



KOSOVO: A CRISIS UNFOLDING HISTORICAL CRISIS COMMITTEE

CRISIS OVERVIEW

Historical crisis simulation committees are cornerstones of the Carleton Model NATO Conference. The historical crisis committee operates outside of the contemporary NATO simulation, as delegates participating in the crisis are transported back in time to a historical NATO crisis. The committee operates on its own timeline, and may jump quickly between hours, days, or years. Its fast-paced nature necessitates flexibility and quick thinking, and enables the committee to take charge of the decision-making processes leading up to the crisis in which NATO was once involved.

The crisis is pre-developed by the committee director and their crisis staff. They will provide regular updates to the committee during the conference to inform them of time changes, and will deliver key activities, news and problems to which the committee must respond upon receipt.

Kosovo: A Crisis Unfolding simulates activities leading up to NATO's peacekeeping intervention in Kosovo in 1999 and the events following. Beginning in June 1998, delegates will simulate a North Atlantic Council (NATO's principal decision-making body), meeting at national Defence Minister level, to discuss first steps. From this time on, delegates will decide the actions the NAC must take while the crisis continues unfolding, and find solutions for peace and stability in the region.

Please note the following caveats, which will be enforced during committee:

- Any actions that implicate the United Nations (UN) require the UN delegate as a sponsor.

- Any actions that implicate the CSCE/OSCE require the CSCE/OSCE delegate as a sponsor.
- Only Member States may vote on communiqués. Observer delegates, including international organizations and non-state actors, may not vote on substantive issues. However, everyone counts in calculating quorum.
- Any peacekeeping operations must include the UN as a sponsor to indicate their support. The UN delegate also represents the Security Council, and must indicate that the Security Council has sanctioned their activities.
- As delegates will be simulating a NAC for the entire conference, all positions are binding.
- To communicate with the crisis headquarters, send a note to your chair, who will pass the message along to crisis staff.

Each topic was chosen due to its relevance before, during and after NATO's intervention in Kosovo, and delegates must be prepared to discuss changes in their policies, political positions and goals as the committee timeline progresses. (In other words, delegates should know their positions on each topic from 1998 to approximately 2004. This will enhance the historical accuracy of the committee and maintain as realistic a simulation as possible. However, delegates should be prepared to respond to regular crisis updates, which may include regional instability, political conflict, and international decision-making.

TOPIC 1: NATO'S ROLE IN FACILITATING PEACEKEEPING

NATO is a military and political alliance, tasked with promoting cooperation on defence and security issues and the resolution of disputes within its Member States. Since its inception, its mandate, goals and activities have diversified to reflect contemporary threats and provide better responses to new crises. After the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of communism, NATO experienced significant transformation in the way it operates and is organized. The Yugoslav wars and destabilization in Eastern and Central Europe following the collapse of communism highlighted the ways in which the Alliance adapted its mandate and operations.

While peacekeeping has historically been recognized as a UN activity, the Cold War and the years following emphasized that a country's internal security often depended on the security and stability of its neighbours. At the end of the Cold War NATO shifted its focus towards this, notably to encourage stability in Central and Eastern Europe. Much of this work focused on promoting economic, political and social stability, marking a sharp detour from the Alliance's traditional military focus on protecting its members against armed attack.¹ NATO's 1991 Strategic Concept emphasized this shift, noting, in Article 20(l) that one of its fundamental security tasks included, in addition to those articulated in the Washington Treaty, creating a stable foundation for European security, based on the development of democratic

¹ Parliament of Canada, Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, "The New NATO and the Evolution of Peacekeeping," April 2000, from:
<http://www.parl.gc.ca/Content/SEN/Committee/362/fore/rep/rep07apr00-e.htm>.

institutions and peaceful conflict resolutions.² Article 24 noted that “managing the diversity of challenges facing the Alliance requires a broad approach to security, [...] reflected in three mutually reinforcing elements [...]: dialogue, cooperation and the maintenance of a collective defence capability.”³ The Strategic Concept highlighted the need for early political solutions to conflicts, influenced by preventative diplomacy and a turn from the traditional military power of its Cold War days.

