

29th Annual

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY MODEL UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE

Sponsored by the David M. Kennedy Center for International Studies
Friday, October 26, 2018 – Provo, Utah

SECRETARIAT

Jacob Stebbing
Security Council

Olivia Demordaunt
General Assembly Plenary

Nell Stevens
*General Assembly Fourth
Committee*

Emma Gleave
*United Nations Environment
Programme*

Aidan Houston
Model European Union

Marco Pesci
*Commission on Science and
Technology for Development*

Elizabeth Griffith
Human Rights Council

Cheyenne Rivera
*Organization of American
States*

Olivia Whiteley
Secretary General

Emily Jackson Thorn
Executive Director

DAVID M. KENNEDY
CENTER FOR
INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

Cory Leonard
Assistant Director

Bill Perry
MUN Instructor

Dear Delegates,

Welcome to the 29th Annual BYU Model United Nations Conference! I want to congratulate you on your decision to participate in the Model United Nations program.

My name is Aidan Houston and I am a junior at BYU with a double major in European Studies and Russian. Last year I represented the Russian Federation at the Model United Nations Conference in New York City.

The European Union is a completely separate body from the United Nations which operates more like a federal European government than a non-binding association of state actors. You will assume the role of the Head of Government (not a delegation or representative) of one of the 28 Member States of the European Union. These 28 leaders make up what is called the European Council. This body is solely responsible for making the most senior decisions that determine the future of Europe.

The issues before the European Council will be as follows:

- I. Furthering the EU Enlargement Agenda in the Western Balkans and Turkey
- II. Normalizing Relations with the Russian Federation

These issues are vitally important to the fate of the European Union and liberal international institutions in general. This background guide will give you the context of the issues at hand which will serve as a springboard for your own research.

Remember that the European Union is not the United Nations. As such, there will be certain things that you are advised to become acquainted with before the Conference. Be sure to thoroughly study the guide to procedure attached below.

Please feel free to contact me personally about any questions or concerns.

Kindest regards,
Aidan Houston
President, European Council
houstonaidana@gmail.com

The European Union

“There is a remedy which...would in a few years make all Europe...free and happy. It is to re-create the European family, or as much of it as we can, and to provide it with a structure under which it can dwell in peace, in safety and in freedom.”
- Winston Churchill, former Prime Minister of Great Britain

Introduction: The Birth of the Liberal World Order

European integration is more than any political or economic agreement between bureaucrats. It is the result of thousands of years of conflict, politics, and struggle. It is an ultimate attempt to resolve the ills of civilization that have so long plagued humanity; or at least control them to the point of total subjection. The European Union is an endeavor towards the highest and final manifestation of human governance. For this reason, it is often called “the European experiment.” The European Union is designed to test the potential of idealism. It truly is an experiment on the limits of peace and prosperity. An understanding of the context from which the ideals of European integration were born will make the significance of this experiment clear.

For centuries, Europe has been one of the central hubs for the interaction of civilization and culture. It is the second smallest of the seven continents, but also the second highest in population density. It is the stage on which government, philosophy, art, and warfare as we now know them were first played out. Europe is the birthplace of democracy, capitalism, socialism, communism, fascism, and a host of other political philosophies that continue to dominate the world of government today. Europe is the birthplace of the state itself. It is the scene of the works of Bach, Shakespeare, and Tolstoy. It is also the scene of the most horrific systematic genocide in human history. Europe is as good of a representation of the fundamental achievements and atrocities that are common to humanity as any other.

It is consistent with history, therefore, that Europe would become the birthplace of the liberal world order. The word “liberal”, of course, carries much political weight in the modern-day context that has little to do with the origins of liberalism itself. For the purpose of this background guide, it will be considered at its most fundamental level. Liberalism is, in fact, a relatively young political philosophy (about 250 years old) founded on the ideas of equality between individuals, governments accountable to the governed, and free movement of goods and capital between nations, among others. Liberalism resulted in the English, American, and French revolutions, and thereby created the first true republican democracies. The greatest threats to liberalism since its birth have been the rise of authoritarian fascism and communism. After the fall of fascism in the 1940s and communism in the 1990s, the European Union has become the symbol of the seemingly victorious liberal world order. It remains to be seen if it will retain this dominant position.

A Brief History

In the aftermath of WWII, there was a period of serious introspection for Europe. The cities and villages across the continent were in absolute ruin after three decades of war like the world had never seen. All were in agreement that steps needed to be taken to ensure that war to this level could never happen again.

From these sentiments came the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), created in 1951 with the signing of the Treaty of Paris. The ECSC was much more than what its title implies. Initiated by France and West Germany, two of the most heated rivals of the past century, the ECSC included four additional founding members: Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg. These six countries are considered the founding members of the European Union. The intention of the ECSC was to integrate the industries of war so closely between these countries that conflict would become virtually impossible. As Robert Schuman, a French statesman and one of the founding fathers of the European Union, said in 1950, “The solidarity in production

thus established will make it plain that any war between [the Member States] becomes not merely unthinkable, but materially impossible.”¹

After talks for a common Defence Community and Political Community failed, the founders turned to economics as a starting point for further integration. In 1957, the Treaty of Rome founded the European Economic Community (EEC). The EEC created a customs union, eradicating all tariffs and fees on the transfer of goods and capital between the Member States. The treaty also created a European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom), which was based on essentially the same principles as the ECSC, and a directly-elected European Parliament. In the 1960s, the first signs of resistance to supranational power and claims to sovereignty began to show themselves in France. Regardless, the signing of the Merger Treaty in Brussels in 1967 combined all previous integration agreements into one central authority called the European Communities (EC). The EC would be the central authority on European integration for the majority of the 20th century.

Over the next three decades, the EC expanded its membership to 16 states. The Single European Act in 1986 set the precedent for a future single market, which would completely integrate Europe into one economy with a common currency by 1992. In 1992, the Maastricht Treaty (also known as the Treaty on European Union) did just that and more. The treaty officially created the European Union and became its founding constitutional document. The new Union was founded on three pillars: the former European Communities, plus new Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and Justice and Home Affairs (JHA) pillars. The European Union was now not only a much more serious economic agreement, but a political one as well. This treaty took Europe closer to a federal “United States of Europe” than it ever had been.

