



BATHMUN

Conference 2025

NATO Study Guide

*Responding to the 2001 Article 5 Invocation by
the US and Ensuing involvement in Afghanistan*

Table of Contents

<i>Message from the Chairs</i>	3
<i>Chair Introductions</i>	4
<i>Introduction to the Committee</i>	6
<i>About the Committee</i>	6
<i>Committee Mandate</i>	6
<i>Specialised Rules of Procedure</i>	7
<i>Topic Introduction</i>	9
<i>Timeline</i>	9
<i>Current Situation</i>	12
<i>Committee Mission</i>	13
<i>Points of Discussion & Guiding Questions</i>	14
<i>Key Stakeholders and Blocs</i>	15
<i>Additonal Resources</i>	18
<i>Bibliography</i>	19



Message from the Chairs

Hello, and welcome to the BATHMUN 2025 NATO committee. We are very excited to see the debate that occurs around responding to the 2001 Article 5 invocation by the United States and ensuing involvement in Afghanistan. The debate will simulate these events that occurred over 20 years ago, and this committee has been formed to debate an appropriate response to this catastrophe.

After the horrific events of 9/11, in which 4 commercial flights were hijacked, destroying both of the Twin Towers, Article 5 was triggered to initiate collective defence of all the NATO countries. This would be the first time that the self-defence article had been activated in NATO'S history if the attack was determined to have come from abroad. As representatives of your countries, your response to this catastrophic event will show the world how NATO responds to situations like this.

As with most historical tragedies, the use of hindsight is the best way to respond to the events of 9/11. Due to being in 2025, we have far more facts to help us find a solution to this issue. However, it was not fully possible to see all these same facts during 2001. As we are a historical committee, we, the NATO dais, request that you should not refer to events or published writing/facts written or occurring after 12th September 2001.

This study guide contains facts, context, and detailed information about the situation in order to help better prepare you for the debate. Included in this study guide are questions to help with writing resolutions and also bloc positions to show you who your country's closest allies will be during debate. This guide is a starting point for you, we heavily encourage external reading and research on your nation's position before you arrive at BathMUN. As a chairing team, we will be looking for not just a comprehensive understanding of the facts and context included in this guide, but also the extra steps that you take to ensure that you are on top form throughout the conference.

Thus, from all NATO dias members, we hope you enjoy researching and debating this topic!

Oliver Robson, Marta Mateu, Aled Watkins



Chair Introduction



Oliver Robson
Head Chair

Hello Delegates! My name is Ollie, I am a second-year MSci CompSci and Maths undergraduate at University of Exeter. With three years of MUN experience, nine conferences under my belt, and four chairing roles at college and university, I just can't seem to leave - you can take the man out of MUN, but can't take the MUN out of the man.

Outside of MUN, I enjoy programming, tabletop games like DnD and chess, and also exploring the probability spaces of card games (otherwise known as card counting and basic strategy). I look forward to witnessing the chaos that is the 2025 NATO committee.

Marta Mateu
Deputy Chair



Hi, my name is Marta and I am coming into my second year studying law in Barcelona, Spain, where I was born just before the world plunged into economic crisis, although that fact is somewhat irrelevant.

After I was chased by my favorite teacher to join the school's Model UN club, I have participated and chaired over 15 conferences worldwide, and now I have the privilege to be part of BathMUN. If not talking about politics, you can find me anywhere close to the sea, reading a good book or trying new sports.





Aled Watkins
Deputy Chair

Hello Delegates! My name is Aled and I am a 2nd year History student at Cardiff University. I am the current vice-president of Cardiff MUN society having done MUN for the last 3 years. In my spare time, you can find me watching or listening to football or cricket. I am really looking forward to chairing this committee and meeting everyone!



Introduction to the Committee

About the Committee

The North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) and its principal decision-making body the North Atlantic Council (NAC), was founded in April 1949 to oppose the Soviet Union. . It initially began with 12 members, 10 of whom were European, with the 2 American members being Canada and the United States. Before the attacks of September 11th 2001, 7 more European members had joined. . The “current” committee for BathMUN2025 consists of Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom and the United States. In addition to these voting committee members, NATO welcomes four observer nations who can help by pledging assistance bilaterally with NATO. These are Australia, Finland, New Zealand and Pakistan.

