



SRMUN ATLANTA 2017

Development through Dialogue: Using Global Cooperation to Build Lasting Change

November 16 - 18, 2017

NATO_atlanta@srmun.org

Greetings Delegates,

Welcome to SRMUN Atlanta 2017 and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). My name is Jordin Dickerson and I am serving as your Director for NATO. This is my third conference as a SRMUN staff member. Previously, I served as the Assistant Director for UNHCR-ExCom during the Atlanta 2016 Conference and as the Director of UNICEF-EB at the Charlotte 2017 conference. I am currently a first-year law student at the University of Virginia and I have a Bachelor's Degree in History and Political Science with a Concentration in International Relations. Our committee's Assistant Director is Allie Fowler. This is Allie's second time as a staff member. Allie previously served as the Assistant Director for UNEA at the 2016 Atlanta Conference. Allie has a Bachelor's degree in History and is currently pursuing her Master's in International Relations and Public Policy at Colorado State University.

NATO's purpose is to protect the freedom and security of all its members through its military and political alliance. Founded in 1949, the Organization currently has 28 Member States who all work together to promote common interests and the principles of the Washington Treaty.

NATO will have an open agenda with no predetermined topics being provided to delegates. Instead, delegates should prepare for two topics relating to international peace and security that are most important to your respective Member State. In addition, it is essential for delegates to remain informed of international affairs. NATO will engage in a concurrent crisis simulation at some point during the conference, which will pull significantly from real-world situations. Delegate success in this committee depends largely upon knowledge of current international affairs and the position of their Member State on these affairs.

For SRMUN Atlanta 2017, NATO and the Security Council will be presented with the unique scenario of participating in a concurrent crisis and challenged to work together towards a solution. In doing so, the delegates must simultaneously react to crisis developments and the actions of both bodies. The concurrent crisis committees are designed for experienced delegates who are prepared to move with a swiftly developing topic and high level of debate. Additional information will be provided on the SRMUN Website in the forthcoming weeks.

The following briefs provide background on some key current events to keep in mind when drafting your position papers. While the committee does have an open agenda, it is important to look at issues that affect more than just your respective Member State. That being said, delegates are expected to go beyond the briefs and engage in intellectual inquiry of their own. The position papers for this committee should reflect the complexity of the issues you propose and their externalities. Delegations are expected to submit a position paper and be prepared for a vigorous discussion at the conference. Position papers should be no longer than two pages in length (single spaced) and demonstrate your Member State's position, policies, and recommendations on two topics. For more detailed information about formatting and how to write position papers, delegates can visit srmun.org. ***All position papers MUST be submitted no later than Friday, October 27, 2017 by 11:59pm EST via the SRMUN website.***

Allie and I are enthusiastic about serving as your dais for NATO. We wish you all the best of luck in your conference preparation and look forward to working with you in the near future. Please feel free to contact Ryan Baerwalde, Allie Fowler, or myself if you have any questions while preparing for the conference.

Jordin Dickerson
Director
NATO_atlanta@srmun.org

Allie Fowler
Assistant Director
NATO_atlanta@srmun.org

Ryan Baerwalde
Deputy Director-General
ddg_atlanta_security@srmun.org

Committee History of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was founded in 1949 following the end of World War II (WWII).¹ To the Member States within this Body, NATO functions as a peacetime military and political alliance ready and willing to be called into action if any other Member State is attacked, according to Article 5 of the Washington Treaty.² The Washington Treaty is the founding treaty of NATO and is rooted in the idea of collective defense among Member States.³ This allows less-developed Member States to have a nuclear ally for protection against such attacks.⁴

Initially, Western Europe became concerned about their security, both physically and politically, in the years after the conclusion of WWII.⁵ Consecutively, the United States became increasingly involved in European affairs, specifically in sending aid to those rebuilding their infrastructure.⁶ Thus, a natural alliance began to form. The first instance of a NATO-like alliance came in March of 1948 when Great Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg signed a collective military alliance in the Brussels Treaty.⁷ The United States, wanting to join this coalition, called for a military alliance with Western Europe that would adhere to the United Nations (UN) Charter, but could also exist outside of the Security Council; therefore avoiding a Soviet Union veto.⁸ The United States added the idea of including other Member States surrounding the North Atlantic to expedite military action when needed.⁹ This idea passed through the other Member States and by 1949, the United States, Canada, Belgium, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, and the United Kingdom joined together to form NATO.¹⁰

