 2001, North Korea began to redouble their efforts in developing nuclear weaponry as newly elected US President, George W. Bush, rejected the Agreed Framework. In 2006, North Korea announced its first nuclear weapons test. Relations between the US and North Korea continued to worsen. In 2011, Kim Jong-il died of a heart attack and Kim Jong-un took control. North Korea's nuclear weapon experiments as well as other military actions gained international condemnation.

PAST ACTION

Relations between North Korea and the United Nations date as far back as the Korean War. Following the North Korean invasion of South Korea in the summer of 1950, the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) unanimously passed UN Security Council Resolutions 82 and 83, calling for an immediate cessation of hostilities and for member states of the UNSC to aid the efforts of South Korea during the war. 21 member states later supplied aid to South Korea, forming the United Nations Command, and under UNSC Resolution 84, the Command was placed under the leadership of the United States. Despite gains made by the UN during the Korean War, most notably the success of the Inchon Landing in reversing the tide of the battle in favor of South Korea, UN forces eventually withdrew from Korea following China's entry into the Korean War in the fall of 1950. In the aftermath of the Armistice Agreement signed between North and South Korea in 1953 and the partitioning of Korea in 1954, the UN was unable to maintain oversight over the development of North Korea.

In 1991, the United Nations admitted both North and South Korea to the United Nations General Assembly. However, North Korea has since isolated itself from the activities and demands of the United Nations, and the UN has taken numerous measures to discourage the militarization of North Korea, namely through the implementation of sanctions. The UNSC passed resolutions condemning North Korea's actions following both North Korea's withdrawal from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) in 2003, and their launch of ballistic missiles in 2006, imposing sanctions on the country for the latter. In response to the country's nuclear tests in 2006 and 2009, the UNSC established the UN Security Council Sanctions Committee on North Korea for the purpose of overseeing the sanctions imposed on North Korea. Sanctions imposed following the country's later weapons tests and satellite launches have since expanded to include arms and trade embargos, cargo inspection, and bans on luxury goods, among others.

North Korea poses a direct threat to NATO's objective of ensuring the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction. As a committee, NATO has issued several statements throughout history condemning North Korea's unilateral actions, and has urged North Korea to abide by sanctions put in place by the UNSC and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and to reconsider its withdrawal from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

CURRENT SITUATION

North Korea has been creating crude short and medium-distance missiles for decades since its alliance with the Soviet Union, but has been struggling to create the long-range ICBMs (inter-continental ballistic missiles) that the United States and Russia have an arsenal of. While they have had their own nuclear weapons since 2006, none can be delivered to a distant target. Its current ICBM prototype, the Taepodong-2, has been failing its recent test launches, due to issues with the missile re-entering the atmosphere after launch.

However, North Korea has two other ICBMs, the KN-08 and KN-14 that would theoretically be able to reach the distance to the United States, but neither have been tested. With over a decade of ballistic missile creation and launch attempts, it is possible that North Korea will have a working ICBM by 2027, especially because they may successfully create a nuclear warhead small enough to efficiently attach to the missile.

Recently, North Korea has been test launching these ICBMs during patriotic parades or holidays, but many countries see this as a display of power. In 3 out of 5 Taepodong testing events, the full missile has failed to detonate at all. True ICBMs have the capability to reach distant parts of the globe, and in part are the reason the United States, Russia, and other countries operate on the policy of mutually-assured destruction. The idea of a volatile state with no concept of diplomatic relations obtaining weapons of mass destruction, such as the Taepodong or the KN's, poses a significant threat to the international community.

BLOC POSITIONS

Stricter Actions: US, Italy, UK, France & Spain

As North Korean military actions continue to escalate with their nuclear tests and missile launches, some countries have called for stricter actions to be taken. Nations such as France and the UK have been firm in their call for further economic sanctions with North Korea as well as countries that trade with North Korea. The US has taken a more severe approach by suggesting military action as undesirable but perhaps necessary. Cyber attacks against the country's computer system has also been suggested as a viable action against this possible threat.