In 2007, the Treaty of Lisbon was signed and greatly reformed the Maastricht Treaty, becoming the second constitutional document of the European Union. The treaty granted more power to the European Parliament and restructured the EU legally, creating the European Council and giving more executive power to the entire Union as a whole. This treaty makes up the current construction of the EU.

The European Union is comprised of seven separate institutions:

1. European Council
2. Council of the European Union
3. European Parliament
4. European Commission
5. Court of Justice of the European Union
6. European Central Bank
7. European Court of Auditors

Executive and legislative powers are shared between several of the seven institutions. The European Council (all 28 Heads of Government) holds chief authority to set general expectations and guidelines for the direction of the Union. The Commission drafts legislation based on the agreements made at the European Council. It is then approved by a bicameral legislature: Parliament and Council of the EU. The policies are then carried out by the Commission and other institutions where applicable.

The European Council

Though the Council has met at various European “Summits” since 1969 that have changed the direction of the EU, it was not formally incorporated as a regular institution until the Treaty of Lisbon. Article 15 of the Treaty of Lisbon states, “The European Council shall provide the Union with the necessary impetus for its development and shall define the general political directions and priorities thereof. It shall not exercise

¹ Schuman, Robert. “The Schuman Declaration.” *European Union*. Accessed September 7, 2018. https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/symbols/europe-day/schuman-declaration_en

legislative functions.”² The Council is the origin of all major decisions made in the European Union. Though it does not have power to create actual legislation, all policy is derived from the decisions made at the Council. In other words, the Council largely makes general decisions which will give the rest of the institutions a clear idea of the direction in which the Union is to move. However, the Council does occasionally make detailed legislative decisions. In this case, such decisions still must be formally drafted by the Council and cannot take any real effect until they are voted on by the bicameral legislature.

Article 15 also provides that “decisions of the European Council shall be taken by consensus.”³ All substantive decisions made and resolutions passed by the Council must be passed unanimously. Abstentions, which are allowed to any Member State at any time, do not prevent a resolution from passing that is otherwise approved unanimously. Voting on procedural matters requires only a qualified majority.⁴

The European Council has made the decisions that have ushered in new eras for Europe since the beginnings of integration in Europe. It is the conglomerate of all of the most powerful leaders in Europe, and may therefore be the most important body on the entire continent.

² European Union. *The Treaty of Lisbon*. Lisbon: 2008. <http://www.lisbon-treaty.org/wcm/the-lisbon-treaty/treaty-on-european-union-and-comments/title-3-provisions-on-the-institutions/88-article-15.html>

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ See instructions on procedure at the bottom of this background guide.

Annotated Bibliography

Novak, Petr. "Factsheets on the European Union: The European Council." European Parliament. Published May 2018. Accessed June 25, 2018.

http://www.europarl.europa.eu/atyourservice/en/displayFtu.html?ftuId=FTU_1.3.6.html

Helpful document published by the European Parliament explaining the function and mandate of the European Council.

Schuman, Robert. "The Schuman Declaration." Delivered 9 May 1950. Accessed June 25, 2018.

https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/symbols/europe-day/schuman-declaration_en

The address delivered by Robert Schuman outlining the purpose of the forthcoming European Coal and Steel Community.

Treaty of Lisbon. European Union. Accessed June 26, 2018. <http://www.lisbon-treaty.org/wcm/the-lisbon-treaty/treaty-on-european-union-and-comments/title-3-provisions-on-the-institutions/88-article-15.html>

<http://www.lisbon-treaty.org/wcm/the-lisbon-treaty/treaty-on-european-union-and-comments/title-3-provisions-on-the-institutions/88-article-15.html>

Founding document of the European Union. Article 15 outlines the function of the European Council.

I. Furthering the EU Enlargement Agenda in the Western Balkans and Turkey

"We should believe in the strength and vitality of the values which constitute the E.U. and which neighboring states can believe in and aspire to join."

-Donald Tusk, President of the European Council

Introduction: The Purpose of EU Enlargement

Since its outset, the intention of European integration has been to assimilate the economies and governments of individual European states to a level in which conflict on the continent becomes virtually impossible. Along with this increased security comes the promotion of democratic values and economic growth. Candidate states are required to reach a certain standard of effective government, authentic democracy, and protection of human rights in order to accede. It is therefore always in the interest of the European Union to expand its influence by allowing additional countries to become Member States.

The Lisbon Treaty outlines the basic values behind enlargement. Article 2 states, "The Union is founded on the values of respect for human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights, including the rights of persons belonging to minorities."⁵ As such, Article 49 states, "Any European State which respects the values referred to in Article 2 and is committed to promoting them may apply to become a member of the Union."⁶

The process by which countries become members of the European Union is called "enlargement." Typically, countries join the EU in groups over the course of a common time period. These groups of enlargement are called "waves". Since the beginning of European integration in the 1950s, the EU recognizes six successful waves of enlargement. These waves are each preceded by an Enlargement Agenda, which outlines the goals and strategy by which the Union will bring the potential Member States up to EU standards and prepare for their accession. These agendas have brought the European Union from its original six Member States to its current 28.

The European Commission's 2018 manuscript on the matter⁷ describes enlargement as being instrumental in helping countries achieve three main criteria. These three areas are derived from the Copenhagen Criteria⁸, which was agreed upon in 1993 by the European Council as the defining document on the process of EU Enlargement. They are as follows:

1. Political stability, which includes the protection of democracy by the country's political institutions, basic rule of law, the guarantee of human rights, and the protection of minorities;
2. A functioning market economy that will be able to compete within the EU's single market; and
3. Adherence to all of the aims and regulations of the EU.

Through extensive negotiation, the EU and candidate Member States ensure that all of these criteria are met before accession becomes possible. Once all of the agreed upon requirements are met, then the process of accession begins. It is the role of the European Council to outline general standards of political stability,

⁵European Union. *The Treaty of Lisbon*. Lisbon: 2008. <http://www.lisbon-treaty.org/wcm/the-lisbon-treaty/treaty-on-european-union-and-comments/title-6-final-provisions/136-article-49.html>

⁶European Union. *The Treaty of Lisbon*. Lisbon: 2008. <http://www.lisbon-treaty.org/wcm/the-lisbon-treaty/treaty-on-european-union-and-comments/title-1-common-provisions/2-article-2.html>

⁷ Directorate General for Communication. "EU Enlargement." EU Publications. June 15, 2018. Accessed September 7, 2018. <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/6490722d-686a-11e8-ab9c-01aa75ed71a1/language-en/format-PDF/source-search>.