Today, NATO consists of 28 Member States and functions in two bodies: the North Atlantic Council (NAC) and the Military Committee to represent the political and military aspects of the organization, respectively.¹¹ Although neither is technically superior, and both have the power to make recommendations to the other, the NAC is generally considered to be the primary body for decisions on strategy and the goals of the Organization.¹² The Military Committee is generally responsible for executing the resolutions of the NAC and making decisions concerning the size and organization of NATO forces.¹³ Additionally, operation commands are given by the Strategic Commander and his administration at Supreme Allied Command Europe outside Brussels.¹⁴ NATO has its own army, navy, and nuclear weaponry, alongside their standing forces under the commands of the Organization.¹⁵ Member States often contribute additional forces to carry out important missions, either in cooperation with NATO forces or directly under NATO control.¹⁶ Where most UN committees are restricted to making recommendations rather than taking direct action, NATO can and will go to war to protect the security of its members.¹⁷ However, this does not mean that NATO is reckless or takes action without considering the geopolitical consequences. Thus, the Military Committee generally defers to the NAC and not the other way around.¹⁸ The Alliance is bound by the North Atlantic Treaty to report its military actions to the UN Security Council and to abide by the principles of the UN

¹ "North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), 1949," *Milestones: 1945-1952, Office of the Historian*, <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/nato> (accessed 16 May 2017).

² Ibid.

³ "Founding Treaty," North Atlantic Treaty Organization, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_67656.htm (Accessed 16 May 2017).

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ "What is NATO?", North Atlantic Treaty Organization, <http://www.nato.int/nato-welcome/index.html> (Accessed 16 May 2017).

¹² Ibid.

¹³ "Military Committee" North Atlantic Treaty Organization, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_49633.htm (Accessed 16 May 2017).

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Ibid.

Charter.¹⁹ In general, resolutions of this committee should contain very few clauses that start with “recommends” and quite a few that start with “decides” or “authorizes”.²⁰

NATO is what is known as a consensus committee. This means that every decision made in NATO is made by “common consent” and reflects the will of all of the sovereign Member States of the Alliance. Consensus decision making has been the applied form of decision making, at all levels, for the Alliance since 1949. Because of this unique operating procedure, NATO does not vote on issues. Rather, if there is disagreement on an issue, Member States work very hard to negotiate and consult with each other to reach an agreement. The aim is to reach agreement and if necessary to agree on compromises. If agreement cannot be reached, individual member countries are free to pursue their own preferred course of action. It is also important to note that NATO does not have its own forces as the 28 allies contribute military personnel upon agreement. NATO does have, however, its own command and control structure which is an effective vehicle in any resolution or negotiations process. Member States banded together to handle the conflicts resulting from both the Korean and Vietnam Wars and welcomed new members following the fall of the Soviet Union.²¹ NATO also intervened in the Bosnian War, in order to facilitate a peaceful resolution.²² In all of this time, however, Article 5 has only been invoked once in 68 years, shortly after the terrorist attacks on the United States on 11 September 2001.²³ Since this time, NATO has taken command of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan and issued the 2010 Strategic Concept to better define their goals as “collective defense, crisis management, and cooperative security.”²⁴ Today, NATO has exhibited concern over Russia’s expanded military exercises along the borders of Eastern Europe and efforts to occupy neighboring territory such as the Ukraine. The threat of terrorism is also problematic for NATO today as ungoverned space in Iraq and Syria can easily become the next breeding ground for illegitimate regimes.

