**Introduction**

Welcome to NAC, this committee is slightly different to most as NAC is not a United Nations committee meaning its priorities are slightly different: NAC’s focus is mostly military and humanitarian so when making decisions in this committee delegates should think of their countries position on the issue and work out what military action would advance those goals the most. NAC is also debated clause by clause this means no resolutions need to be submitted, we recommend writing several clauses that can then be suggested individually.

NATO BRIEFING – ARTICLE 5 REFORMS

*SUMMARY*

Article 5 of NATO is a core component of NATO’s defensive deterrent. The article itself has remained primarily untouched since its introduction in 1949. However, with the ever changing nature of the modern world and it’s evolving security threats, the line between an attack on a country is growing more blurred by the day, with cyber attacks and intrusions by non-state actors becoming commonplace.

*BACKGROUND*

Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation was signed in 1949 as a key part of NATO’s defence policy, having only been invoked one time - By the USA - during its 75 years of existence after the events of the 9/11 attacks in September 2001.

Article 5 states that an attack against one member is considered an attack against all, triggering collective response measures from all member nations. However, in modern times an ‘attack’ on a nation does not always manifest as conventional military action.

*ONGOING DEBATE*

*Nature of Armed Attack*

There is ongoing debate over whether and how non-kinetic activities—such as cyberattacks, infrastructure sabotage, or economic coercion—should be considered within the scope of an "armed attack" as defined in Article 5. Diverging legal and doctrinal interpretations among Allies have underscored the complexity of consensus-building in this area.

*Thresholds and Attribution*

Challenges persist regarding thresholds for response, particularly in cases where the perpetrator of an attack is unclear. Attribution difficulties in cyberspace, for instance, complicate collective decision-making and risk assessment.

*Strategic Ambiguity vs. Clarity*

Some stakeholders prefer maintaining a degree of flexibility in Article 5’s language, arguing that ambiguity can leave room for interpretation. Others suggest that clearer definitions could reinforce NATO’s credibility in responding to emerging threats.

*Operational and Procedural Considerations*

There has been interest in examining how existing NATO response mechanisms under Article 5 might be adapted to better account for hybrid scenarios or rapidly unfolding cyber incidents. These conversations have focused on improving coordination, communication, and decision timelines, rather than altering the Treaty itself.

*RISKS AND CONSIDERATIONS*

*Escalation –* Lowering the requirements for NATO Article 5 to be invoked could potentially lead to escalation from adversaries and be seen as an act of aggression

*Lack of Security –* If Article 5 is relaxed, then the security of many countries may lie in jeopardy without the means of the alliance to defend themselves from larger militaries. Alongside this,

*Alliance Division –* Conflicting views within the alliance could lead to division within the alliance, weakening the overall effectiveness of NATO

*CONCLUSION*

The question of whether NATO should revise, reinterpret, or supplement Article 5 remains open. While no formal treaty amendments are currently under consideration, discussions continue at various levels regarding the adequacy of existing frameworks in addressing contemporary and future threats. Member states have expressed differing levels of urgency and preference, with general agreement on the importance of preserving Alliance unity while enhancing strategic relevance.