In June 1992, the NAC passed a Ministerial Communiqué expressing NATO’s willingness to “support, on a case-by-case basis in accordance with [their] own procedures, peacekeeping activities under the responsibility of the CSCE [now the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE)], including by making available Alliance resources and expertise.”⁴ This effectively formalized NATO’s role in peacekeeping. In December 1992, NATO passed a Communiqué that noted the contributions it was already making to the UN’s peacekeeping efforts, including ceasefire monitoring and protecting humanitarian relief convoys in Bosnia. Article 4 recognized the importance of upholding the Alliance’s commitment to peacekeeping in Oslo:

Recognising that decisions to support peacekeeping activities will have to be taken on a case-by-case basis and in accordance with Alliance procedures, we need to ensure that the necessary capabilities are refined and are available if and when such decisions are made.⁵

These communiqués showed that NATO’s commitment to peacekeeping, particularly during the Bosnian War, was strong.

NATO’s peacekeeping efforts are generally to be undertaken in concern with another international organization mandated with peacekeeping, such as the CSCE/OSCE or UN. NATO’s military history, resources and expertise have made the Alliance well suited to supervise, monitor and enforce activities related to peacekeeping.

NATO’s first peacekeeping intervention was in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) between 1992 and 1995. Conflict erupted in BiH when Yugoslavia broke up at the end of the Cold War. Following the secession of Croatia and Slovenia from Yugoslavia in 1991, the Socialist Republic of BiH, comprised of a majority Muslim Bosniak population, Orthodox Serbs and Croats (Catholic), gained independence in 1992 via referendum. BiH’s independence gained international support. Conflict intensified as Serbs attempted to carve out territory within BiH. In 1992, NATO became formally involved in peacekeeping operations in Bosnia particularly due to the high civilian casualty and mortality rates, first by monitoring the arms embargo and sanctions

² North Atlantic Treaty Organization, “The Alliance’s New Strategic Concept,” last updated 26 August 201n

³ Ibid.

⁴ North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Ministerial Communiqué of the Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council, Oslo, 4 June 1992, from: <http://www.nato.int/docu/comm/49-95/c920604a.htm>.

⁵ North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Final Communiqué of the Meeting of the Defence Planning Committee, 11 December 1992, last updated 4 November 2008, from: http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_23971.htm?selectedLocale=en.

against the former Yugoslavia, and then by deploying aircraft to impose a no-fly zone over BiH (Operation Deny Flight, 1993).⁶ These activities supported the UN's Protection Mission in BiH (UNPROFOR). In August and September 1995, NATO's Operation Deliberate Force against Bosnian Serb positions in BiH helped pave the way for peace negotiations and the signing of the Dayton Peace Agreement.

The Dayton Agreement included provisions allowing NATO to take responsibility for military operations in BiH from UNPROFOR via the NATO Implementation Force (IFOR). Once IFOR operations were completed, the Stabilization Force (SFOR), which derived its powers from UN Security Council Resolution 1088, began its peace support operation. NATO's involvement in Bosnia provides a key example of the way in which NATO is prepared to act in a peacekeeping role alongside international partners. It highlights NATO's primary role as an enforcer of peacekeeping operations, and demonstrates NATO's first tangible shift away from a purely military intervention.

As committee begins, it is crucial that delegates remain cognizant of the history of NATO's peacekeeping role, its relationship within the wider peacekeeping community (including with the UN and CSCE/OSCE), and lessons learned from its intervention in Bosnia. The year is now 1998 and the crisis in Kosovo is unfolding. As NAC representatives, you should be prepared to articulate, defend and implement a solution to the impending war, and you should be prepared to anticipate the consequences of your actions. While delegates should discuss the topic of peacekeeping in its broader sense, it should be tied in with the unfolding crisis in Kosovo.