For the purposes of this simulation, our committee will follow the standard SRMUN Rules of Procedure. The only difference in the operation of NATO within the SRMUN rules is that all decisions taken by the committee must be ‘consensus’ (overriding Rule 46), but voting procedure will still take place. This means in order for a resolution to pass there must be no objection to the resolution. An objection to the resolution will be defined as a ‘no’ vote – delegates will still have the opportunity to abstain, vote by acclamation, or roll call. This change does not preclude the right of any member of the committee to issue a formal statement explaining that member's vote as explained in Rule 49. Delegates will still have the ability to motion for division of the question (Rule 50) or vote on amendments (Rule 51). Both of these motions and all procedural voting during formal voting procedure will not require a ‘consensus’ and will remain the same under the SRMUN rules. The differences between substantive and procedural voting will be explained at the beginning of your first committee session.

The following Member States of NATO will be represented at SRMUN Atlanta 2017:

ALBANIA, BELGIUM, BULGARIA, CANADA, CROATIA, CZECH REPUBLIC, DENMARK, ESTONIA, FRANCE, GERMANY, GREECE, HUNGARY, ICELAND, ITALY, LATVIA, LITHUANIA, LUXEMBOURG, NETHERLANDS, NORWAY, POLAND, PORTUGAL, ROMANIA, SLOVAKIA, SLOVENIA, SPAIN, TURKEY, UNITED KINGDOM, and the UNITED STATES.

¹⁹ “Relations with the United Nations,” North Atlantic Treaty Organization. http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_50321.htm (Accessed 17 May 2017).

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ “What is Nato? Key Events,” *North Atlantic Treaty Organization*, <http://www.nato.int/nato-welcome/index.html> (accessed 17 May 2017)

²² Ibid.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Ibid.

Turkey-NATO Diplomatic Relations

Relations between Turkey and its NATO Allies have been strained in the past year as Turkey's government looks to consolidate power.²⁵ There have been increasing diplomatic tensions between Turkey and France, the Netherlands, and most notably Germany.²⁶ Turkey has been vital in the fight against the Islamic State (ISIL) both militarily and geographically, so any strained relations could have a disastrous effect on the fight against ISIS in Syria and Iraq.²⁷

Turkey's increasing constraints on press freedom domestically resulted in the arrest of French journalist Loup Bureau.²⁸ He was arrested for having photographs of himself with members of the Kurdish People's Protection Units on his laptop.²⁹

In March of 2017, the Netherlands, citing security issues, prohibited a plane carrying Turkish Foreign Minister Mevlut Cavusoglu from landing.³⁰ Cavusoglu was visiting the Netherlands in order to speak with Turkish citizens preparing to vote in the upcoming Turkish elections.³¹ Another Turkish minister was stopped from entering a Turkish consulate by Dutch officials.³² President Erdogan responded by accusing the Netherlands of Nazism and stated that they were "sacrificing Turkish-Dutch Relations."³³

Tensions between Germany and Turkey have also deteriorated over the last year. With over 3 million Turkish people living in Germany, the two Member States are constantly collaborating.³⁴ German forces have been utilizing Incirlik Airforce Base, located in southern Turkey, to assist in the fight against the ISIL.³⁵ Throughout the previous two years, diplomatic relations between the two Member States have been strained significantly. In June 2016, the German Parliament voted to recognize the Armenian Genocide, which resulted in Turkey recalling their ambassador.³⁶ Turkey, in retaliation, forbade German politicians from visiting Germans stationed at Incirlik Airforce Base for about a month. Germany also blocked Turkish officials from campaigning to Turkish citizens living in Germany, an act which President Erdogan labeled as "Nazi practices."³⁷

Following the failed military coup in Turkey, Turkish-German journalist Deniz Yucel was arrested by Turkish officials on charges of propaganda.³⁸ German officials called this an attack on free press.³⁹ Turkey also arrested, German citizen and human rights activist, Peter Steudtner, on accusations of working with terrorist groups.⁴⁰ Germany has now cautioned all Germans from traveling to Turkey which could potentially hurt Turkey's economy and German investments in the economy.⁴¹

²⁵ "Turkish Tensions Undermine It's Role in NATO", Politico, <http://www.politico.eu/article/turkish-tensions-undermine-its-role-in-nato/> (accessed 9 August 2017).