⁸ "Presidency Conclusions: Copenhagen European Council." Presidency of the European Council. Accessed June 20, 2018. http://www.europarl.europa.eu/enlargement/ec/pdf/cop_en.pdf

economic capacity, and adherence to EU regulations that a candidate country must reach. The Council also outlines a schedule to which the negotiations and potential accession process should adhere. These general decisions serve as an outline for negotiations between the EU and the candidate countries. Without these standards agreed upon by the Heads of Government, there would be no goals to which the candidate country should strive.

A Brief History of Enlargement

Since its founding, the EU has grown from its original six Member States to 28. This growth is separated into six successful waves of enlargement. The first country to sign an association agreement with the European Communities was the United Kingdom in 1954. Seven years later, the UK applied to join the EC, but their application was vetoed by the French President Charles De Gaulle, stating that “the nature, the structure, the very situation (conjuncture) that are England’s differ profoundly from those of the continentals.”⁹ Spain became the next country to apply for membership into the European Communities in 1964. However, all six founding Member States showed their strict commitment to the purpose of enlargement early on by rejecting Spain’s application on the grounds that it was not yet a democracy. The first successful enlargement occurred after the United Kingdom reapplied in 1969 following De Gualle’s relinquishing of the French Presidency. At the time of the UK’s application, the countries of Ireland, Denmark, Gibraltar, and Norway considered themselves so closely tied to the British economy to remain outside of the European Economic Community if the UK was to join. Four of the five countries became members of the EC in 1973. Norway did not join after a national referendum on membership failed.

The process of enlargement is not always easy, however. In the late 1970s and early 1980s, the EU genuinely considered enlargement into countries that had recently been ruled by authoritarian regimes for the first time. Greece, Spain, and Portugal were all emerging from fascist rule. At the time, it was unclear what direction they would take. The EU was interested in securing its borders along the south, but there was apprehension about admitting countries with little to no track record of healthy democracy or economic stability. In 1977, Francois Mitterrand, future President of France, said, “Neither Greece nor Spain are in a position to join the Community. Accession is neither in their interest nor is it in our interest. Interim steps are desirable.”¹⁰ Despite President Mitterrand’s initial opposition, however, Greece joined the EC in 1981 and Spain and Portugal followed suit in 1986. These two enlargements set a precedent for the future of the European Union. It was more than a decision about Greece, Spain, and Portugal. By allowing these countries to become Member States, the countries of the European Communities decided that they would allow and even pursue enlargement into states with desire to develop democracies and free market economies, but a history of authoritarianism.

By 1995, with the accession of Austria, Sweden, and Finland, the membership of the EU had reached 16 states. Around this time, the question of eastern expansion started to become legitimate. Most former Soviet states had established democratic governments by 1991. Based on the precedent established with the 1981 and 1986 enlargements, these countries sought membership into the European Union. In anticipation of these applications, the European Council created the Copenhagen Criteria. Despite initial affirmation of support from the EU, the actual process of accession proved slow. The fall of communism was unexpected, and the EU struggled to successfully reunify Germany while keeping the goal of a monetary union on track. The Member States wanted to be absolutely sure that the candidate states would have the capacity to meet the Copenhagen Criteria. Eventually, after taking steps to ensure political stability, economic capability, and adherence to EU regulations, ten countries joined the European Union in 2004: Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia, and Slovenia. After Romania and Bulgaria joined in 2007 and Croatia in 2013, the EU reached its present-day count of 28 Member States.

⁹De Gualle, Charles. “French President Charles DeGaulle's Veto on British Membership of the EEC.” International Relations and Security Network. Accessed June 20, 2018. https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/125401/1168_DeGaulleVeto.pdf

¹⁰ “Beyond Enlargement Fatigue? The Dutch debate on Turkish accession.” European Stability Initiative, 2006. Accessed 20 June, 2018. https://www.esiweb.org/index.php?lang=en&id=156&document_ID=74

The Enlargement Process

The process of enlargement is comprised of three stages, all of which are subject to the approval of all Member States of the EU¹¹

1. The country is offered the prospect of membership
2. The country becomes an official candidate for membership
3. The country enters official accession negotiations

Typically, the country first signs an association agreement with the EU that indicates the potential for future membership. At this stage, most states are far from the necessary standards for accession. The period of association allows the country to begin aligning its policies with that of the EU. In return, the country may receive tariff-free access to some EU markets. The Commission, by direction of the Council, investigates the country's status in each of the three realms of the Copenhagen Criteria and does preliminary work to get the country to a point where negotiations are plausible. This stage can vary in time from a matter of months to many years.¹²

Eventually, the country formally applies for membership. At this point, the country receives candidate status. The Council then requests an opinion on the country's readiness from the Commission. Based on the opinion of the Commission, the Council decides whether or not to open negotiations.

The entirety of EU law and regulations, otherwise known as the "acquis", is divided into separate realms of negotiation. These realms are called "chapters", which are based on similarities between the existing laws in the candidate state and the acquis. The first step in negotiations is a process called "screening". The purpose of screening is to explain the acquis to the candidate state and identify areas in need of alignment with EU standards.¹³ The Council then proceeds in negotiations in each of the chapters and receives screening reports from the Commission on the progress of the country within each chapter.

When negotiations have been successfully completed in each of the chapters, the entirety of the agreements made are incorporated into a draft accession treaty. This treaty must first be approved by the European Parliament. Once this vote has taken place, the treaty must be ratified by the candidate country and all 28 Member States. After the treaty has been ratified, the candidate country receives observer status until the date of scheduled accession. After this date, the country becomes a full-fledged member of the European Union.

The Current Agenda: the Western Balkans and Turkey

Western Balkans

At the Thessaloniki Summit in 2003, the European Council established the Western Balkans as a priority for EU expansion.¹⁴ These countries are currently defined as Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, Macedonia, Montenegro, and Serbia. Montenegro and Serbia have both started formal negotiations, Albania and Macedonia are official candidate countries, Bosnia and Herzegovina has applied for membership but has not yet been

¹¹ Communication Department of the European Commission. "Enlargement." EUROPA. June 2015. Accessed September 7, 2018. https://europa.eu/european-union/topics/enlargement_en.