Committee Mandate

NATO is a defensive military alliance, it has some major functions which UN committees do not. The mandate for actions NATO can discuss and/or take are:

- Discussing defense spending of NATO members,
- Calling for military assistance within NATO members,
- The invocation of Article 5 and military responses to attacks,
- Discussions over the stability of the North Atlantic,
- Expansion of NATO membership



Specialised Rules of Procedure

In NATO, you are not delegates, all representatives on the North Atlantic Council are known as ambassadors. All substantive decisions of the North Atlantic Council (NAC), the chief governing body of NATO), are made through unanimous consensus.

During Roll Call, all ambassadors must be Present and Voting. To pass a policy document, all present members must vote in Favour.

Within the North Atlantic Council, ambassadors can submit Communiques and Instruments of Accession alongside Resolutions. Only one of each type of policy document may be passed by the end of session.

The standard policy document for NATO is a Communique. A Communique has a similar structure to Resolutions, but contains no operative clauses, and the content is statements of intent, not statements of action. In the case where action should be taken (such as in response to a threat), a resolution is instead submitted and voted on; a resolution has the same structure as a standard ModelUN resolution. An Instrument of Accession is a special policy document inviting a non-member state to join the Alliance. In all cases of policy documents the following applies:

- ◆ Policy documents have no signatories or sponsors, instead all members are considered to be sponsors.
- ◆ Policy documents are introduced to the committee formally by a chosen representative (historically the Ambassador for Belgium as Brussels is the home to the NATO headquarters).
- ◆ Following closure of debate, a roll call vote proceeds. If a delegate votes against, the policy document fails and the committee should re-open debate. During this debate, disagreements should be discussed and resolved, followed by the same process.



- ◆ If the vote passes, the document is then passed to the ambassador for the United States, who then chooses whether the document ultimately passes or fails.



Topic Introduction

Timeline

1988-1989 Afghan-Soviet War

Operation Cyclone: 300 000 Afghan civilians were armed to fight against the USSR by the United States of America. These actions led to five people, including Osama bin Laden, a Saudi exile and refugee in Afghanistan under the protection of the Taliban regime, to form a terrorist organisation staunchly opposed to the United States: Al Qaeda. The presence of the American army in Saudi Arabia was considered an invasion and a violation of the sacred Islamic territories, namely Mecca and Medina, giving rise to anti-Western and anti-US sentiment.

1990-1991 Gulf War

The Gulf War saw sustained American presence in the Middle East. In retaliation, Al-Qaeda has since been responsible for several attacks against the American government.

1993 World Trade Centre Attack

Al Qaeda used a car bomb in the parking lot of the World Trade Center. The explosion killed six people and injured 1042 others with extensive structural damage to the North Tower also occurring.

1996, 1998 Issuing of Fatwas

Two fatwas dictating Al-Qaeda's goal and path were issued by Bin Laden and other Islamic leaders. The first, titled "Declaration of War Against the Americans Occupying the Land of the Holy Places", was published in 1996 and condemned the presence of US troops in Saudi Arabia during the Gulf War. Two years later, in 1998 a second was published with the main assertion being that "killing Americans and their allies, whether civilians or military personnel, is an individual religious duty for every muslim."



1998 Attacks to the American Embassies

The second fatwa was followed by attacks on the American embassies in the cities of Dar es Salaam in Tanzania and Nairobi in Kenya, where two simultaneous bombs exploded in front of the embassy buildings. This resulted in 900 FBI agents being sent to Africa to assist in the search for evidence and identification of victims. The suspects that were arrested all had one thing in common: they were all members of Al-Qaeda.

Pre-Operational Indicators

Suspensions started to grow that the organisation was considering using commercial aircraft as weapons. An internal CIA memo in December 1998 warned of possible plans to hijack aircraft. Whilst these warnings were brought before Congress they led to no action.

1998-2000 The USS Cole Incident

In October 2000, with the support of the Taliban regime, Al-Qaeda carried out a suicide attack against the US Navy destroyer USS Cole (DDG-67) in the Yemeni port of Aden while it was refueling. An agreement between the US and Yemeni governments led to several FBI agents being flown to the country to conduct an investigation alongside local authorities. Once again a common theme emerged, Al-Qaeda.

