

**8th BURAK BORA ANATOLIAN HIGH SCHOOL
MODEL UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE 2026**

H-NATO

STUDY GUIDE AND RULES OF PROCEDURE

Under Secretary General: Nilüfer Deniz Altan

Academic Assistant:Eylül Ecrin Şirin



Table of Contents

1. Letters from the Academic Team
2. Rules of Procedure
 - 2.1 General Rules
 - 2.2 Rules Governing Debate
 - 2.3 Rules Governing Points
 - 2.4 Rules Governing Committee Documents
 - 2.5 Rules Governing Voting
 - 2.6 Precedence of Motion
3. Introduction to H-NATO
4. Agenda Item
 - 4.1 Introduction to the Agenda Item
 - 4.2 Background of the Cold War
 - 4.3 Key Turning Points
 - 4.4 Emerging Tensions
 - 4.5 Possible Directions for the Committee
 - 4.6 Guiding Questions
5. References

LETTERS FROM THE ACADEMIC TEAM

Welcome Letter From the Under Secretary General

Dear delegates,

I am delighted to welcome you all to the H-NATO committee at BBALMUN26. My academic assistant and I have worked hard on this committee for a year, and I hope you will enjoy it as much as we have.

Will you embrace the principle of unity or the principle of individuality? By examining both, I hope the H-NATO committee will help you discover new horizons.

If you have any questions about the committee, please don't hesitate to reach out to me. We look forward to seeing you all.

Nilüfer Deniz ALTAN

niluferdenizaltan55@gmail.com

Welcome Letter From the Academic Assistant

Dear Delegates,

It is a great pleasure to welcome you at BBAL MUN'26, this committee! For 1 year, I have strived to simulate H-NATO for you in the best way, and today I am honored to provide you with such a guide in an area where you will improve yourself for 3 days.

In this committee, you will refresh your vast historical war knowledge, and this will make you a committee that develops not only from the point of view of MUN, but also your cultural, debate and strategic thinking skills.

All my wishes are to have a fun and full conference with you for 3 days. I'm waiting for you all with excitement.

Eylül Ecrin ŞİRİN
eylulecrinsirin28@gmail.com

2. RULES OF PROCEDURE

2.1 General Rules

Article 1: Scope

The rules contained in this guide apply only to the H-NATO committee within BBALMUN'26. The Internal Regulations of other Committees are entirely at the discretion of the Academic Team or Secretariat. At the discretion of the Academic Team or Secretariat, these rules may be amended to facilitate healthy debate, and any changes made to the rules shall be clearly communicated to the entire committee and shall take precedence over the rules set out in this document.

Article 2: Language

The official and working language of the conference is English. During the sessions, it is prohibited for delegates to give a speech in any language other than English, in case of the usage of another language, the chairboard has the authority to remind the delegate to provide necessary interruption. Likewise, all documents presented to the secretariat must be in English.

Article 3: Representation

Each member state is represented by two delegates, namely the Minister of Defence and the Minister of Foreign Affairs. As delegates represent individuals, they may use personal pronouns in individual speeches.

Article 4: Credentials

Delegates, Chairpersons, Observers, Secretariat members and other Staff (hereinafter referred to as 'Participants') shall be entitled to certain rights upon registration. They must obtain the permission of the Secretary-General to obtain any privileges. Otherwise, they have the same basic rights as other delegates. Except in exceptional circumstances, all delegates are granted the same rights.

Article 5: Electronic Devices

The use of computers, tablets and mobile phones is prohibited during official sessions unless the chairboard states otherwise.

Article 6: Dress Code

In accordance with the delegate's diplomatic status, the official dress code must be observed. Violation of this provision may result in an official warning from the Secretariat and may lead to dismissal from office without payment of certification and compensation.

Article 7: Courtesy

Each delegate shall behave courteously and respectfully towards Committee staff and other delegates. The Chair shall immediately caution any delegate who fails to comply with this rule and issue an informal warning. Delegates who feel they have not been treated with respect may speak to the Chair. The Chair shall take appropriate action.

Article 8: Attendance

Attendance shall be registered by roll call at the beginning of each meeting as delegates are called in alphabetical order by the presidency. After their names have been read out, delegates shall indicate their attendance by stating 'present' or 'present and voting'. When a delegate states 'present and voting', this means that they cannot abstain during the voting procedure on any document put to the vote during that meeting. If a delegate is late for a session, they must send a note to the chair indicating that they are present, otherwise they will not be recognised in the session or allowed to vote. Delegates marked absent for two or more sessions will not receive their attendance certificates.

2.2 Rules Governing Debate

Article 1: Quorum

When at least one-fourth of the Committee members (as announced at the beginning of the first session) are present, a quorum is deemed to have been established, and the Chair declares the Committee open for further discussion. Unless specifically objected to and proven otherwise, it is assumed that the quorum is present. A roll call is never taken to determine whether a quorum is present. However, the Chair may take a roll call at the beginning of sessions to facilitate discussion. To vote on any significant motion, the Chair must determine that a simple majority of Committee members is present.

Article 2: Opening Speeches

Delegates must deliver their opening speeches before commencing the discussion. The chairperson will give the floor to delegates in alphabetical order of their names.

Article 3: Agenda

The agenda determines the order in which topics will be discussed in the committee. Therefore, the first decision the committee will make is to determine the agenda. Delegates are expected to submit a motion to determine the agenda. This motion must have a seconder. If there is no opposition to the motion, it is deemed accepted. If there is opposition, the committee officers create a Speakers' List consisting of 2 or 4 delegates to speak for and against the motion. Following the speeches, the committee proceeds to a vote.