¹² For an example of an accession with only a brief association agreement, see that of Finland and Sweden: [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2015/563509/EPRS_STU\(2015\)563509_EN.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2015/563509/EPRS_STU(2015)563509_EN.pdf)

For an example of a long period, see that of Turkey, which is described in further detail below.

¹³ Directorate General for Communication. "Enlargement." EU Publications. August 5, 2015. Accessed September 7, 2018. <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/5c93a9e3-f5b7-4567-88aa-eea55451a0a1>

¹⁴ European Commission. "Press Release: EU Western Balkans Summit." Europa Press Release Database. June 21, 2003. Accessed September 7, 2018. http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_PRES-03-163_en.htm.

recognized as an official candidate country, and Kosovo is a potential candidate but is not yet recognized as a state by all Member States.

Four years prior to the Thessaloniki Summit, the Council developed a unique strategy to help facilitate integration in the Western Balkans. This policy is called the Stabilization and Association Process (SAP). This process has led Montenegro and Serbia to significant success in their negotiations, which began in 2012 after the Commission offered a favorable opinion of their applications in 2010. President of the European Council Donald Tusk, in his 2017 State of the Union address, announced an official strategy that would allow both countries to join the EU by 2025.¹⁵ However, there are still significant reforms that must be made before such an accession is possible.

The Commission's 2018 Report on Montenegro identified issues in the country concerning all three areas of the Copenhagen Criteria.¹⁶ In the realm of political stability, there is extremely low electoral trust in the country. This is clearly evidenced by a boycott of the Parliamentary system by the entire opposition since October 2016. The Parliament still has limited legislative power; the State Audit Institution showed little to no plans of implementing economic policies agreed upon and the executive has limited control to force such a development. While some progress has been made in the country's public administration, Montenegro still struggles to depoliticize the bureaucracy and create a merit-based public service. There is still widespread corruption. There are reports of violence against journalists and little has been done to address these claims.

Economically, Montenegro has made progress into developing a healthy market economy. The economy has been steadily growing since 2013, albeit with a moderate level of inflation. There is still an abnormally large burden of public debt. There is a trade deficit due to low levels of exports and high imports.

In terms of adherence to the *acquis*, Montenegro has made significant progress. The main areas that the country still has to make improvements on in order to align national laws with EU regulations are environmental law and migration.

Serbia seems to have less significant issues to address, though there remain many reforms that need to be made. The executive enjoys undue influence over the legislative by implementing many urgent executive orders that limit the ability of Parliament to be the primary source of legislation. The judicial is heavily politicized, under the influence of high partisanship in the country. There is still significant discrimination against minorities, including Roma, LGBTI, and disabled persons. Gender equality is low. Relations with Kosovo have not normalized, though dialogue is happening. Serbia needs to more actively participate in the development of diplomatic relations with the young state.

The 2017 strategy includes an Action Plan with six specific areas in which Serbia and Montenegro must make improvements in order to make accession in 2025 a reality. These six areas are as follows:

1. Rule of Law
2. Security and Migration
3. Socio-Economic Development
4. Transport and Energy Connectivity
5. Digital Agenda
6. Reconciliation and Good Neighborly Relations¹⁷

¹⁵ European Commission. "Strategy for the Western Balkans." EUROPA. February 6, 2018. Accessed September 7, 2018. https://ec.europa.eu/commission/news/strategy-western-balkans-2018-feb-06_en.

¹⁶ European Commission. Montenegro 2018 Report. By Commission Staff. April 17, 2018. Accessed September 7, 2018. <https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/20180417-montenegro-report.pdf>.

¹⁷ Ibid.

Turkey

The relationship between the EU and Turkey is decades old. In 1959, Turkey first applied to the European Economic Community. As a result, the Ankara Association Agreement was signed in 1963¹⁸. The Ankara Agreement sought to create a customs union with Turkey. It also implied a goal of full membership for Turkey in the European Communities. In 1987, Turkey formally applied for membership. The Commission offered a favorable opinion but recommended that the issue be considered in more favorable political times, citing Turkey's conflicts with Cyprus and Greece. In 1997, accession talks began with Cyprus and Greece, but the Council's position on Turkey was reinstated.

In 2005, the Council decided to officially begin negotiations with Turkey, albeit cautiously. The talks have moved slowly since then because of various factors. Political conditions in within the Member States mean that talks have moved with particular scrutiny. Austria and France have both threatened to hold national referendums on the issue. Changes in France's Constitution have obliged it to do so. The issue was a significant factor in Britain's campaign to leave the EU. Germany has supported a privileged association status but still opposes full membership. Cyprus has blocked the opening of six chapters of the negotiations. However, 20 of the 28 Member States still officially support Turkish accession to the EU.

The 2018 report by the Commission defines Turkey as "a key partner for the European Union"¹⁹. The country remains in a customs union with the EU which began in 1995, making for an important economic relationship. It is involved in the fight against ISIL in Syria, and serves as an important buffer for Europe to the Middle East. Turkey has collaborated significantly with the EU to address the refugee crisis, accepting over 3.5 million refugees.²⁰

However, the report has little to offer in terms of Turkey's progress towards the Copenhagen Criteria. The entire state has been under a state of emergency since an attempted coup-de-tat in 2016. Government control over the media is severe. Journalists, intellectuals, and opposition leaders are regularly jailed. President Erdogan continues to stretch his executive power towards authoritarianism. Though the President has expressed the intention to assimilating with the *acquis*, progress has been slow. Many other issues to be addressed are listed within the Commission's report.

The eventual accession of Turkey remains an objective of the European Council. However, recent political advancements, both in Europe and Turkey, have started to put that objective in question. The majority of Member States remain committed to eventual membership for Turkey, but it is unclear how to accelerate talks from their current slow pace. Innovative solutions must be developed to improve the situation in Turkey, for the benefit of all of Europe and the Middle East.

