



The Model Conference Global Security Issues

Faculty of International Relations, University of Economics in Bratislava



Modelová konferencia Bezpečnostná sekcia

Fakulta medzinárodných vzťahov, Ekonomická univerzita v Bratislave

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization would like to thank the Forum for the 21st Century for initiating the discussion and organizing the conference on global security issues. At the same time we express our full support towards solving the challenges occurring in the new global scenario.

After an in-depth analysis of the draft proposed by the Forum for the 21st century let us annotate it and include our suggestions as well. The NATO stresses that it supports all efforts to take part in making the global situation's performance more effective and that it sees the most important issues in assecuration of collective security in the 21st century.

In the section Notes:

- NATO agrees with the Forum on the fact that we are entering the second decade of the twenty-first century of an uncertain and unpredictable world as it has changed significantly in the last two decades. Most dramatically, the 9/11 and subsequent attacks, further, the global nuclear non-proliferation regime is under increasing stress; incidents of instability along Europe's periphery have revived historic tensions; innovative modes of gathering, sending and storing information have brought with them new vulnerabilities; the security implications of piracy, energy supply risks and environmental neglect have become more evident; and a worldwide economic crisis has spawned widespread budgetary concerns.

- In the nearest future the international security environment will change in ways both predictable and unforeseen. Certainly, the forces that come under the general heading of globalization can be counted upon to intensify. This will result in a rapid, if uneven, growth in cross-border flows of goods, services, people, technology, ideas, customs, crime, and weapons. This deepening interdependence will bring the world ever closer but not necessarily make populations more inclined to live in peace. The turn of the century brought with it new and varied challenges for the Alliance. NATO and the Forum seem to be united in the idea that the most probable threats to security in the coming decade are unconventional and those that in particular stand out are an attack by ballistic missile (whether or not nuclear-armed), strikes by international terrorist groups; and the ones also mentioned in the draft - cyber assaults of varying degrees of severity. A host of other threats also pose a risk, including disruptions to energy and maritime supply lines, the harmful consequences of global climate change, and financial crisis.

NATO would like to comment on Forum's notion in the end of the paragraph and add that regarding international terrorism the counterterrorist policies are also a direct and significant concern to the whole international society and although it acknowledges that those policies used by now have helped us to succeed in many ways, on the other hand they have made it also easier for the terrorist groups to recruit supporters through the narrative of Western oppression and hostility toward the Muslim world. NATO thinks that because of that the change in counterterrorist policies should be another concern that the international society should bear in mind.

- As stated in the draft, healthy partnerships provide an opening for the whole international society to pursue solutions to complex problems that affect its security; in most instances, the preferred method will be a comprehensive approach that combines military and civilian elements. NATO acknowledges the Alliance is strong and versatile but it is by no means well-suited to every task and that is the reason it agrees with the Forum in its observation that other organisations, national governments and nongovernmental entities can lead the way toward such vital goals as economic reconstruction, political reconciliation, improved governance, and the strengthening of civil society.

- Speaking about the new security environment, the draft has drawn up a problem of privatization, so-called privatization of security and the emergence of new non-state actors, be it the bottom up or top down process. First about the use of what is called private military companies. Regarding solely NATO's record of practice and according to the statement of the Secretary General, basically the Alliance believes that NATO operations should be conducted by what might be called official military units led by their responsible governments. Having stated that, it does not exclude the possibility that private security companies as such can be used for specific security tasks, protection of facilities, protection of people in certain areas. NATO would not completely exclude the possibility of using private companies, but of course, we have to strike the right balance and basically our military operations should be conducted by our military.





The Model Conference Global Security Issues

Faculty of International Relations, University of Economics in Bratislava



Modelová konferencia Bezpečnostná sekcia

Fakulta medzinárodných vzťahov, Ekonomická univerzita v Bratislave

Please find some additional suggestions on this issue in the section Proposes.