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ "Pressure Mounts for Release of French Journalist in Turkey," The Local France, <https://www.thelocal.fr/20170809/turkey> (accessed August 9, 2017).

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ "Tensions rising between Turkish, European Leaders Before Elections," CNN World News, <http://www.cnn.com/2017/03/12/europe/turkish-dutch-tensions-increase/index.html> (Accessed 9 August 2017).

³¹ Ibid.

³² Ibid.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ "Broken Marriage: Why Can't Germany and Turkey Stop Fighting," The Local France, <https://www.thelocal.de/20170321/how-the-last-12-months-have-been-a-car-crash-for-german-turkish-relations>, (accessed 19 July 2017).

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ "Turkey's Arrest of German Activist Heightens Nations Tensions," The New York Times, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/07/20/world/europe/germany-turkey-sigmar-gabriel-peter-steudtner.html>, (accessed 19 July 2017).

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ "Germany Steps up Economic Pressure of Turkey in Rights Row," Reuters, <http://www.reuters.com/article/us-germany-turkey-idUSKBN1A5116?il=0>, (accessed 19 July 2017).

Tensions between NATO Member States have the potential to undermine important NATO initiatives. Turkey has been a vital player in the NATO fight against ISIL.⁴² Additionally, Turkey has the second largest army among the NATO Member States.⁴³ While they were reluctant to join the coalition at first, the United States and other NATO Allies now utilize Incirlik Airforce Base in conducting airstrikes against ISIS.⁴⁴ The loss of Turkish cooperation would cripple the effort to combat ISIS. Continued tensions between Turkey and its western Allies pose to benefit Russia, both politically and diplomatically. Russian presence and influence in the Middle East continues to grow and are interested in increased relations with Turkey.⁴⁵ Tensions between NATO Member States and Turkey may push Turkey into an increased alliance with Russia.⁴⁶ Turkey has currently agreed to a \$2.5 billion USD deal to purchase a military defense system from Russia, although the agreement has not yet been solidified.⁴⁷

NATO and Cybersecurity

Cyber warfare is increasingly on frontlines of major attacks across the globe. The United Nations, as of 2016, has not yet defined what constitutes cyberwarfare, but several Member States have already begun taking steps against such attacks.⁴⁸ The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) made cybersecurity an essential area of defense at the Wales Summit in September 2014.⁴⁹ Later, in July 2016, the Allies reaffirmed their commitment to cybersecurity in that they must defend this territory as securely as on land, sea, or air.⁵⁰ NATO developed the Computer Incident Response Capability (NCIRC) to specifically protect its own networks and would evolve to keep up with the rapid cyber and technological changes.⁵¹

Cyber defense has also found its way into NATO's Smart Defense programs, which allow Member States to share information and co-develop defense programs that neither could procure alone. Some of these cyber-based defense systems include the Malware Information Sharing Platform (MISP), the Smart Defense Multinational Cyber Defense Capability Development (MN CD2) project, and the Multinational Cyber Defense Education and Training (MN CD E&T) project.⁵²

The Russian Federation has committed cyber-attacks on NATO Member States in the last year. In the United States, Russia hacked the Democratic National Committee (DNC), one of the United States' major political parties, leaking information and emails with a goal of negatively impacting the Democratic Party during the Presidential election and giving now President Donald Trump a boost.⁵³ Russia also hacked a voting systems manufacturer in the United States.⁵⁴ The Russian Federation continues to deny any involvement in the United States' Presidential Election.⁵⁵

⁴² "The U.S. and NATO need Turkey," Time, <http://time.com/4457369/the-u-s-and-nato-need-turkey/> (Accessed 29 August 2017).

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ "Turkey Chooses Russia Over NATO for Missile Defense," Bloomberg, <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2017-07-13/turkey-is-said-to-agree-to-pay-2-5b-for-4-russian-s-400-sams> (Accessed 29 August 2017).

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Michael Beaver, "The United Nations and Cyberwarfare," *Global Risk Advisors*, <https://globalriskadvisors.com/blog/united-nations-cyber-warfare/> (accessed August 19, 2017).