Questions to Consider

1. How can the Council address Montenegro and Serbia's shortcomings to the three areas of the Copenhagen Criteria?
2. What programs/regulations/agreements can be developed to assist Montenegro and Serbia's development in the six areas of the 2017 Action Plan?
3. Should Kosovo be recognized as a state and given candidate status?
4. Should negotiation talks with Turkey be accelerated or slowed? How?
5. What kind of schedule can be created for a future Turkish accession?

¹⁸ European Economic Community and Republic of Turkey. Ankara Agreement. September 1, 1963. Accessed September 7, 2018. <http://www.gif.org.tr/Documents/AB/1963%20ANKARA%20Agreement.pdf>.

¹⁹ European Commission. Turkey 2018 Report. By Commission Staff. April 17, 2018. Accessed September 7, 2018.

<https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/20180417-turkey-report.pdf>

²⁰ Ibid.

Annotated Bibliography

“Ankara Agreement.” European Council. Signed 1 September, 1963. Accessed 21 June, 2018. <http://www.gif.org.tr/Documents/AB/1963%20ANKARA%20Agreement.pdf>

Full text of the Ankara Agreement which established the first association between the EU and Turkey and set a precedent for Turkish membership.

Director-General for Communication (European Commission). “EU enlargement.” Published June 15, 2018. Accessed June 21, 2018. <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/6490722d-686a-11e8-ab9c-01aa75ed71a1/language-en/format-PDF/source-search>

Brief factsheet explaining the process of enlargement.

EU Western Balkans Summit, Thessaloniki. European Council. 21 June 2003. Accessed June 21, 2018. http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_PRES-03-163_en.htm

Full text of the declaration made at the Thessaloniki Summit in which the Council identified the Western Balkans as a priority for enlargement.

“From 6 to 28 Members.” European Commission. Accessed June 21, 2018. https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/policy/from-6-to-28-members_fr

Short interactive history of enlargement from the founding of the EU to its current state.

“Montenegro 2018 Report.” European Commission. April 17, 2018. Accessed June 21, 2018. <https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/20180417-montenegro-report.pdf>

Report from the Commission on the status of Montenegro’s negotiations. Includes all of the shortcomings that will need to be addressed at this Conference.

“Presidency Conclusions: Copenhagen European Council.” Presidency of the European Council. Accessed June 20, 2018. http://www.europarl.europa.eu/enlargement/ec/pdf/cop_en.pdf

Summarization of the Copenhagen Council meeting that created the Copenhagen Criteria, which defines the three realms of requirements for accession into the European Union.

Schuster, Kathleen. “Turkey-EU relations: Which countries are for or against Turkish accession?” Published 6 September, 2017. Accessed 20 June, 2018. <http://www.dw.com/en/turkey-eu-relations-which-countries-are-for-or-against-turkish-accession/a-40381533>

Article briefly describing the position of all 28 Member States of the European Union on Turkish accession.

“Serbia 2018 Report.” European Commission. April 17, 2018. Accessed June 21, 2018. <https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/20180417-serbia-report.pdf>

Same as the previous entry, but for Serbia.

“Strategy for the Western Balkans.” European Commission. Published February 6, 2018. Accessed June 20, 2018. https://ec.europa.eu/commission/news/strategy-western-balkans-2018-feb-06_en

Description of the strategy announced by President Tusk in 2017 and implemented in 2018. Includes links to factsheets for all of the Western Balkan countries and their progress towards accession.

“The 1995 Enlargement of the European Union.” European Parliamentary Research Service. Published November 2015. Accessed June 21, 2018.

[http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2015/563509/EPRS_STU\(2015\)563509_EN.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2015/563509/EPRS_STU(2015)563509_EN.pdf)

History of the 1995 accession of Sweden and Finland.

Treaty of Lisbon. European Union. Accessed June 20, 2018. <http://www.lisbon-treaty.org/wcm/the-lisbon-treaty/treaty-on-european-union-and-comments/title-6-final-provisions/136-article-49.html>

The founding document of the European Union, signed in 2007.

“Turkey 2018 Report.” European Commission. April 17, 2018. Accessed June 21, 2018.

<https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/20180417-turkey-report.pdf>

Same as the previous entry, but for Turkey.

II. Normalizing Relations with the Russian Federation

*“The secret of politics? Make a good treaty with Russia.”
-Otto von Bismarck*

Introduction: The Origins of a Complicated Relationship

The relationship between Russia and the rest of the European continent is a centuries-old tale of political and cultural drama between peoples. From the earliest days of recorded history, it has been unclear to what extent Russia is a part of Europe. Even strictly geographically speaking, the question remains: where does Europe begin and end? Some may claim as far east as Ekaterinburg, others somewhere about one-fifth of the way into Russia, while yet others would say Russia's western border. Surely there are differences in cultural and political values. But how deep are these differences? Are they innate? There are unquestionable differences even between Member States of the European Union; what makes Russia's differences so unique?

These questions have bothered Europeans in more ways than one for more years than a few. Russia originates from the medieval kingdom of Kievan-Rus, which, at its height, spanned across what is now Ukraine, western Russia, and southern Finland. Kievan-Rus was organized almost identically to other contemporary European kingdoms. Most scholars would agree that there was little to separate Kievan-Rus politically or culturally from the rest of Europe. However, economic and religious ties between Rus and Asia (mostly Byzantium) grew during the early years of the second millennium CE. In the 13th century, the Mongols invaded Rus with the intention to conquer all of Europe. The Mongols conquered Rus, but the Russian resistance was so severe that they did not have the strength to continue their invasion. The Mongols established the Golden Horde, a temporary government overseen by the Mongols, in Eastern Europe. While the south and the west developed under the early Renaissance, the east bore the yoke of Mongolian rule. It is quite likely that Russia and the rest of Europe began to diverge on the role and function of government during this period.

Though maintaining close ties and initially moving on an outwardly similar path of evolution, Russia and the west continued to diverge through the next few centuries. By the time of the Enlightenment in western Europe, Russia was still dominated by a feudalist system with a powerful monarch and no parliament. While liberal revolutions in England, France, and America secured the position of republicanism, similar revolutions in Russia during the same time period failed. At the beginning of the 20th century, the rising generation in western Europe had come to believe in liberalism, while their Russian counterparts thought it too weak to tear down the outdated and truly oppressive social system in which they lived. Their radicalized liberalism became the Bolsheviks' socialism. The ensuing relationship between the Soviet Union and the West needs little summarization. It is safe to say that the Cold War did nothing to warm relations between the two poles of the continent.