- NATO supports the idea of stability, transparency, predictability, lower levels of armaments, and verification which can be provided by arms control and non-proliferation agreements. In fulfilling its purpose and fundamental security tasks, the Alliance will continue to respect the legitimate security interests of others, seek the peaceful resolution of disputes as set out in the Charter of the United Nations, emphasize the importance of abiding by and strengthening existing multilateral non-proliferation and export control regimes, international arms control and disarmament agreements, reduce further the prominence of nuclear arms in the defence doctrines of any country, and to ensure that nuclear materials are handled in a safe and secure manner.

However, NATO feels the need to add that although Allies have made substantial reductions in both the size and diversity of their nuclear capabilities, as long as nuclear weapons exist, NATO will continue to maintain secure and reliable nuclear forces, with widely shared responsibility for deployment and operational support, at the minimum level required by the prevailing security environment.

In the section Proposes:

- One of the NATO's key partners is the United Nations as we share a commitment to maintaining international peace and security. NATO does not feel itself called upon to suggest the solution of the pressing issue of calling for necessary flexibility and creativity from UN member states to reform the UNSC as three of our member states are preceeding the UNSC permanent seats (although recorded, that the permanent members seem to be open to some reforms, such as enlargement and some working method reforms, partly to legitimise their own seats), none of them has clearly stated in favour of which of the discussed alternatives it is.

The Alliance feels the need to stress that it does not find the first variant outlined in the second draft suitable for the reform of the UNSC as without the right to veto for the new members or by extending the UNSC by regional organizations (composed of countries on different level of economic and political level), while leaving out the other, would not solve the problem of inequality in the Council a such. As long as the veto exists, and as a member of common justice, it should be extended to all new permanent members of the enlarged Security Council, in full application of the principle of equality between current and new permanent members.

Regarding the second variant, NATO would like to suggest the Forum to reconsider the enlargement of the UNSC by the whole group, the so called G4, without leaving out Germany and Japan in its proposal, two member states that contribute more to the United Nations than almost any other countries in the world, yet they are not represented on the Security Council.

Another point is that we would not promote the reduction of the number of non-permanent countries as the reformed Council must give a chance to the 70 countries that have never served in it. We do agree with the Forum on the fact that the vast majority of decisions made by the Council affect African countries that have no permanent representation on the Council and in order to increase legitimacy for its decisions, it should recognize to give African countries a stronger voice leaving it up to the UNSC to choose the best way of doing so.

NATO would suggest the Forum to rethink the necessity to draft criteria of membership in permanent membership group that in case of its possible extension would on one side make the whole process more democratic and transparent, and on the other hand even more importantly would include measures as a demonstrated capacity to contribute to international peace and security, including contributions to the UN and membership in good standing with major international security regimes, so that the candidates would be fully prepared to accept not only the privileges, but the weighty obligations of membership.

- NATO supports the Forum's statement that our new strategy in order to combat new security challenges must incorporate the notion of a "Comprehensive Approach". Today's security challenges cannot be dealt with by NATO alone. Security in Afghanistan, and elsewhere, demands a comprehensive application of economic, political and other measures that go far beyond NATO's capabilities. There is a vital role for NATO to play within such a comprehensive approach – but it requires us, the Alliance, to be much better





The Model Conference Global Security Issues

Faculty of International Relations, University of Economics in Bratislava



Modelová konferencia Bezpečnostná sekcia

Fakulta medzinárodných vzťahov, Ekonomická univerzita v Bratislave

connected with other international players, including the United Nations, the European Union and the NGO community to allow us to cover the full spectrum of tasks, from collective defence to peace support operations. It should also encourage international entities to work more closely together in acquiring key capabilities and in funding operations. NATO welcomes Forum's suggestion of developing a common early warning mechanism and joint monitoring schemes for the early detection of potential crises, but on the other hand the Forum should specify the way of deploying it as putting it into practice would have to be based on mutual trust and cooperation among all states willing to participate, those that have their own systems as well as those without these capacities. Needless to say, the current financial crisis and the budgetary problems faced by all our nations only make this all above mentioned a more pressing requirement. This is also about taxpayer's money. We have to make efficient use of our resources, through better cooperation, through better coordination and through collective solutions, because this should help us to make the right political choices; to better prioritise our tasks; to clarify the political and military tools that we need to have available; and to better identify the resources needed to fulfil them. We do believe that this could be achieved under the umbrella of the UN, especially its SC which as the unique world body should be prepared to take the responsibility.