Questions for discussion

- 1) How can NATO work with multilateral partners, such as the UN and CSCE, to improve the effectiveness of peacekeeping missions in Central and Eastern Europe?
- 2) Should NATO's peacekeeping mandate be expanded to nation-building and peace-building, and how can this be accomplished? Should limits be imposed on NATO's role in peacekeeping?
- 3) What resources (financial, military and political) should Member States be expected to contribute to NATO peacekeeping efforts?
- 4) What are the "lessons learned" from NATO's intervention in Bosnia that can be applied to the Kosovo crisis?
- 5) How should NATO define "peacekeeping"?

Further reading

⁶ North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Peace support operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina, last updated 7 September 2015, from: http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_52122.htm

Independent International Commission on Kosovo. *The Kosovo Report: Conflict, International Response, Lessons Learned*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK. 2000.

Senate of Canada. "The New NATO and the Evolution of Peacekeeping: Implications for Canada." *Report of the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs*. 2000. From: <http://www.parl.gc.ca/Content/SEN/Committee/362/fore/rep/rep07apr00-e.htm>.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). "NATO's role in relation to the conflict in Kosovo." Last updated 15 July 1999. From: <http://www.nato.int/kosovo/history.htm>.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). "Peacekeeping Past and Present." *NATO Review*. From: <http://www.nato.int/docu/review/2001/Peacekeeping-Challenge/Peacekeeping-past-present/EN/index.htm>.

TOPIC 2: NATO AND CIVILIAN PROTECTION

The protection of civilians is a key component of many international military operations. Since the early 1990s NATO has conducted operations where the protection of civilians was a key component, either explicitly mandated or carried out by default to successfully achieve the mission. Implementation of protection of civilians remains a priority and challenge for NATO and other international organizations, such as the UN and the African Union (AU). Over the past decade, NATO and its partners have been developing various policies and guidelines for the protection of civilians, especially concerning the planning and conduct of NATO-led operations and missions.⁷

Different international organizations understand protection of civilians differently, depending on their mission, capabilities, and areas of operations. Protection of civilians can encompass various areas of activity such as the defence of alliance borders, implementing tailored partnership programs, or engaging in crisis management operations. NATO and its partners have contributed to the protection of civilians by integrating related measures in the planning and conduct of NATO-led operations and missions. The protection of civilians includes all efforts taken to avoid, minimize and mitigate the negative effects that might arise from NATO and NATO-led military operations. It also includes efforts to protect children from the effects of armed conflict and to prevent conflict-related sexual and gender-based violence.

Protection of civilians may be the main objective of an entire operation—for political or moral reasons—to stop large-scale violence being perpetrated against a segment of the population.⁸ This was the case during Operation Allied Force to stop the ethnic

⁷ Marla B. Keenan and Alexander W. Beadle, "Operationalizing Protection of Civilians in NATO Operations," *International Journal of Security and Development* 4(1):55, 2015, 1.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 2.

cleansing of Albanians by Serbian forces in Kosovo (1999) and during Operation Unified Protector to stop the Gaddafi regime's violent crackdown on its own population in Libya (2011). In both instances, NATO played a primary role through its use of airpower to impose no-fly zones and strike Serbian and Libyan military targets. While the operation in Kosovo did not have a mandate from the United Nations Security Council (UNSC), the operation in Libya did.⁹

The case of Kosovo marked the first time NATO launched a military campaign to avoid a humanitarian tragedy outside of its borders against another sovereign state. Not acting meant legitimizing and condoning ethnic cleansing in a neighboring state and the need to protect civilians was of high priority.