The fall of communism and the election of Boris Yeltsin as the new Russian Federation's staunchly democratic president only briefly pulled the European Union out of its skepticism. The rise of Vladimir Putin has shown that the differences between Russia and the rest of Europe are not shallow. Both sides have proven unwilling to trust the other. If steps to bridge the chasm between the EU and the Russian Federation are not taken soon, it may grow to the point of disastrous irreversibility.

Advancements in EU-Russian Relations

After the fall of the Soviet Union, the Russian Federation formally opened diplomatic ties with the European Union. In 1994, the EU signed the Partnership and Cooperation Agreement (PCA) with Russia and the New

Independent States of Eastern Europe.²¹ The agreement forms the legal basis for the Russian-EU relations. It states its purpose as follows:

1. to provide a suitable framework for political dialogue;
2. to support the efforts made by the countries to strengthen their democracies and develop their economies;
3. to accompany their transition to a market economy;
4. to encourage trade and investment.

As outlined in these points, the agreement is primarily concerned with promoting trade and establishing good economic relations. The text of the agreement does not often mention political relations between the two parties. Outside of economics, it does address a common commitment to the promotion of human rights.

The European Union's foreign policy towards countries in the south and the east is entitled the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP). The European External Action Service (EEAS) says that the purpose of the ENP is to "work with its Southern and Eastern Neighbours to foster stabilisation, security and prosperity."²² In practice, the ENP encourages neighboring states to align more closely with EU standards without necessarily implying future membership commitments. Russia, however, chooses not to participate in this policy, wishing instead to be considered an equal partner. Instead, the EU and Russia developed an additional agreement called the Four Common Spaces. The spaces are the Common Economic Space, the Common Space of Freedom, Security and Justice, the Common Space of Co-operation in the Field of External Security, and the Common Space on Research, Education and Culture. The four spaces encourage some level of integration, as far as it is possible without assimilation between the policies of the two. The agreement shows that Russia does not intend to fold to the spread of EU influence, instead choosing to be a separate but equally powerful actor in Europe. This mindset proves the importance of creating innovative arrangements between the EU and Russia that will maintain peace without compromising the independence of either party.

Incidents in EU-Russian Relations

Though relations between Russia and the EU improved publicly in the years following the collapse of the Soviet Union, various incidents since that time have brought the relationship to a near-breaking point. The rise of Vladimir Putin has coincided with the rise of Russian nationalism, which has given him significantly more control over governmental affairs than his predecessor. Putin remains extremely popular in his home country, easily winning four Presidential elections since he first replaced Boris Yeltsin in 1999. His popularity in Russia means that he faces little-to-no pressure when he pushes the limits of his constitutional power or when controversies with other nations arise. The Russian government has increasing control over the media and the opposition. Such power means that the government has little trouble down-playing scandals in international affairs, including large-scale military action. The EU has attempted to respond to various incidences with increasing strength, but such actions have only intensified Russian resolve and continued to cool the relationship between the two. The Russians see the West as arrogantly assuming a monopoly on power, while the West sees Russia as a loose-cannon bully with no respect for basic principles of fair governance or the sovereignty of its neighbors.

Since the accession of former Soviet states to the EU, the EU has accused Russia of intimidation tactics towards these new Member States. In a 2009 Statement, 22 leaders of central and eastern European countries released a statement declaring, "Our hopes that relations with Russia would improve and that Moscow would finally fully accept our complete sovereignty and independence after joining NATO and the EU have not been fulfilled.

²¹ "Partnership and Cooperation Agreements (PCAs): Russia, Eastern Europe, the Southern Caucasus and Central Asia." EUR-Lex. September 9, 2010. Accessed September 7, 2018. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=LEGISSUM:r17002>.

²² European Union External Action Service. "European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP)." EUROPA. Accessed September 7, 2018. https://eeas.europa.eu/diplomatic-network/european-neighbourhood-policy-enp_en.

Instead, Russia is back as a revisionist power pursuing a 19th-century agenda with 21st-century tactics and methods.”²³ Since that time, controversial occurrences in eastern Europe have only become more common. During that same year, the Russian military conducted simulations of a nuclear attack on Poland. From 2013 to 2015, the Russians held seven large scale military exercises along the border with the Baltic States. In September 2014, the FSB (the Russian successor to the Soviet KGB) crossed the Estonian border and abducted a member of the Estonian Internal Security Service. These are only a few of the incidents of intimidation of eastern EU Member States.

Russia is directly involved in and arguably responsible for what the international community has deemed “the Ukrainian Crisis.” Russian ties with former Ukrainian President Viktor Yanukovich and various threats caused the Ukrainian association agreement with the EU to fail, resulting in the 2014 Euromaidan Revolution in Kyiv and the subsequent violent police crackdown. Soon after, Russia stirred unrest in Eastern Ukraine and sent troops across the border to support separatists in a war against the Ukrainian military. The EU condemned the action as an invasion and enacted various sanctions and visa-bans on Russian citizens. The armed conflict continues to this day, displacing millions of Ukrainian citizens as refugees.²⁴ In the same year, Russia invaded the Ukrainian peninsula of Crimea and annexed the entire area as Russian territory.

Russian intervention in western elections has become well-known in recent years. The EU has accused the Russian government of meddling in the French Presidential elections of 2017. It has also claimed that the Russian government attempted to meddle in the Brexit vote and the Germany General Election. All of these alleged actions from the Russian government would have been to undermine EU legitimacy. Though not a direct attack on EU sovereignty, the extensive efforts of the Russian government to undermine US Presidential candidate Hillary Clinton and support populist candidate Donald Trump through propaganda techniques was seen by the EU as an attack on liberal democracy as a whole.²⁵

All of these incidents heated a pot of mistrust that finally boiled over in 2018 when the United Kingdom accused the Russian government of poisoning one of its citizens. Sergei Skripal, a former Russian intelligence officer who acted as a double agent for the UK during the 1990s, was poisoned in Salisbury in March 2018. Prime Minister Theresa May demanded an explanation from the Russian government, which was ignored. Subsequently, the UK chose to expel 23 Russian diplomats from its borders. 18 out of the 28 EU Member States also chose to expel Russian diplomats at this time.²⁶ Russia reciprocated the actions by expelling an equivalent number of diplomats from each country that had done so to them. This marks a severe escalation of tensions between Russia and the EU, and limits the diplomatic medium through which tensions are traditionally addressed.