Condemn DPRK Military Actions: Canada, Germany, Turkey, Norway, Romania, Bulgaria, Denmark, Greece, Iceland, Lithuania, Netherlands & Slovenia

Since the first North Korean nuclear test, several nations have issued statements naming the tests as condemnable. In most of these countries, North Korea is viewed negatively, however several countries are worried what stricter actions might have on trade relations with China. Nations such as Germany have taken diplomatic actions by instituting talks between nations to decide further actions. Others have called upon North Korea to return to six party talks and negotiations. Despite the differences of opinion on further necessary action, all seem to agree on the nuclear tests illegality in the eyes of international law.

CASE STUDIES

Case Study #1: The July 2017 ICBM Test And Threat on Guam

In violation of several UN resolutions, North Korea's intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) test during July of 2017 warranted a fresh series of sanctions, unanimously ratified by the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) on August 7th, 2017. The Korean Central News Agency reported that the purpose of the test was to exhibit the theoretical range of the missile while carrying a nuclear warhead. The missile in question, a Hwasong-14, was capable of remaining airborne for approximately 45 minutes and managed to travel a distance of 1,000 kilometers in the time, enabling it to potentially strike areas in South Korea and Japan. The sanctions imposed by the UNSC in turn are expected to reduce North Korea's export revenue by over a third, targeting North Korea's primary exports and other sources of revenue.

When posed a question regarding North Korea during a meeting held a day after the passage of the UNSC sanctions, President Donald Trump of the United States of America cautioned North Korea against making "any more threats to the United States," lest they be met with "fire and fury." North Korea responded in turn, threatening to fire missiles into the waters surrounding the American territory of Guam if the United States became "more reckless."

Following bouts of verbal threats between the United States and North Korea, North Korea did eventually go back on its threat on Guam for the time being, saying it would wait "a little more" before striking. While the apparent

retraction of the threat did alleviate international tensions, the possibility of a North Korean attack on any territory belonging to a member state holds serious implications for the future course of action that NATO collectively agrees to take. NATO's cornerstone policy of collective defense, established under Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, famously states that "an attack against one...shall be considered an attack against them all." Under Article 6 of the treaty, the provisions set forth in Article 5 are expanded to include all territories in Europe, North America, and the North Atlantic. While several territories, including Guam, are beyond the region established in the North Atlantic Treaty, the decision of invoking Article 5 is ultimately one to be made at NATO's discretion.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Should NATO should invoke Article 5 in response to a potential attack from North Korea?
2. Should North Korea's threatening rhetoric be interpreted as that of a dangerous power not to be underestimated, or simply empty words?
3. What measures should member states take to ensure the safety of their nations from North Korea, if any measures need be taken at all?
4. What are the direct impacts, if any, on your country's economy and political climate?

SOURCES: TOPIC A

<http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-32810887>

<https://www.economist.com/blogs/graphicdetail/2016/02/graphics-britain-s-referendum-eu-membership>

<http://www.politico.eu/article/graphics-how-the-uk-voted-eu-referendum-brexite-demographics-age-education-party-london-final-results/>

<http://www.theweek.co.uk/brexit-0>

<https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2016/06/uk-brexit-guide/482730/>

SOURCES: TOPIC B

<http://www.news.com.au/world/asia/north-korean-attack-on-guam-could-invoke-article-5-of-nato-treaty-if-carried-out/news-story/49edb038580f14aa14fba62b42bda371>

<http://www.cnn.com/2017/08/09/politics/trump-fire-fury-improvise-north-korea/index.html>

<https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2017/08/north-korea-guam/536952/>

http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_110496.htm?selectedLocale=en#

<http://www.cnn.com/2017/07/29/asia/north-korea-intercontinental-ballistic-missile-test/index.html>

<http://www.cnn.com/2017/08/05/asia/north-korea-un-sanctions/index.html>