In March 1999, NATO launched an air campaign, entitled *Operation Allied Force*, to halt the humanitarian catastrophe that was then unfolding in Kosovo.¹⁰ The decision to intervene followed more than a year of fighting within the province and the failure of international efforts to resolve the conflict by diplomatic means. After first targeting the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia's air defences, NATO gradually escalated the campaign using the most advanced, precision-guided systems and avoiding civilian casualties to the greatest extent possible. Target selection was reviewed at multiple levels of command to ensure that it complied with international law, was militarily justified, and minimized the risk to civilian lives and property.¹¹

The initial phase of Operation Allied Force concentrated firepower upon Serbian military targets including tanks, artillery, bunkers, barracks, ammunition depots, and enemy troops.¹² These strikes were carried out in areas far from civilian population. Moreover, the anticipated military advantage outweighed civilian concerns because the Serbian military forces were judged to be responsible for most of the humanitarian disaster.¹³ As the operation entered the later phases, however, NATO increasingly began to focus on targets that were not only closer to civilian areas, but those that arguably had military and civilian purposes.¹⁴ It can be argued, nonetheless, that NATO ultimately chose means and methods to ensure maximum damage with minimum civilian casualties.

The airstrikes not only disrupted Serbia's electrical power and water supplies, something that has been widely disputed, but also destroyed twenty-four bridges.¹⁵ The "Rock-n-Roll" bridge, however, was the only bridge that was spared from bombing because the Allies wanted to avoid excessive civilian casualties. The fact that Serbian volunteers stood on the bridge to prevent its destruction also contributed to the decision not to bomb the "Rock-n-Roll" bridge. NATO planners refused to

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), "The Kosovo Air Campaign (Archived)," last updated 7 April 2016, from: http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_49602.htm.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Randy W. Stone, "Protecting Civilians during Operation Allied Force: The Enduring Importance of the Proportional Response and NATO's Use of Armed Force in Kosovo," *Catholic Law Review* 50(2), 2001, 526.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Ibid., 529.

attack the "Rock-n-Roll" bridge because the anticipated civilian casualties outweighed any expected military advantage.¹⁶

Examples of NATO attacks, namely those against the Socialist Party Headquarters building in Belgrade and Serbian infrastructure targets, show that NATO planners had intended to avoid excessive civilian casualties.¹⁷ Political leaders of NATO member nations also took active roles in target selection.¹⁸ NATO "reviewed the range of possible civilian collateral damage for each target, gathered intelligence, and used weapons that would minimize civilian casualties."¹⁹ NATO also postponed a ground invasion of Kosovo and an attack on Serbian computer systems. These would have negatively impacted Serbian civilian life.²⁰ Ultimately, NATO succeeded in many of its attempts to protect civilians in the Kosovo conflict.

Civilian protection will remain an important topic during this crisis committee. The instability of Central and Eastern Europe during the 1990s, as well as the looming crisis in Kosovo, has shown that military and peacekeeping interventions are often necessary, particularly for NATO in order to maintain their ambitions of European regional security. As the Kosovo crisis unfolds, this committee will need to remain cognizant of the difficulties in crafting interventions that minimize civilian casualties while maximizing impact. What can NATO learn from the intervention in Bosnia? What can it learn from the observer states, such as the UN?

Questions for discussion

- 1) Do military interventions inherently limit the ability to protect civilians, and how can NATO improve its capacity to protect civilians?
- 2) Are military interventions typically successful at protecting civilians or are there other means that are more successful?
- 3) Is civilian protection still a relevant topic for NATO and the international community?

Further Reading

Keenan, Marla, and Alexander William Beadle. "Operationalizing Protection of Civilians in NATO Operations." *Stability: International Journal of Security and Development* 4, no. 1, 2015.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization. "Protection of Civilians." NATO, October 17, 2016. From: http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_135998.htm.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Ibid., 530

¹⁸ Ibid., 531.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Ibid.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization. "The Kosovo Air Campaign (Archived)." *NATO*, April 7, 2016. http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_49602.htm.

Solana, Javier. "NATO's Success in Kosovo." *Foreign Affairs* 78, no. 6 (1999): 114–20.