In this notion, NATO wants to underline that what we need is a relationship that allows us to pursue these long-standing common interests, and which will not be de-railed every time we disagree.

- The UN Battlegroup initiative addressed in the second draft would certainly set a new level of ambition for the UN, alongside the existing SHIRBRIG, the one of the most successful and promising developments towards an effective standing UN army, yet without a clearer focus on the quality of the capability, such as the ability to deploy forces rapidly, sustain them at distance and operate multinationally. The NATO welcomes the potential contributions the EU's development of its own military capacities could make to a more effective global governance system. However, in this part NATO feels the need to stress that in discussions between the EU and NATO, there was a broad agreement that the Battlegroup initiative will be mutually reinforcing with the larger NATO Response Force (NRF), each providing a positive impetus for military capability improvement, so wherever possible and applicable, standards, practical methods and procedures for Battlegroups are analogous to those defined within the NRF. The types of mission for which the NRF and EU Battlegroups are designed are complementary, rather than being duplicative. We suggest the UN Battlegroups to be designed for all missions needed for peacekeeping, peacekeeping and peacebuilding, they would need a piece of both above mentioned types, as i.e. the show of force, stand-alone use for crisis response operations, or initial entry for a larger operation have by now largely been carried out by the Allied forces.

NATO believes that the swift deployment of special UN battlegroups could not only play an important role in reinforcing the UN's many overstretched peace missions – particularly on the African continent – but the very establishment of these autonomous Battlegroups would also provide the UN with greater strategic independence and flexibility vis-à-vis NATO, EU and the United States as SHIRBRIG, has largely been neglected by international attention. However, NATO suggests to rethink the concept of these Battlegroups and particularly the way they would be managed as we must be aware that again, in the case of a blatantly unreasonable veto dead-lock in the Security Council when urgent action would be needed, these Battlegroups could again end up only in a nice political proclamation and not serve as a flexible and autonomous option of last resort.

On the other hand, NATO would like to stress that given the membership overlap between the EU and NATO/Partnership for Peace, the necessary interoperability between forces developed by EU Member States and NATO nations and the proposed UN Battlegroups should primarily be a responsibility of individual countries.

- NATO agrees with the Forum that although PMCs only represent one of the three broad types of Military Service Providers but the type of most concern for regulation. Regarding our record of practice, in fact the majority of fears articulated by critics exist only as academic theory. The Allies would like to stress and kindly ask the Forum to incorporate the following into the draft stating that the most regulations having to do with human rights and accountability will be readily accepted by the PMCs who already assume standards instilled in typical Western militaries (i.e. the IPOA Code of Conduct articulating some key human rights protections was largely written by NGOs and widely endorsed by PMCs). As already stated in the first