⁴⁹ "Cyber Defence," *North Atlantic Treaty Organization*, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_78170.htm (accessed August 19 2017).

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ "2016 Presidential Campaign Hacking Fast Facts," CNN, <http://www.cnn.com/2016/12/26/us/2016-presidential-campaign-hacking-fast-facts/index.html> (Accessed August 19 2017).

⁵⁴ "Russian Agents Hacked US Voting System Manufacturer Before US Election," The Guardian, <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2017/jun/05/russia-us-election-hack-voting-system-nsa-report> (accessed August 19 2017).

⁵⁵ Ibid.

In France, President Macron was hacked right before the French election.⁵⁶ Thousands of emails and other documents were released online.⁵⁷ The hackers were linked to a Russian affiliated group that were also involved in the U.S. election hacking.⁵⁸ The German Federal elections are to take place at the end of September and there is fear of Russian cyberattack on their election as well.⁵⁹

The Russian hacking of elections undermines both the democratic process as well as the specific governments of NATO Member States. Promoting the democratic processes is one of the most important values and goals of NATO, therefore these cyber-attacks should not be taken lightly.⁶⁰

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) issued several statements recently condemning the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) for launching nuclear weapons. The launches are in clear violation of sanctions placed on the DPRK by the United Nations (UN). The North Atlantic Council (NAC) specifically called for stronger sanctions to be placed on the DPRK after their launch of a long range ballistic missile on 4 July 2017.⁶¹

The missile tests have been increasing in frequency over the past several years. Therefore, NATO invited Australia, Japan, New Zealand, and the Republic of Korea to join in the discussion of these tests in 2016.⁶² In a statement released on 15 December 2016, NAC insisted "the [DPRK] seriously undermine regional stability, defy the non-proliferation regime rooted in the Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), jeopardize the prospects for lasting peace in the Korean Peninsula and pose an increasing threat to international peace and security."⁶³

DPRK continues to build its nuclear arsenal and consistently overstep sanctions. NATO and other UN Member States continuously express concerns over international safety and security, due to the growing distances DPRK's weapons can travel.⁶⁴ While some NATO Member States may not be the immediate target of these attacks, the repercussions will undoubtedly destabilize the global economy and environment.⁶⁵ The DPRK's actions threaten to disrupt the delicate peace that exists on the Korean Peninsula, which would drive many NATO Member States to action.⁶⁶ The leaders of most NATO Member States agree that a peaceful reduction of arms can be accomplished in the DPRK.⁶⁷ Others contend that more sanctions against DPRK will force them into disarmament, while the United States believes that military action may be necessary.⁶⁸ Dr. Johns Nilsson-Wright, a senior research fellow in the Asian program at Chatham House, claimed that the United States cannot attack for fear of potential retaliations on

⁵⁶ "Macron Hackers Linked to Russian-Affiliated Group behind US Attack," The Guardian, <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/may/08/macron-hackers-linked-to-russian-affiliated-group-behind-us-attack> (Accessed August 19 2017).

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ "US Intelligence Chief: Russia Interference in French, German Elections," Politico, <http://www.politico.eu/article/us-intelligence-chief-russia-interfering-in-french-german-elections/> (Accessed August 19 2017).

⁶⁰ "What is NATO," North Atlantic Treaty Organization, <http://www.nato.int/nato-welcome/index.html> (Accessed August 29 2017).

⁶¹ "Statement by the North Atlantic Council on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK)," *North Atlantic Treaty Organization*, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_146213.htm?selectedLocale=en (accessed 7 August 2017).

⁶² "Statement of the North Atlantic Council on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea," *North Atlantic Treaty Organization*, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news_139426.htm?selectedLocale=en (accessed 7 August 2017).

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ "The Analysis of DPRK Nuclear Test of February 12, 2013 by Belbasi Nuclear Tests Monitoring Center-KOERI," *CBTBO Preparatory Commission*, February 2013, <http://www.ctbto.org/fileadmin/snt2013/posters/T2-P71.pdf> (accessed 7 August 2017).