Possible Areas of Reconciliation

If steps are not taken soon to reverse the direction of EU-Russian relations, tensions may escalate to a point of crisis. Though neither side seems particularly interested in extending a full olive branch, the EU has some available options in front of it that may help begin the process of normalization. The following issues are by no means a comprehensive list of available options. Innovative ideas must be developed in all realms in order to address the situation. Conversely, many Member States are quite unwilling to pursue any sort of reconciliation tactics with the Russian Federation. Others have seen the rise of populist political parties with Russian

²³Adamkus, Valdas, et al. “An Open Letter to The Obama Administration from Central And Eastern Europe.” Radio Free Europe. July 16, 2009. Accessed June 30, 2018.

https://www.rferl.org/a/An_Open_Letter_To_The_Obama_Administration_From_Central_And_Eastern_Europe/1778449.html

²⁴ UNHCR. “Ukrainian Refugee Crisis.” USA for UNHCR. Accessed July 3, 2018. <https://www.unrefugees.org/emergencies/ukraine/>

²⁵ Kuper, Simon. “Russia Meddles while Europe Votes.” Financial Times. February 8, 2018. Accessed June 31, 2018.

<https://www.ft.com/content/4fb3ae34-0b98-11e8-839d-41ca06376bf2>

²⁶ Dewan, Angela. “These are all the countries that are expelling Russian diplomats.” CNN. March 28, 2018. Accessed June 31, 2018. <https://edition.cnn.com/2018/03/26/europe/full-list-of-russian-diplomats-expelled-over-s-intl/index.html>

sympathies in recent elections. Yet other Member States find themselves between these two sides of the argument. All of these happenings have only complicated the issues from within the EU.

EU Sanctions

Since the beginning of the Ukrainian Crisis in 2014, the EU has imposed various economic and travel sanctions on the Russian Federation.²⁷ President Putin and some prominent European leaders (such as in Italy, Austria, and Croatia)²⁸ have called for the sanctions to be lifted. These leaders argue that the sanctions have done nothing to discourage Russian action, and have only hurt average Russian and Ukrainian citizens. A lifting on all or some of the current sanctions could potentially show EU readiness to begin dialogue and improve relations. However, such actions would certainly draw criticism from the Ukrainian government.

Visa liberalization

In 2010, talks began to create a visa-free regime between Russia and the EU's Schengen Travel Zone. If realized, this agreement would have meant that Russian and EU citizens could travel across the Russian border without applying for expensive visas. However, talks were halted after the Russian annexation of Crimea. In 2016, the EEAS created a press release video in Russian outlining a way that talks could resume.²⁹ Some concerns include the level of human-trafficking in Russia, the complexities of refugee quotas amidst the migration crisis, and the extremely loose border between Russia and Kazakhstan. However, many from within the EU have supported the EEAS' plan of resuming talks. Several German politicians have called for a visa-free border in order to help begin the process of integrating democratic values into Russia. Resuming visa-liberalization talks is another area where dialogue between Russia and the EU could commence civilly.

Reinstatement of Russian Diplomats

The decision to expel Russian diplomats from various EU countries was heavily criticized by the Kremlin. A decision to reinstate the diplomats that were expelled from these countries would potentially show the EU's commitment to dialogue between the two sides. Especially in countries from which only one or two diplomats were expelled, such a move would be largely symbolic rather than having a real effect on the practical workings of diplomatic relations. However, it could improve the quality of dialogue and the general trust on both sides. Still, some would see a decision to reinstate diplomats as a weak move, proving that the EU does not carry through on its punishments.

Needless to say, something must be done in the near future to being the process of normalizing relations between Russia and the West. If not, the Russian Federation may resume its role as the most advanced threat to the liberal world order on the globe. Neither side is interested in further conflict. However, Russia has proven that there are clear differences between its understanding of government culture and that of the EU. As such, traditional methods of European diplomacy will not be successful. The future of peace and prosperity in Europe depend upon innovative solutions from the European Union.

Questions to Consider

1. How can the EU ensure the safety of its eastern Member States in the face of Russian intimidation?
2. How can the EU ensure that Russia will not continue to undermine general elections in Europe?
3. What can be done to resolve the Ukrainian Crisis?
4. Should EU sanctions be lifted, visa travel be liberalized, and/or Russian diplomats be reinstated?
5. In what other specific ways can the EU help calm tensions with Russia?

²⁷ European Union. "EU sanctions against Russia over Ukraine crisis." European Union Newsroom. July 3, 2018. Accessed July 3, 2018. https://europa.eu/newsroom/highlights/special-coverage/eu-sanctions-against-russia-over-ukraine-crisis_en

²⁸"Italy's New Prime Minister Calls For Ending Some EU Sanctions On Russia." Radio Free Europe. June 6, 2018. Accessed June 31, 2018. <https://www.rferl.org/a/italy-new-prime-minister-conte-calls-end-some-eu-sanctions-russia-stop-illegal-immigration-/29274541.html>

²⁹ To view in English: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LYBSMoflcQQ>; in Russian: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ObZ-JXxJSIY>

Annotated Bibliography

Adamkus, Valdas, et al. "An Open Letter to The Obama Administration from Central And Eastern Europe." Radio Free Europe. July 16, 2009. Accessed June 30, 2018. https://www.rferl.org/a/An_Open_Letter_To_The_Obama_Administration_From_Central_And_Eastern_Europe/1778449.html

Joint statement from many Eastern European leaders on the intimidation of Eastern European Member States by Russia.

Dewan, Angela. "These are all the countries that are expelling Russian diplomats." CNN. March 28, 2018. Accessed June 31, 2018. <https://edition.cnn.com/2018/03/26/europe/full-list-of-russian-diplomats-expelled-over-s-intl/index.html>

Article with a list of all countries that expelled Russian diplomats after the British nerve-agent controversy and the number of diplomats expelled.