The Model Conference Global Security Issues

Faculty of International Relations, University of Economics in Bratislava



Modelová konferencia Bezpečnostná sekcia

Fakulta medzinárodných vzťahov, Ekonomická univerzita v Bratislave

position, we think that contractual obligations can be much more specific and invasive than general guidelines and regulations as they can include military observers, increased transparency and detailed financial and legal penalties for noncompliance and we appreciate that the Forum has considered that when issuing the second draft. There is one concern about the Forum's propose and that is the fact that although it proposes the general guideline in form of an ethical code, it leaves the space for every country to adjust the contract with the licensed company to its own system of law, which is in fact one of the main debated issues of this industry nowadays so it would not solve the complete problem. Firstly because when debating the codes of practice mentioned in the draft, NATO thinks that those promoted by professional associations representing security firms, such as IPOA, may serve as the basis. In our view, IPOA reflects the collective aspirations of its membership, conceptualized around the notion of a peace and stability industry as this industry comprises specialized and multi-task enterprises engaged in a variety of support activities in reconstruction environments and not just security provision. IPOA's Code of Conduct has an ethical dimension. It encourages service delivery consistent with international laws governing conflict and values purporting the respect of human rights. At the same time, if not speaking solely only about the typical Western militaries but the general guidelines that should be proposed on the international level, it needs to be acknowledged that accountability is culturally and spatially variable, reflecting different moral codes across cultures, boundaries, and agencies. The codes of ethics literature is well established, offering valuable insights that have not yet been applied to the study of the privatization of security. This substantive aim should be a part of the accountability project here proposed. For the security industry, perhaps the most challenging arena of accountability is that involving the undertakings of its employees in conflict zones, especially in wars. Not only are combatants and innocent civilians maimed or killed, but security personnel too. The thing, that could burden the dialogue among international entities on the topic of codification of such ethical code is that at a basic level, one's innate sense of right and wrong, the essence of ethical thinking, may drive one to condemn any human undertaking in which the direct or remote possibility of maiming or killing becomes part of the job. Even more if a profit motive is involved. However, assessing accountability in this arena is much more complex than an exercise of right and wrong; particularly considering the blurring between civilians and combatants characteristic of new conflicts and between foes and friends as a result of the growing threat posed by fundamentalist terrorism.

Despite the above mentioned possible problems, NATO in case of such proposal on the international level – particularly the UN ground, would be ready to show assistance in its promotion as it do understands that codes respond to public concerns and expectations for service delivery in a particular sector. As statements of 'best practice', companies need to answer for divergences and transgressions from stated rules and values, yet, at the same time, in search of public awareness and respectability, firstly, in our view a constructive dialogue is needed to reach balanced and informed conclusions before trying to institutionalize this private sector under the UN umbrella.

- The Alliance has an interest in protecting global lifelines that sustain modern societies and in promoting security and stability well beyond its immediate borders. NATO agrees with the Forum that this mission can in all likelihood be carried out only in cooperation with its partners as NATO's military tools are not always perfectly suited to address all new challenges.

Regarding the Forum's propose on the topic of proliferation of the WMD, obeying the NPT and strengthening the role of the IAEA, we cannot speak for any body but NATO, but exactly how NATO as NATO as a whole can contribute to political and diplomatic efforts against WMD proliferation is a more difficult question which will be easier to be answered after the Summit in Lisboa, as we expect it to address the need to undertake another major nuclear policy review within our members with a view to bringing our nuclear doctrine and nuclear sharing policies in line with the spirit and letter of the NPT. A declaratory approach, via expressions of Alliance support for non-proliferation treaties or export control regimes can only go so far.

NATO is not a signatory to any non-proliferation agreement. Though sometimes present as an observer, the Alliance is not in a position to affect the outcome of deliberations such as the NPT Review Conference. Nor is the Alliance the most appropriate mechanism for policy coordination in such settings, where the "Western" groups include many non-NATO countries. Despite collective Alliance support for cooperative threat reduction efforts in Russia and other NWS, NATO has not played any coordinating role, as the member countries have preferred to keep their assistance in bilateral channels. However, defining NATO's potential





The Model Conference Global Security Issues

Faculty of International Relations, University of Economics in Bratislava



Modelová konferencia Bezpečnostná sekcia

Fakulta medzinárodných vzťahov, Ekonomická univerzita v Bratislave

role in the international institutional architecture for addressing WMD proliferation has become even more difficult, due to the increasing role of bodies or programmes, such as the PSI or the G20, involving some but not all Alliance members, and partially overlapping with NATO activities or fields of interest. That is the reason NATO suggests that differences among the states in their views on whether, when and how to use force in responding to WMD and terrorist threats have to be countered on international level and the need to improve the quality of political dialogue is of vital importance.