Article 4: Debate

The agenda is set by the submission of a motion to open the debate. This motion is not open to debate and requires a simple majority to be adopted. Once the motion is accepted, a new standing list of speakers is created to conduct general discussions on the subject. This List of Speakers determines the order of speakers in all discussions related to the Subject Area, unless it is invalidated by procedural motions, amendments, or the submission of a draft resolution.

Article 5: Voting

Committee delegates indirectly represent their countries alongside the ministers whose names they bear. During motions, delegates may vote and debate on behalf of the minister whose name appears on their placard. However, in votes specifically indicated by the chair, two delegates shall reach a joint decision on behalf of the country they represent and cast a single vote.

Article 6: Speakers List

The Committee shall always maintain an open Speaker List for the subject area under discussion. This list enables delegates to engage in a general discussion by providing them with the opportunity to speak on any topic related to the agenda item, current situation, a particular matter, etc. When the Chair asks for delegates wishing to be added to the general speakers' list, delegates may raise their cards to add their countries. If there are fewer than three volunteers, the Chair has the right to make a random selection, as there must always be at least three delegates on the general speakers' list, otherwise the discussion is terminated. The Chair determines the speaking time or considers motions to determine the speaking time. Members may add their names to the Speaker List at any time by submitting a written request to the Chair or when the Chair calls for members wishing to be added to the Speaker List. Members cannot add their names to the Speakers' List if they are already registered on it, and they may remove their names from the Speakers' List by submitting a written request to the Chair. When the Chair asks for any motion or proposal and there are no proposals in the chamber, the debate automatically reverts to the general speakers' list. A motion to close the general speakers' list shall never be accepted.

Article 7: Yields

The Chair may give the floor to delegates during various procedures such as opening speeches, the list of speakers, the introduction of resolutions, and speeches for or against. A delegate who is given the floor addresses the committee from a podium that may be assigned by the Chair. The right to speak always belongs to the Committee Staff and may only be given to delegates by the Chair. A delegate who has the right to speak and has time remaining after their speech may transfer their remaining time or right to speak to another delegate in the following ways:

Yield to Another Delegate: The remaining time is given to that delegate. If the delegate accepts the transfer, the Chair accepts the delegate's questions for the remaining time.

Yield to Questions: Those asking questions/expressing views will be selected by the Chair and will be limited to one question each unless they propose a motion

to follow up. Only the speaker's answers to the questions will be deducted from the speaking time.

Yielding the Floor: Such a yield should be made when the delegate wishes to conclude their speech. The Chair will then take back the floor.

Article 8: Right of Reply

If a delegate's personal or national integrity has been impugned by another, the delegate may submit a Right of Reply by only writing to the Committee staff about the matter. The Chair will grant the Right of Reply at the delegate's discretion once the demand is received and this decision is not appealable. A delegate granted a Right of Reply will not address the Committee except at the request of the Chair. Submitting a Right of Reply to a right of Reply is out of order.

Article 9: Moderated Caucus

A moderated caucus is a structured debate format in which the predetermined list of speakers is set aside, allowing the chair to call on delegates to speak. During a moderated caucus, delegates take turns delivering brief speeches on the designated subtopic. The duration of 5e speeches are generally determined by the delegate who had raised the motion of a moderated caucus as a total and an individual speaking time. Delegates who are wishing to speak are chosen by the chairboard and added on the list of speakers.

Article 10: Semi-Moderated Caucus

In a semi-moderated caucus, speakers are not determined by a list of speakers. In a semi-moderated caucus, delegates who wish to speak may stand up and speak. Other delegates are expected to remain seated. When speaking, delegates should always be respectful to one another. Semi-moderated caucuses create a slightly more informal environment for speakers.

Article 11: Unmoderated Caucus

A delegate may raise a motion for an unmoderated caucus after at least one moderated caucus followed by a speech from the Speakers' List was held, while the floor was open, before the closure of debate. The delegate making the motion must specify a time limit for the caucus, not to exceed twenty minutes.

The motion will immediately be put to a vote and will pass given a simple majority. During the unmoderated caucuses, delegates are not required to be seated, can talk directly with each other, and may only work towards the preparation of committee documents. An unmoderated caucus can be extended only once, and the length of an extension may not exceed the previous motion.

Article 12: Closure of Debate

When the floor is open, a delegate may move to close debate on the substantive or procedural matter under discussion. When the closure of the debate is moved, the Committee Chair will ask the delegates if there are any objections to voting by unanimous consent. If there are no objections, the motion to close the debate will automatically be adopted and the Committee will move immediately to the substantive voting procedure.

Article 13: Suspension or Adjournment of the Meeting

In the last 5 minutes of parliamentary sessions, delegates are expected to raise a motion to suspend the meeting. When in order, such motions will not be debatable but will be immediately voted upon, barring any motions taking precedence, and will require a simple majority to pass. In the last thirty minutes of the last session, delegates can raise a motion to adjourn the meeting. When the meeting is adjourned, all committee functions will be postponed or terminated for the duration of the conference.

2.3 Rules Governing Points

Article 1: Points of Personal Privilege

Whenever a delegate experiences personal discomfort, he or she may rise to a Point of Personal Privilege to request that the discomfort be corrected. A Point of Personal Privilege may only interrupt a speaker if the delegate speaking is inaudible.