Stone, Randy W. "Protecting Civilians during Operation Allied Force: The Enduring Importance of the Proportional Response and NATO's Use of Armed Force in Kosovo." *Catholic University Law Review* 50 (2001 2000): 501–38.

TOPIC 3: DISARMING NON-STATE ACTORS

Non-state actors, referring to organisations acting within a conflict that have no visible or accounted affiliation with a state government, have played an increasing role in shaping the political and military landscape of the last two decades. Their use of hybrid and unconventional warfare has redefined military doctrine and operations, and has changed the dynamics in how governments interact with non-state actors. In the case of the militaries of state actors, there is a constraint under existing international laws on how states may conduct war. In the case of non-state actors however, they often are required to resort to unconventional and unlawful means and methods of warfare as the only way to make up for the military and economic imbalances.²¹ As such, these non-state actors often refuse to comply with international laws and regulations, in order not to lose any advantage they may hold in the conflict.

These non-state actors acquire their weapons through various means, including black-market smuggling and underground manufacturing, however in many of the more recent conflicts of the late 20th and early 21st centuries, the supply of arms has been the result of internal transfers of weapons from past conflicts, or from raids from former military stock piles. These weapons usually manifest themselves as Small arms and light weapons (SALW) and mine action, as these are the cheapest and easiest weapons to acquire, and effective in combat situations.

The disarmament of non-state actors is a difficult process, requiring not only the need for the non-state actor to agree to the disarmament, but for the respective government to agree as well. For NATO to effectively help facilitate the disarmament of a non-state actor, a ceasefire agreement has to be made between both parties (the government and the non-state actor). Once the process of negotiation has taken place, the process of physically removing and disarming non-state actors becomes both a difficult and long drawn out process.

²¹ M. Cherif Bassiouni, "The New Wars and the Crisis of Compliance with the Law of Armed Conflict by Non-State Actors," *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 98(3), 2008, 715.

As a long-standing commitment of NATO, disarmament is a top priority of NATO, with the disarmament of non-state actors being the most difficult to disarm. Having come into effect in 1997, member states of NATO (except the United States of America) are signatories to the Ottawa Convention on Prohibiting the Use of Landmines, and works with member states to demine conflict zones, such as BiH. In addition, NATO's Partnership for Peace (PfP) Trust Fund Policy was initiated in 2000 to assist countries in fulfilling their Ottawa Convention obligations to dispose of stockpiles of anti-personnel landmines.²² The policy was later expanded to include efforts to implement the UN Programme of Action on SALW.

Non-state actors have played a prominent role in the lead-up to hostilities in Kosovo. Particularly in times when state boundaries are unclear, and when geopolitical tensions run high the rise of non-state actors becomes more pronounced and their influence in garnering support for geographical and geopolitical goals is strengthened. In developing communiqués to address the issue of non-state actors, this committee must have a clear understanding of the potential risks and benefits of engaging with them and vice versa regarding disarmament. As the crisis unfolds, the role of non-state actors will become stronger and clearer, and concerted action by the NAC will be required to ensure the threat they pose is minimized.

Questions for discussion

- 1) How can Member States further limit the sale of small arms to non-state actors?
- 2) How much of a role can NATO hold in the disarming process?
- 3) Is there a better way to gain cooperation between different parties in the disarmament process?

Further reading

Yesson, Erik. Sending Credible Signals: NATO's Role in Stabilizing Balkan Conflicts. NATO/EAPC Fellowship Final Report, 2003.

Afghanistan: arms proliferation fuels further abuse. European Union, 2008.
http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2004_2009/documents/dv/daf_asa110042008/DAF_asa110042008en.pdf.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization, "Arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation in NATO." Last modified June 23, 2016. From:
www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_48895.htm.

²² North Atlantic Treaty Organization, "Arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation in NATO," last updated 9 April 2009, from: http://www.nato.int/summit2009/topics_en/17-arms_control.html.