2001 Intelligence System Indicators

In the summer of 2001 there were warning signs of an imminent attack. Official government documents indicate that the US intelligence system had been "flashing red"; communications involving plans to hijack aircraft were detected in Italy and Jordan, Egypt raised alerts about the active presence of Al-Qaeda on American soil, and the Israeli Mossad transmitted a list of 19 suspects to the FBI, which it was later revealed that this list contained the names of those who later hijacked the aircraft. The British MI6 reported a large increase in intercepted calls.



Mid-2001 Imminent Threat Indicators

In July, an agent based in Phoenix, Arizona, sent the FBI a memo warning of light training in the western part of the country by suspicious individuals - later known as the Phoenix Memo. This memo was not shared with the entire agency or the CIA, resulting in no immediate action in response to the potential threats it expressed. A month later, bureaucratic and legal limitations prevented the investigation of suspicious behaviour by Zacarias Moussaoui, later found to be a member of Al-Qaeda. Days before the attack, the Prime Minister of Russia, Vladimir Putin, tried to warn President George W. Bush of a significant attack.



Current Situation

08:46AM	Flight 11 crashed into the North Tower of the World Trade Center, people thought it was a deadly accident.
09:03AM	Flight 175 crashed into the South Tower off the World Trade Center.
09:37AM	Flight 77 crashed into the west side of the Pentagon.
09:45AM	US airspace shut down, grounding all flights.
09:59AM	The South Tower of the World Trade Center collapsed.
10:03AM	Flight 93 crashed into a field in Somerset County, Pennsylvania after the passengers were believed to have fought against the terrorists. The target of the plane is unknown although it is thought to be a high government building such as the White House.
10:28AM	North Tower of the World Trade Center Collapsed.

An emergency meeting of NATO was called for September 12th. The purpose of the meeting is to decide on how to respond to the attacks and what support NATO would show towards the United States. Among the possible reactions would be the invoking of Article 5 which called for collective defence, an attack on one would be an attack on all.

Notably, in the aftermath of the September 11th discussions, one of the possible reactions would be the invoking of Article 5 which called for collective defence, an attack on one would be an attack on all.



As such, one of the main questions that might be raised in the debate is the necessity of investigations over the need for immediate action if this is invoked, with the United States being the most keen for this. The North Atlantic Treaty Organisation was not the only nation whose citizens were affected by the 9/11 attacks, with over 90 nationalities of victims believed to have died. As such, the entire world is in uproar over this attack, and will no doubt want to help NATO in its efforts, whatever response they take.

Committee Mission

This North Atlantic Treaty Organisation Committee will address the attack of the World Trade Center through a communique of intent which should include a press statement. NATO members should agree upon an appropriate response to the attack and a message to assure the citizens that world peace is still possible.



Points of Discussion & Guiding Questions

Determining the Cause of Attacks

- ◆ Does NATO act immediately or wait for proof that Al-Qaeda were responsible?

Official Invocation of Article 5

- ◆ Do the 9/11 attacks reach the threshold for Article 5 to be invoked? What is this threshold? Additionally, what are the obligations outlined in the Washington Treaty?

Reactionary focus

- ◆ Is a narrow focus on Al-Qaeda cells and leaders the correct course of action? Or is it a focus on the Taliban regime in Afghanistan?
- ◆ Should the main point of attack be the terrorist organisations supporting the hijackers, and is a full scale invasion of the territories that house these organisations required?

Victims of the Attack

- ◆ Workers in the World Trade Center represented over 90 nationalities, as such which nations or international bodies should NATO approach? What should be the nature of the approach?

International Community

- ◆ Should NATO look to work with Russia who has stated its willingness to aid NATO?
- ◆ Is this a fully NATO discussion, or is there room for NATO to approach the UN for assistance?



Key Stakeholders and Blocs

The United States of America

As the attacked nation, America will be pushing for major military intervention into apprehending and eliminating Al-Qaeda, based in Afghanistan. The USA will be the main advocates for acting now, planning later. The USA will need to address the failings of its security agencies and whether it could've prevented the attacks. Any communiques or resolutions attempted to pass by the USA should address these concerns as well as any concerns from fellow NATO members over its previous involvement in the Middle East.

The United Kingdom

Is the most outspoken ally to the United States within NATO. The NATO Secretary General at this time is Lord George Robertson from the United Kingdom, it is at his suggestion that the invoking of Article 5 is being discussed. The United Kingdom is expected to support the United States' position and lobby its European Allies into supportive positions. Key link between America and Europe.