Article 2: Points of Order

At any point when a committee is in session, a delegate may rise to a Point of Order for expressing his or her belief that the rules of procedure are not being followed. The Point of Order will be immediately decided by the Chair in accordance with these rules of procedure. A Point of Order may never interrupt a speaker.

Article 3: Points of Parliamentary Inquiry

When the floor is open, a delegate may rise to a Point of Parliamentary Inquiry to ask the

Chair a question regarding the rules of procedure. A Point of Parliamentary Inquiry may never interrupt a speaker.

Article 4: Points of Information

Points regarding issues rather than parliamentary procedure and that are not covered in the rules governing other points shall be asked to the Committee Director as a Point of Information. A point of information cannot interrupt a speaker.

2.4 Communique

2.4.1 Communique Writing and Submission

Communiques are official documents; they are primarily the product of negotiations held in the Council Chambers and are adopted by the Council according to the consensus procedure. Furthermore, declarations contain opinions on specific situations and action plans recommended for implementation by the Alliance.

When preparing a communiqué, it should be borne in mind that the wording used will affect its acceptability to other delegates. Since consensus is required for the Council to adopt a communiqué, the importance of the wording increases significantly when the document reaches the critical stage, i.e. the approval stage. The draft communiqué should be clear and concise. Ultimately, the better the content of the draft declaration, the higher the likelihood of achieving consensus at the Council session. The fundamental purpose of drafting the declaration is to articulate, in a clear and concise manner and in accordance with the established format, the ideas addressing the issues under consideration, including the proposals of all states within the Alliance.

2.4.2 Sample of a Draft Communique

Draft Communiqué

held at NATO Headquarters,
Thessaloniki, April 26th 2013

1. Today the North Atlantic Council met in Defense Ministers Session, in Thessaloniki, to advance the ...
2. At our meeting today...
3. We are committed to the continuing success of the NATO-led International Security Assistance force...
4. We welcome the adoption...
5. We fully support the negotiations...
6. We strongly condemn terrorism...
7. In response to the call by the government of Pakistan...
8. NATO will continue to play an essential role in regional security and stability...
9. We express our concerns about ...
10. We express / our deep appreciation...
11. We fully agree with the statements...
12. We recognize the need/ the importance...
13. We reaffirm our determination...
14. We reiterate our commitment to the...
15. We remain committed to our transatlantic link...
16. The members of NATO, recognize that the Alliance faces a wide range of threats...

Each clause is numbered (1-...). All the clauses end with a dot. Each clause may contain more than one sentence.

Amendments

After draft communiqués have been submitted to the board and approved by the Secretariat, draft communiqués are presented to the delegates. At this point the state representatives have the right to modify through known as amendments, representing adjusted perspectives or proposals on the topic under discussion. Phrasing and purpose of the amendment should complement the draft communiqué.

There are two types of amendments as outlined in the Rules of Procedure as well:

1. Non Substantive Amendments, correcting grammatical, spelling or formatting mistakes will be automatically adopted without approval from the Council, at the discretion of the President.

2. Substantive Amendments, which are due to change the substantial meaning of the communiqué, shall be unanimously adopted by the NAC. All amendments are subject to the Board's and Secretariat's approval, who may disapprove an amendment, on grounds of consistency and content.

2.5 The Scheme Of The Committee

Delegates are expected to write a communique paper during the committee which may include the information they have written in their directives when they have a crisis to solve in the committee

INTRODUCTION TO THE COMMITTEE

1.1 Establishment of NATO

NATO (The North Atlantic Treaty Organization) founded on December 4, 1949 the aftermath of World War II. The organization was collectively established to ensure security. NATO is a security alliance formed by Western world against Soviet expansion. After World War II, the Soviets rapidly increased their influence in Eastern Europe and established the region called "Iron Curtain".

Article V of the founding documents of NATO regulates the "principle of collective defense", which forms the basis of the organization, and states that an attack on one member will be considered to have been made against all members.

"The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defence recognized by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the Party or Parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other Parties, such action as it

deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area.

Any such armed attack and all measures taken as a result thereof shall immediately be reported to the Security Council. Such measures shall be terminated when the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security."

1.2 Functioning of NATO

Decisions and Consultations

NATO's decision-making system is based on the principle of consensus, and within this framework, decisions are taken at various levels, mainly by the North Atlantic Council (NAC). Permanent delegations and working groups, consisting of ambassadors and technical experts from member states, prepare draft decisions on relevant issues in detail and submit them to the Council agenda. Unanimity is essential for every decision to be taken by the Council, a decision is considered adopted unless there is an specific 'no' from any country. In the conduct of the process, the Secretary General assumes a facilitating and conciliatory role rather than a decision-making one; he ensures diplomatic coordination among members and represents the political framework of the decisions taken. All these stages form the basis of NATO's official decision-making mechanism, and each step is carried out in accordance with the Alliance's common security understanding.

i. NAC (North Atlantic Council)

NAC is NATO's highest decision-making authority. Each member country is represented by a representative. In times of crisis, he takes urgent meetings and decides on military operations, expansions, budgets and political principles.

ii. Military Representatives

It adapts the decisions taken by the NAC to the military strategy. Each country takes its place with the Chief of General Staff and representative. When NATO decides to intervene in a crisis, it determines how the decision will be implemented, which forces will be used, and which countries will assume which tasks.