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ Lizzie Dearden, "What Would Happen if Trump went to War with North Korea?" *The Independent*, April 2017, <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/asia/north-korea-nuclear-world-war-donald-trump-kim-jong-un-south-missile-weapons-tests-moab-mop-a7697076.html> (accessed 7 August 2017).

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Ibid.

nearby Member States. He continued, claiming that President Trump “appears more interested in using the bully pulpit of calculated ambiguity and rhetorical provocation than any serious commitment to full blown military action.”⁶⁹ The United States and DPRK have a long standing tension between them.⁷⁰ During the civil war on the Korean Peninsula, the U.S. provided aid and it’s military to fight for what would become the Republic of Korea (ROK).⁷¹ The DPRK has since been intolerant of anything relating to the U.S., even going so far as to make threats.⁷² These threats range from verbal warnings of terror on either ROK or the U.S. to testing and launching long-range missiles that could reach both Member States.⁷³ While DPRK has never acted on these threats, its recent change in leadership could reverse this precedent.⁷⁴ Kim Jong Un, son of the previous leader Kim Jong Il and the grandson of founder Kim Il Sung, has been noted by scholars as being more willing to act if DPRK is ever threatened.⁷⁵ With the U.S.’s new leader also willing to jump into military action quickly, the tensions continue to escalate.⁷⁶

NATO also increased its participation in global affairs, specifically in Northeast Asia. In April 2013, NATO Secretary-General Anders Fogh Rasmussen visited the Republic of Korea (ROK) and Japan to further strengthen relations.⁷⁷ This visit was significant because of the signing of the NATO-Japan Political Declaration, which states that NATO will aid the two Member States in their security efforts against cyber security, counter-terrorism, maritime security, and nuclear non-proliferation specifically against threats from DPRK.⁷⁸ Japan and (ROK join several other NATO “Partners across the globe,” including Afghanistan, Australia, Iraq, Pakistan, Mongolia, and New Zealand.⁷⁹ NATO’s Deputy Secretary General Alexander Vershbow delivered a speech at the Institute for Security and Development Policy (ISDP) in Stockholm, Sweden that set the tone for future NATO-East Asia relations.⁸⁰ He noted that globalization has caused the world to become intermingled in a way they never had before and that Member States due to faster travel times and the internet.⁸¹ He also noted that East Asia has several serious security issues that would need to be resolved eventually including the DPRK increasing its nuclear weaponry.⁸² Vershbow strongly encouraged NATO Allies and partners in this regions to continue to work together to ensure stability worldwide.⁸³ NATO’s recent focus on global affairs, its recent partnership with neighboring Member States of the DPRK, as well as other potential targets within range of their nuclear weapons, clearly explains how much this is an issue for NATO.⁸⁴

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ Daniel Wertz and Chelsea Gannon, “A History of U.S.-DPRK Relations,” *The National Committee on North Korea* November 2015, <https://www.ncnk.org/resources/briefing-papers/all-briefing-papers/history-u.s.-dprk-relations> (accessed 30 August 2017).

⁷¹ Ibid.

⁷² Ibid.

⁷³ Ibid.

⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁷ Miha Hribernik, “Toward a Global Perspective: NATO’s Growing Engagement with Japan and South Korea,” *European Institute for Asian Studies*, May 2013, https://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/31213776/EU-Asia-at-a-glance-Hribernik-NATO-Japan-Korea.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAIWOWYYGZ2Y53UL3A&Expires=1502160437&Signature=vhbKOMZREPRxHIJPCRE38PsQrBI%3D&response-content-disposition=inline%3B%20filename%3DToward_a_global_perspective_NATO_s_growi.pdf (accessed 7 August 2017).

⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹ Ibid.

⁸⁰ NATO Deputy Secretary General Alexander Vershbow, “NATO and East Asia,” *North Atlantic Treaty Organization* June 2015, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/opinions_120648.htm?selectedLocale=en (accessed 30 August 2017).

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² Ibid.

⁸³ Ibid.

⁸⁴ Ibid.