Hesitant Nations

Some nations are worried that an attack on unproven evidence may cause irreparable damage if later proven incorrect. These nations will most certainly be expected to be the main opposition to the US's policy of do now, investigate later. While these nations may hold reservations on military intervention and counterattacks, they should actively support investigations into the root causes of the attacks. If the attack can categorically be proven as coming from the accused actors, these nations may choose to support a counter-operation.

Nations in this bloc: Belgium, Germany, Netherlands, Norway



If the attack can categorically be proven as coming from the accused actors, these nations may choose to support a counter-operation. Nations in this bloc: Belgium, Germany, Netherlands, Norway

Other Powerful NATO Nations

While Germany is one of the larger NATO nations and has routinely expressed concern over counterattacks, there are still a large proportion of US supporters within NATO. While there remains some need for active investigation to truly identify the people at fault, these nations are expected to recognise that decisive action should be taken swiftly. These nations will likely align themselves with the United States and the United Kingdom, and may call for the immediate invocation of Article 5. Additionally, if a counter-attack is agreed upon, these nations stand to be able to pledge a significant non-US proportion of any supplies needed, and should throw not just their support, but their resources behind any military communiques. Nations which fit within this bloc include: Canada, France, Italy, Poland and Spain.

Smaller NATO Members

While some of NATO's members are large and have strong militaries, there remains a large proportion of those who would struggle if an attack by NATO was launched. These nations, located across Europe and especially in the east, are expected to look for what explicitly the Washington Treaty forces them to provide, and to work out any negotiations. These negotiations are expected to look like discussion over whether non-militaristic aid is a suitable replacement, should a military intervention take place. Additionally, these nations may look to question the rush of nations such as the US to invoke Article 5, and may attempt to negotiate a delayed timeframe to allow for resources to become available. A notable example of this is Iceland, who does not have a military, who should consider what alternatives can be provided to assist NATO with any efforts. Nations which fit into this category: Czech Republic, Greece, Iceland, Luxembourg, Turkey



Non-NATO Members

In order to allow for increased debate, NATO has decided to invite four observers: Finland, Australia, New Zealand and Pakistan. These non-NATO nations are expected to help steer what the NATO response looks like by providing an international perspective. Additionally, nations such as Finland and Pakistan are advised to lend their assistance in lobbying nations within their region for additional non-NATO support for any actions. The other way in which non-NATO members can assist is by pledging aid and resources to the Alliance in any action which NATO decides to take, as well as supporting the US in its journey to invoke Article 5. However, Pakistan may express some concern over a large-scale military intervention, considering that they share a border with Afghanistan, the region which is under suspicion.



Additional Resources

Documentaries:

- Turning Point: 9/11 and the War on Terror (Netflix)
- Road to 9/11

Podcast:

- Zero Hour: A History of 9/11 (Spotify)



Bibliography

Archives.gov. (2001). Statement by the president in his address to the nation. [online] Available at: <https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010911-16.html>.

Archives.gov. (2005). Frequently Asked Questions About the War on Terrorism at Home and Abroad. [online] Available at: <https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/infocus/nationalsecurity/faq-what.html>.

Britannica (2018). al-Qaeda. In: Encyclopædia Britannica. [online] Available at: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/al-Qaeda>.

Brookings. (n.d.). How the United States Enabled Al Qaeda. [online] Available at: <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/how-the-united-states-enabled-al-qaeda/>.

FBI (2016). East African Embassy Bombings. [online] Federal Bureau of Investigation. Available at: <https://www.fbi.gov/history/famous-cases/east-african-embassy-bombings>.

Federal Bureau of Investigation (n.d.). USS Cole Bombing | Federal Bureau of Investigation. [online] Federal Bureau of Investigation. Available at: <https://www.fbi.gov/history/famous-cases/uss-cole-bombing>.

LIMUN 2025 (n.d.). LIMUN 2025 Rules of Procedure (RoP). [online] Available at: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1zTThuVvSIMfYIXSof3rMMDTkURoMiU72/view>

Olmo, G.D. (2021). Afghanistan | Operation Cyclone: What role did the United States play in the rise of the Taliban? BBC News Mundo. [online] 27 Aug. Available at: <https://www.bbc.com/mundo/noticias-internacional-58351126>.

www.nato.int. (n.d.). NATO Press Release - (2001) 124 - 12 September 2001. [online] Available at: <https://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2001/p01-124e.htm>.