iii. Subordinate Committees

It is the unit where daily diplomatic talks are conducted and draft resolutions are prepared. The topics are presented here first, if an agreement is reached, it will be taken to the NAC.

iv. Nuclear Planning Group

The highest level advisory and administration body for NATO's nuclear deterrence policy is the Nuclear Planning Group (NPG), which occupies a unique place in the Alliance's decision-making framework. The NPG, which meets at the defense ministerial level, establishes the guiding principles for NATO's nuclear strategy, as well as the security, modernization, and deployment of nuclear weapons. It also assesses potential crisis nuclear options. By certifying that all other allies participate equally in nuclear decision-making processes, the NPG enhances open communication and the Alliance's shared responsibility mechanism. The North Atlantic Council (NAC), NATO's highest political body, finally approves the strategic framework created by the NPG and incorporates it into the Alliance's overall defense and deterrence strategy.

NATO's role in the Cold War: Strategic Interest and Capabilities

1. Preventing Soviet expansionism

The central aim of NATO was to prevent the Soviet Union from expanding its sphere of influence in Europe. In this way, it is carried out in the form of establishing a military balance of power and forming a set against the Eastern Bloc.

2. Protecting Western Europe with collective defense

5th of the 1949 Washington Treaty. On the basis of the Article, European states were provided to find security under the assurance of the USA, as it considered that the attack on a member was made against the entire alliance. In this way, in case of any attack, NATO would unite and activate the operation.

3. Institutionalizing the US military and political influence in Europe

In NATO, the US assumes a lasting and legitimate leadership role on European security. As a result, the USA maintained its superiority in the global balance of power against the Soviets.

4. Ensuring military integration and standardization in Europe

NATO developed a common command structure, common weapon systems, logistics standards and joint training doctrines among the member armies, consequently ensuring that NATO could act quickly and in a coordinated manner.

5. Ensuring political unity in the Western blok

NATO ensured the coordination of foreign policy of its members, not only as a military but also as a political institution.

Consensus and consistency were formed in the anti-Soviet bloc.

6.Safe integration of Germany into the system

After the World War, the re-arming of West Germany was risky. NATO prevented Germany's uncontrolled military developments and integrated it into the military and strategic framework of the West.

7. Psychological and diplomatic deterrence against the Soviets

NATO's presence limited the Soviets' means of political repression in Europe. Based on this, even the establishment of the Warsaw Pact was an indication of NATO's influence.

8. Crisis management and military presence

NATO has established a structure ready for war at any time with continuous exercises, intelligence sharing and command control systems.

INTRODUCTION TO THE AGENDA ITEM

The Cold War is based on the conflict between the ideological, military, political and economic talks between the United States and the Soviet Union in the 1940s. With the collapse of Japan and Germany, the field was left to the solid USA and the Soviet Union, and the world began to take shape around these two powers. The basic ideological difference between the two powers created 2 worldviews that are impossible to compromise. The Soviet Union formed the Eastern Bloc

around a communist thought, and the USA formed the Western bloc around capitalist thought. They knew that if they got into a hot conflict on both sides, they would disappear, so they preferred to fight coldly.

The "Europe First" policy of the USA and the United Kingdom did not please the Soviet Union. Stalin Hitler began to raise his power again in Germany, and the German armies continued the war against the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union suffered significantly hard-to-recover casualties in the war with the German army. The independent policies of the United States and the United Kingdom left the Soviet Union alone against Nazi Germany.

Currently, in 1950, the tension between the capitalist bloc led by the USA and the communist bloc led by the Soviet Union is in the line and see each other as an existential threat on both sides. The recent division of Germany and the new end of the Berlin blockade pose a hard border of the cold war in the middle of Europe. By 1950, the Korean Peninsula had become one of the most volatile flashpoints of the early Cold War. Following Japan's surrender in 1945, Korea was divided along the 38th parallel into two separate states: a Soviet-backed communist regime in the North, headed by Kim Il-sung; and in the South, there was a United States-supported anti-communist government under Syngman Rhee. Both governments proclaimed themselves the sole legitimate government over the entire peninsula and thus transformed it into a highly militarized area with frequent border clashes and deepening political antagonism. Tensions reached a dramatic head on 25 June 1950, when North Korean forces invaded South Korea en masse, capturing key territories and forcing an urgent international response. Under United Nations auspices, the United States provided substantial military aid to the South, while China eventually entered the fray on behalf of the North, transforming the war into a major proxy struggle between the two global superpower blocs. The involvement of multiple great powers increased the fear of an extended global conflict, while the Korean War became the first significant armed conflict of the Cold War period. Therefore, the developments in 1950 mark a crucial turning point in world geopolitics, vividly demonstrating how regional conflicts can soon become an international crisis within the emerging bipolar world order.