"European Neighborhood Policy." European External Action Service. Accessed June 31, 2018. https://eeas.europa.eu/diplomatic-network/european-neighbourhood-policy-enp_en

EEAS Database on the European Neighborhood Policy with helpful and up-to-date articles and press releases.

European Union. "EU sanctions against Russia over Ukraine crisis." European Union Newsroom. July 3, 2018. Accessed July 3, 2018. https://europa.eu/newsroom/highlights/special-coverage/eu-sanctions-against-russia-over-ukraine-crisis_en

European Union database of press releases on sanctions on Russia as a result of the Ukrainian Crisis.

"Italy's New Prime Minister Calls For Ending Some EU Sanctions On Russia." Radio Free Europe. June 6, 2018. Accessed June 31, 2018. <https://www.rferl.org/a/italy-new-prime-minister-conte-calls-end-some-eu-sanctions-russia-stop-illegal-immigration-/29274541.html>

Statements from recently-elected Italian PM on lifting sanctions on Russia.

Kuper, Simon. "Russia Meddles while Europe Votes." Financial Times. February 8, 2018. Accessed June 31, 2018. <https://www.ft.com/content/4fb3ae34-0b98-11e8-839d-41ca06376bf2>

Piece from the Financial Times outlining the various actions of the Russian government in meddling with European and American elections.

"Partnership and Cooperation Agreements (PCAs): Russia, Eastern Europe, the Southern Caucasus and Central Asia." European Union. September 29, 2010. Accessed June 31, 2018. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=LEGISSUM%3Ar17002>

Summary by the EU of the decisions associated with the PCA.

UNHCR. "Ukrainian Refugee Crisis." USA for UNHCR. Accessed July 3, 2018. <https://www.unrefugees.org/emergencies/ukraine/>

Very short informational site on the Ukrainian Refugees displaced by conflict.

Model European Union Parliamentary Procedure

Assignment of Agenda Items / Setting the Agenda

The **President of the European Council** has the right to propose the order of the agenda. If there are NO objections there shall be NO VOTE on the agenda. However, a Member State may also move to “set the agenda.” If at least two other Member States second the formal proposal (motion), it will immediately be put to a vote (see Voting Procedures). The Chair will declare the agenda set as such if the vote is successful. The Chair will say: “*The President of the European Council wished to set the agenda as follows, unless other proposals are put forth at this time.*” If there is an objection, he/she will respond: “*<Country Name> moves to set the agenda to...*”

Role of the Chair

The President of the European Council chairs all sessions. As the Chair, the President of the European Council will have sole and final power to open and close sessions, recognize speakers, place limits on speaking time and control discussion and debate. In cases where parliamentary procedure is unclear or in doubt, the Chair shall use his or her judgment to settle the matter and proceed with the session.

Roll Call

The first order of business for each of session will be to establish roll call. This is done by the Chair at the beginning of each individual session and does not require a motion.

Tour de Table

A *tour de table* is used at the opening of each session. The Chair will ask each head of government in turn to give a short summary (up to 2 minutes) of their thinking on the matters up for discussion, ensuring that every Member State is able to outline its position and learn other Member States’ positions on the topic.

Debate Format (Two Types)

Formal debate will require participants wishing to speak to raise their placard and be recognized by the Chair. The speaker’s list may be opened when the Chair calls for motions (“*<Country Name> moves to open the Speakers’ List*”). The length of speaking time may also be set via motion (“*<Country Name> moves to set the speaker’s time at X seconds*”). Participants make their statements while seated around the table. Participants may address each other directly during their statements with questions and/or responses. Participants may also yield the remaining speaking time to a fellow Member State or back to the Chair if they have a question or have nothing more to say by indicating so at the end of their speech. A Member State may raise their placard at any time when they wish to be added to the Speakers’ List.

Informal debate allows participants to leave their seats. Heads of Government are expected to mingle and speak amongst themselves. This time should be used to negotiate and write/edit working papers and resolutions. The Chair or any participant may call for informal debate via motion for a specified time (“*<Country Name> moves to have informal debate for X minutes*”). If at least two other Member States second the motion, it will immediately be put to a vote. Once informal debate time has expired, formal debate will resume.

Points and Motions

Motions may also be used to combine or divide agenda items, to table an issue, or to refer an issue to a committee for further study. Motions are also in order (determined always by the Chair) to “close debate on an issue” and bring it to a vote. Motions are always subject to a “second” by two Member States and are brought to a vote immediately.

Point of Order. If, during a meeting, a Member State feels that the meeting is running in a manner contrary to these Rules, he/she may rise to a point of order. The Chair may overrule, or accept the appeal. If accepted, the

Chair may make an immediate ruling or ask the Member State to speak on the point of order for a maximum of one minute (but he/she may not speak on the subject of the debate). The Chair will then immediately rule on the point of order.

Point of Information. If a Member State wishes to obtain clarification of procedure or of any other matter, he/she may rise to a point of information and receive clarification from the Chair or anyone else designated by the Chair.

All motions by any participants (other than the Chair) are always subject to a second by two Member States. These may be asked to give an explanation of the rationale (no more than one minute). If successful they will be brought to a vote immediately.

Voting Procedures

Where votes are taken, they should normally be open and made by roll call in alphabetical order by Member State, and recorded by the Chair. Voting will be verbal and expressed either as “Yes,” “No,” or “Abstain.” Once a vote has been declared open, no one will be allowed to speak other than to cast his or her vote. No one may approach or leave the room. Once all votes have been cast, the Chair will tally the vote and immediately announce the result. The decision of the Chair on a tally will be final.

Voting on procedural issues or matters of the agenda requires a **simple majority** of the Member States present in the session, including the Presidency.

Voting on substantive issues, such as resolutions, requires **consensus**.

- **Non-binding vote:** If Member States would like to propose a resolution and take a vote without being final and binding, they may motion for a non-binding vote. All Member States will be permitted to verbally cast their votes. It is good to call for non-binding vote to see who is not in favor and discuss it prior to calling for binding vote, seeing that **if a single Head of Government votes “No” the resolution would fail in event of binding vote.**
- **Binding vote:** Binding votes on resolutions are called for by motions and are **always final**. If a single Member State votes “No” on a binding vote, **the resolution will fail and be discarded**. Multiple resolutions may be passed by binding vote, so long as they are not conflicting.