The Cold War continues to be one of the most significant threats to international stability, with the ideological conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union having quickly evolved into a systemic rivalry over political influence,

military dominance, and technological supremacy. The bipolar division of the world has entailed tensions between the two superpowers that are risking an international peace, especially as their military buildups continue to grow and as they compete for strategic strongholds in regions vital to world security. With Europe irreconcilably divided, with Asia increasingly caught up in the struggle, and with newly independent countries becoming battlegrounds for proxy rivalry, the danger that localized incidents may lead to a wider war significantly threatens world security. The development of nuclear weapons magnifies these risks, since a misjudgment may entail unprecedented humanitarian and geopolitical effects. Consequently, the Cold War is not only a political stalemate; it is a condition that characterizes alignment and realignment in diplomacy, influences the pace and direction of economic growth, and gives shape to the future pattern of international relations.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Marshall Plan

In the immediate after the II. World War, disputes about the future of Europe, in particular Eastern Europe became central. The United States and The United Kingdom were alarmed despite establishing communist regimes in countries where the Soviet Union liberated from Nazi control. They saw this strategy as an increase in Soviet expansionism. The United States launched the **Marshall Plan** in 1947 to ensure economic stability in Europe. *(Marshall Plan is beside an economic recovery program for Western European economies, The United States transferred 13.3 billion dollar as foreign aid.)* Furthermore, to improving the welfare of Europe, they aimed to channel their own Capitalist orders into the world by preventing the spread of Communism and it was requested to rebuild the cities that were destroyed due to the war, restructuring the cities and removing trade barriers. Joseph Stalin saw the Marshall plan as The United States effort to impose its own power against Europe and rejected it. Marshall Plan was accepted by Western Europe and The United States, but Eastern Europe and USSR countries rejected it. That rejection sharpened the east-west separation on the world. Stalin founded **Cominform**, which defended world communism in 1947 in response to the Marshall Plan. The Eastern Bloc founded COMECON in 1949 to promote economic cooperation between communist states. But this system was not as forceful and effective as the **Marshall Plan**.

The Yalta Conference and the Potsdam Conference

The Yalta Conference which took place in February 1945 at Crimea brought together United States United Kingdom and Soviet Union leaders to determine post-war order principles during World War II's concluding phase. The conference established all details which would determine Germany's administration after its defeat by creating four military zones and dividing Berlin between the four allied nations. The demilitarisation of Germany together with the complete destruction of its war production facilities and the denazification process formed the essential fundamental principles. The conference established the principles which would determine Germany's war reparations payments while considering the Soviet Union's extensive war-related losses. The main decisions established the process for conducting elections in Eastern European nations after World War II while establishing governments which would reflect popular support; at the same time, the United Nations founding agreement reached its basic terms.

The Potsdam Conference which took place in Potsdam Germany from July to August 1945 served as a platform to examine how the Yalta decisions would be executed. The conference examined four crucial aspects for managing Germany which included demilitarisation denazification democratisation and the restructuring of its economic system. The participants held discussions about three topics which included the economic utilization of German resources and the prohibition of industrial output and the trade relationships between different occupation zones. The Oder-Neisse line served as the western border of Poland while the discussion included population changes and European post-war territorial agreements. The parties maintained different positions about how to run electoral processes and build political systems in Eastern European countries which resulted in different ways of understanding and executing the conference agreements.

The Expansion of Soviet Influence in Eastern Europe

The Soviet Union assumed its main role in determining the political and administrative changes which followed World War II in Eastern and Central

European nations where Soviet troops were deployed. The post-war period brought new governance systems to Poland and Romania and Bulgaria and Hungary and Czechoslovakia; during this process, communist parties, with Soviet support, became increasingly influential within the administrative machinery. The initial government formation created coalition governments which included all political parties; but later on governmental power transformed into communist control for essential institutions including interior, security and defense departments.

The countries conducted elections yet established strict rules which governed electoral procedures and political operations while limiting what opposition parties could do. The government created a centralized administration system while all industrial facilities and banks and large corporations faced nationalization. The government started to implement collectivisation policies across the agricultural industry. The government established state control over education and media and cultural institutions through their reorganization. The countries adopted foreign policy and security policies which conformed to Soviet Union standards; they became part of the Soviet regional power structure. The process produced identical political and economic systems which spread throughout Eastern Europe

The Truman Doctrine

The Truman Doctrine which US President Harry S. Truman announced in 1947 established the framework for US foreign policy that would be followed during the post-war period. The doctrine became significant during the events that unfolded in the Eastern Mediterranean region. A complete aid program was developed for Greece and Turkey which included their ongoing internal unrest and Turkey's strategic military position. The US government chose to assist Greece and Turkey through economic aid and military equipment and technical consultancy according to the proposal that the US administration submitted to Congress.

The United States Congress approved the budget which allowed financial resources to be sent to designated countries. The United States implemented various military training programs and infrastructure development projects and

economic stability programs. The organization sent expert personnel to help with assistance work and they cooperated with local organizations. The United States established a foreign policy system which enabled it to directly intervene in international events. The Truman Doctrine functioned as a regional assistance program which evolved into a strategy through which the United States would engage in worldwide political and economic activities.

Nuclear Deterrence & MAD

Deterrence is a military strategy where one power uses the threat of reprisal to prevent attacks from adversaries. It is particularly associated with nuclear weapons, as nuclear powers and major alliances maintain significant destructive capabilities to inflict unacceptable damage on aggressors, ensuring that this capability is visible and credible to deter potential attacks. Nuclear deterrence has been integral to American security policy since the onset of the Cold War, aiming to convince potential adversaries that the costs of aggression outweigh any potential benefits. The United States established formidable strategic, theater, and tactical nuclear forces to ensure the credibility of this deterrence, threatening devastating retaliation against adversaries. The principal target during the Cold War was the Soviet Union, leading to a condition of mutual deterrence known as "mutual assured destruction" (MAD). This strategy is credited by some for preventing direct conflict between the U.S. and the Soviet Union, despite frequent crises that brought both nations close to nuclear war. Additionally, the evolution of the U.S. post-war alliance system prompted a focus on extended deterrence—utilizing U.S. nuclear capabilities to protect allies—though achieving credible deterrence for allies proved to be more complex than deterring direct attacks on the United States itself.

Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD) is a military strategy where if one superpower launches a nuclear attack, the other would retaliate with an equally devastating nuclear strike, ensuring the destruction of both sides. This concept, often referred to as MAD, was a key part of nuclear strategy during the Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union. The core idea behind MAD is that both sides possess a "second-strike capability." This means that even if one country launched a surprise nuclear attack (a "first strike"), the other country would still have enough nuclear weapons remaining to launch a retaliatory strike. Knowing that any nuclear attack would lead to their own complete destruction, neither side had a strong reason to initiate hostilities. MAD was designed to

deter nuclear war. By making the consequences of starting a nuclear conflict unimaginably terrible for everyone involved, it aimed to maintain a tense peace. This strategy meant that both superpowers were essentially held "hostage" to each other's behavior, making war an unacceptable option. While MAD was a central doctrine, strategies evolved. For example, the U.S. considered "counterforce" targeting (aiming at military sites) before shifting to "countervalue" targeting (aiming at cities and industries) to ensure destructive parity. Efforts were also made to develop defenses, like antiballistic missile systems, which challenged the MAD doctrine and led to new arms races. The collapse of the Soviet Union also marked the end of the superpower dynamic that underpinned MAD.

KEY TURNING POINTS

The Berlin Blockade

The Eastern Bloc brought strict control, aiming to coordinate actions among European Communist members. In 1948, the Western powers' introduction of the Deutsche Mark, a new currency in West Germany, without consulting the USSR, further deepened the crisis. For the Soviet Union, this was perceived as a threat.

After the announcement of this new currency, Stalin, fearing that Germany would use its strength against him, moved to remove all Western powers from West Berlin. A blockade was imposed on the western part of the city, cutting off all road and rail transport. West Berlin remained part of the Soviet occupation zone. The closure of land supply routes led to a shortage of provisions. Between September 26, 1948, and September 30, 1949, an airlift was established with the help of Western aircraft to deliver food aid. During this aid operation, the US used many surplus supply and bomber aircraft from the war. Numerous planes, such as C-47s and C-54s, made sorties almost daily. Thanks to the US airlift, the Soviet blockade was rendered ineffective, and they were forced to lift it on May 12, 1949. This event further increased tensions during the Cold War. Following the failure of the Berlin Blockade, the division of Germany became clear. During the blockade, the Soviet Union aimed to isolate West Berlin and force the

Western powers to leave the city. However, the airlift led by the United States and the United Kingdom disrupted this plan. The failure of the blockade ended any chance of reconciliation between the sides and effectively dashed the idea of a single German government. After this, the Western powers moved to set up separate states in their areas of control, and West Germany was declared in 1949. In response, the Soviet Union created East Germany in its zone. Thus, Germany was officially split into two. This division was not just political; it also represented an ideological split. While West Germany embraced a capitalist and pro-Western system, East Germany developed a socialist structure influenced by the Soviet Union. Berlin became a central symbol of the conflict, with the Western and Eastern blocs standing in direct opposition to each other.

The Korean War

The Korean War (1950-1953) was a deeply significant moment in Cold War history. The war raised important military, political and ideological questions for the United States, Britain, the United Nations (UN) and many countries across the world. It was the Cold War at its hottest, a conflict where millions were wounded, killed or displaced. It also profoundly shaped the Korean landscape, the paths of the two Korean states and collective memory, with consequences to the present day.

On 25 June 1950, forces of Communist North Korea (the Democratic People's Republic of Korea) invaded South Korea (the Republic of Korea), by crossing the 38th Parallel which had been the dividing line between the two Koreas since 1945. The UN – a relatively new organisation at this time – condemned the attack and two days' later its Security Council called on member nations to provide support for South Korea to repel the invasion. The Soviet Union had been boycotting the Security Council since the start of the year over Communist China's lack of representation, so the measures were passed. The United Nations Command (UNC) was established in July 1950 to coordinate the international military and humanitarian response to the invasion. In Britain, the Cabinet – led by Prime Minister Clement Attlee, leader of the Labour Party – expressed their dismay at the invasion. They concluded that: 'It was the clear duty of the United Kingdom Government to do everything in their power to help the South Koreans to resist this aggression. Elsewhere, British people worried about what the

outbreak of war would mean for them and their families, so soon after the end of the Second World War.

The Korean War shaped the course of the Cold War by resolving the inconsistencies that characterised US foreign and defence policies between 1946 and 1950 and by establishing significant new policy axes. Had this war not taken place, no other event that might have occurred could have produced the effects created by the Korean War. Unlike many earlier turning points, such as Britain's withdrawal from Greece and Turkey in 1947, there was virtually no functional substitute for Korea. Consequently, without Korea, international history would have been very different. This situation casts doubt on theories that attribute the general contours of what can be explained to factors with deep-rooted causes, such as the existence of the bipolar world or the needs of the American economic system.

At the height of the Cold War, American policy was characterised by the following features: a high degree of confrontation with the USSR; a perceived significant threat of war; high defence budgets; large armies in Europe; a perception of a united Sino-Soviet bloc; the belief that limited wars posed a major danger; and anti-communist commitments worldwide, stemming from the last two beliefs. Whilst the first and perhaps the second characteristics were present from 1946 to 1947, the other five only emerged after the Korean War. In some cases, the war gave decision-makers the freedom to do things they had previously wanted to do but could not. In other cases, it changed their minds or pushed them in directions they had not previously considered. In any case, the Korean War had to take place for the policies we associate with the Cold War to emerge.

The Suez Crisis

The Suez Crisis of 1956 began when Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser nationalized the Suez Canal on July 26, responding to the cancellation of American and British funding for Egypt's Aswan High Dam due to its ties with the Soviet Union. Fearing disruptions to petroleum shipments, Britain and France plotted military intervention with Israeli support following Nasser's blockade of the Straits of Tīrān. On October 29, Israel invaded Egypt, leading to British and French occupation of the canal zone after a UN cease-fire resolution. Growing opposition and U.S. intervention ended the conflict, resulting in the withdrawal

of British and French forces by December 22, 1956, and Israeli forces in March 1957.

The Suez Crisis instigated a new level of U.S. involvement in the Middle East. Concerned by the decline of European influence and rise of Soviet involvement, the United States declared the Eisenhower Doctrine in early 1957, pledging to distribute economic and military aid and, if necessary, use military force to contain communism in the Middle East. Under the Eisenhower Doctrine, the U.S. government immediately dispensed tens of millions of dollars in economic and military aid to Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Lebanon, and Libya. The doctrine guided U.S. policy toward political crises in Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon in 1957 and it provided the foundation for U.S. military intervention in Lebanon in 1958. The Suez Crisis stands as a watershed event in the history of Middle East diplomacy. By undermining traditional Anglo-French hegemony, exacerbating the problems of revolutionary nationalism personified by Nasser, stoking Arab-Israeli conflict, and offering the Soviet Union a pretext for penetrating the region, the crisis drew the United States toward substantial, significant, and enduring involvement in the Middle East.

EMERGING TENSIONS

The Migration and Propaganda Wars Between East and West Berlin

Between 1949 and 1961, over 2.5 million East Germans fled to the West, mostly through Berlin, creating an existential economic crisis for the East (GDR). To stop this "brain drain," the GDR erected the Berlin Wall in 1961, labeling it an "anti-fascist protective rampart," while the West condemned it as a prison wall. West Berlin was a capitalist enclave within Communist East Germany, making it the primary escape route for citizens looking to reach West Germany. The migration primarily involved young, educated, and skilled professionals, threatening the economic viability of the GDR. Between 1952 and 1961, roughly 3.5 million people left, a massive blow to the socialist image. To stop this, the GDR closed the border overnight on August 13, 1961, replacing barbed wire with a fortified, heavily guarded concrete barrier.

The East marketed the wall as protection against Western infiltration. The West portrayed it as a violent restriction of human freedom and a sign of socialist failure. Western radio and television, which reached East Berliners, undermined GDR efforts to promote communist ideals, leading to attempts to ban or restrict Western media. The East used youth organizations like the Young Pioneers and Free German Youth (FDJ) to encourage reporting "unpatriotic" behavior.

Soviet Accusations of Western Provocation

During the Cold War, the Soviet Union consistently accused the West—particularly the US—of "provocations" intended to undermine, surround, and destroy the USSR. Key accusations focused on NATO expansion, nuclear deployment in Turkey, espionage, and interfering in Eastern Europe, often framing these actions as existential threats to Soviet security. Moscow viewed the establishment (1949) and expansion of NATO not as a defensive alliance, but as an aggressive move aimed at encircling the Soviet Union. Consequently, the US deployment of Jupiter missiles in Turkey and Italy and the creation of a massive nuclear arsenal were characterised as direct provocations forcing the Soviet Union to take countermeasures. The incident in 1960 involving the downing of an American reconnaissance aircraft over Soviet territory was presented as a clear violation of sovereignty and an act of provocation. The USSR accused the West of instigating anti-communist uprisings to destabilise the Soviet buffer zone in Eastern Europe (for example, in Hungary in 1956). The Marshall Plan was viewed by Moscow as an attempt to 'buy' influence in Eastern Europe and weaken Soviet economic control.

Iron Curtain

Given the end of World War II in 1945, the efforts of the Soviet Union and its satellite states to prevent open contact with western countries and non-Soviet-controlled countries were divided between the Soviets and the United States into East-West. The two sides developed their own international economic and military alliances behind the veil. In the West, NATO was established under the leadership of the USA and the Warsaw Pact under the leadership of the Soviets in the East. The iron curtain took the form of a defense border between European countries in the middle of the continent.

The Berlin wall and Checkpoint Charlie became the most important border points for the East-West sides.

Insecurity and the Nuclear Arms Race

On August 6, 1945, the United States dropped the world's first atomic bomb used for offensive purposes on Hiroshima, Japan, followed three days later, on August 9, 1945, by a second atomic bomb on Nagasaki. Through this approach, United States was also aimed to limit the influence of the Soviet Union in the region and to force Japan to surrender indifferently by showing the power of the newly developed weapon. The Soviet Union made great efforts to include captured Nazi scientists in their program, and the program continued intensively with espionage information from Soviet intelligence agencies. On August 29, 1949, he secretly conducted the first successful atomic bomb test called RDS-1 based on the US Fat Man design in the city of Semey, Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic. Now both sides were equally dangerous. This situation ended unilateral superiority and started mutual fear in the world. The rivalry between U.S. and Soviet Union for nuclear weapons and bombs led to employ of billions of rupees. This gave rise to the formulation of the "Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD)," the idea that if one were to attack the other, both would be destroyed. As such, a direct war broke out despite the rising tensions.

POSSIBLE DIRECTIONS FOR THE COMMITTEE

NATO's Containment Policy

In the context of the Cold War, this concept refers to the USSR's attempts to export communism throughout the world. West bloc on the other hand, tried to limit this effect to protect its own political and economic model Capitalism and liberal democratic order.

1. Collective defense principle of NATO (Article V)

"An armed attack on a NATO member is considered to be carried out by all member countries."

2. Military deterrence created by NATO

NATO's military deterrence has shaped on military presence which is forward deployed in Europe during Cold War, nuclear capability, collective defence principle. Especially the NATO forces that are deployed in Germany send an unambiguous strategic message to the Soviet Union: a single attack will trigger a full-scale conflict by the entire alliance. This situation has raised the cost of the attack to unacceptable levels, limiting the Soviet option for military expansion and realizing the key function of deterrence: preventing war from breaking out.

3. Economic and Political Dimensions of Containment

Containment was never purely a military project. The Marshall Plan provided the economic foundation, rebuilding Western European states that might otherwise have drifted toward Soviet influence. NATO members also worked to consolidate a shared political identity around liberal democratic norms — not just as ideology, but as a deliberate counter to Soviet messaging.

Crisis Management and Intra-Alliance Tensions

The crises between 1949 and 1968 reveal something that is easy to overlook in hindsight: NATO's cohesion was never guaranteed. Each major event tested not only the alliance's resolve against the Soviet Union, but its ability to hold together internally.

The Suez Crisis is the clearest example. When Britain and France acted without American consent, the resulting fracture demonstrated that military coordination alone was insufficient — the alliance required political transparency among its members before, not after, consequential decisions were made.

The Berlin crises posed a different problem. With direct confrontation between Soviet and Western forces a realistic possibility, NATO had to define its red lines clearly enough to deter Soviet action while avoiding the kind of provocation that could force Moscow's hand. Managing that balance — firmness without recklessness — is one of the defining strategic challenges of the period.

The NPT (1968) introduced yet another complication. France's development of an independent nuclear deterrent and its withdrawal from NATO's integrated

command in 1966 raised a question the alliance could not easily answer: how do you commit to non-proliferation while some of your own members maintain or pursue independent nuclear programs? Delegates should be prepared to engage with this tension directly.

Alliance Unity as a Strategic Variable

One of the more productive framings for this committee is to treat alliance unity not as a given, but as something that has to be actively produced. The 1949–1968 period offers ample evidence that unity was contested — between large and small members, between the United States and a Europe increasingly skeptical of American leadership, and between short-term national interests and long-term collective commitments.

Delegates representing smaller or mid-sized NATO members should consider how states in that position actually shaped alliance policy during this period — not by dictating terms, but through the leverage that came from geography, basing rights, and the credibility their participation lent to the collective defense framework.

Guiding Questions

1. How can NATO ensure that Article V obligations remain credible when member states have conflicting national interests?
2. What measures can the alliance take to extend its strategic reach beyond its formal treaty boundaries?
3. How can NATO establish clear escalation thresholds that deter Soviet action without provoking an irreversible response?
4. How can smaller NATO members ensure their security concerns are reflected in the alliance's crisis response?

References

<https://share.google/GQ4Ox3s2o9nStezKM>

<https://share.google/c1jDNOH88YpN2KIMQ>

<https://share.google/SciY5qlr7R4EMCF0B>

<https://share.google/PeO4P5e5KR1aKxUeF>

nato.int/en/what-we-do/introduction-to-nato/collective-defence-and-article-5

[britannica.com/topic/North-Atlantic-Treaty-Organization](https://www.britannica.com/topic/North-Atlantic-Treaty-Organization)

[ebsco.com](https://www.ebsco.com)

[archives.gov/milestone-documents/marshall-plan](https://www.archives.gov/milestone-documents/marshall-plan)

history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/marshall-plan

[britannica.com/event/Marshall-Plan](https://www.britannica.com/event/Marshall-Plan)

history.state.gov/milestones/1937-1945/potsdam-conf

trumanlibrary.gov

alphahistory.com/coldwar/post-war-divisions

[archives.gov/education/lessons/korean-conflict](https://www.archives.gov/education/lessons/korean-conflict)

nationalww2museum.org/war/articles/cold-conflict

history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/berlin-airlift

[britannica.com/event/Berlin-blockade](https://www.britannica.com/event/Berlin-blockade)

billofrightsinstitute.org/essays/the-berlin-airlift

[archives.gov/education/lessons/korean-conflict](https://www.archives.gov/education/lessons/korean-conflict)

eisenhowerlibrary.gov/research/online-documents/korean-war

[britannica.com/topic/United-Nations-Security-Council/History](https://www.britannica.com/topic/United-Nations-Security-Council/History)

history.state.gov/milestones/1953-1960/suez

[britannica.com/event/Eisenhower-Doctrine](https://www.britannica.com/event/Eisenhower-Doctrine)

origins.osu.edu/milestones/suez-crisis-1956

diplomacy.state.gov/berlin-wall

en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Emigration_from_the_Eastern_Bloc

nationalww2museum.org/war/articles/cold-conflict

academicblock.com/history/cold-war