

The background of the cover features a classical statue of a winged figure, possibly a personification of Liberty or Justice, holding a globe. The statue is rendered in a light, sepia-toned style. Overlaid on the statue is a faint, dark, geometric pattern resembling a globe's latitude and longitude lines or a network of connections.

MBMUN'25

# STUDY GUIDE

UNDER- SECRETARY-GENERAL:  
YASEMİN RAİTHEL

ACADEMIC ASSISTANT:  
KUZEY KARLIK

## SPECPOL

## **Table of Contents**

**Letter from the Secretary General**

**Letter from the Under-Secretary General**

**Letter from the Academic Assistant**

**Introduction to the Committee**

**Agenda Item: Post-Soviet Sovereignty**  
**Introduction to the Topic**

**Dissolution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics**

**Aftermath and details of the topic**

**Post-Soviet Background and Nostalgia**

**Current situation**

**Expectations and Rules of Procedure of the Committee**

**Questions to be Addressed**

**Further Reading and Bibliography**

## **Letter from the Secretary General**

Honourable Delegates, Esteemed Advisors, and Distinguished Guests,

My name is Bersun Akkaya. As the Secretary-General, it is with great pride, immense joy, and a privilege that I welcome you to the long-anticipated revival of MBMUN, now with its new iteration. This conference is the revival of a conference rooted in tradition and now reconstructed for a new generation of thinkers and changemakers.

The preparation of this conference has been an odyssey. Alongside an exceptional team of organizational and academic teams, we have devoted countless hours fueled by passion and purpose to ensure that MBMUN'25 embodies not only excellence in diplomacy, but with a genuine commitment to dialogue, cooperation, and meaningful progress to be a platform for meaningful discourse, a forum where today's youth can engage with the complexities of a rapidly changing world. It is our utmost pleasure to bring together young minds in a time defined by uncertainty, environmental collapse, contested sovereignties, technological upheaval, and a shifting global order not only to discuss but also to share and develop their ideas with the critical tools of diplomacy, ethics, and global citizenship in a collaborative atmosphere. This year's theme draws inspiration from one of history's most noble civilizations: the Roman Empire. It invites participants to examine the durability of power and the fragility of institutions. Under the motto *Per Aspera Ad Astra* "Through Hardships to the Stars" we call upon you to rise above challenges and to reach intellectually and morally, toward something greater. Each of our ten deliberately selected committees has been formed to combine academic depth with contemporary relevance ranging from historical reenactments to futuristic policy dilemmas, public health to international security, and from post-Soviet sovereignty to the legal dilemmas in orbital militarization. From historical simulation in the Roman Senate to the timeless ethical conflict of the 12 Angry Men, we aim to reflect the diversity of the United Nations and the multidisciplinary challenges that confront our period. Each agenda item was chosen not only to echo global urgency but also to foster intellectual relevance creating a space where rhetoric meets responsibility. Model United Nations is not merely a conference, it is a living classroom, a training ground for leadership, a crucible where global awareness is tested, and a stage where youth diplomacy is celebrated. In this regard, whether your voice resonates through heated debate or takes shape in silent diplomacy, never forget that your presence here has meaning. I invite and encourage all my delegates to research boldly, question fearlessly, and above all, remain deeply committed to the principles of respect, empathy, and curiosity for the rest of their lives..

Aim to reach the moon even if you could not reach the moon, you will find your place among the stars, may the light of the stars be your beacon that enlightens your path to knowledge. On behalf of the entire MBMUN'25 Secretariat, I look forward to welcoming you to leave a mark far beyond its closing ceremony.

Cordially,

Bersun AKKAYA, The Secretary-General of MBMUN'25



## **Letter from the Under-Secretary General**

Most Esteemed Participants,

I, as the Under-Secretary-General of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee, welcome you all to this conference. It is an honor and a pleasure to be able to present the committee with my hardworking Academic Assistant Kuzey Karlık.

Make sure you read this study guide thoroughly and do the necessary research before coming to this committee, a very fun and full one will be waiting for you.

I have no doubt that what you will do in this committee will be excellent. We look forward to seeing you at the conference, wishing you a very enjoyable one.

If you have any questions about the study guide or process, please do not hesitate to contact me via [raithelyasemin@gmail.com](mailto:raithelyasemin@gmail.com)

Sincerely,

Under-Secretary General responsible for SPECPOL

Yasemin RAITHEL

## **Letter from the Academic Assistant**

Dear Delegates,

I would like to welcome you all to the SPECPOL committee! I am Kuzey Karlık and it is my utmost pleasure to serve you as the Academic Assistant of this committee.

First, I would like to thank the executive team for granting me this opportunity in this marvelous conference. And I would like to thank my Under Secretary General Yasemin, For supporting me all the way through.

The study guide we wrote contains crucial information for this committee. Yet as its name states it's only a guide for you, so I am highly encouraging you to do your research both about the topic and your country allocation and don't forget to answer the questions in the questions to be addressed part.

I am sure this committee will be a blast, and I am looking forward to meeting you all on 1-3 July. If you have any questions you can always contact me through direct messages or mail.

Sincerely,

Kuzey, Academic Assistant of SPECPOL.

+90 5339160890

kuzeykarlik@gmail.com

## **Introduction to the Committee**

The United Nations Fourth Committee, also known as the Special Political and Decolonization Committee, was originally formed to deal specifically with decolonization. Prioritizing the concerns of regions placed under trusteeship, or UN supervision until they attained independence as independent states, was its initial priority. Subsequently, it took on certain duties that were formerly performed by the Disarmament and International Security Committee (DISEC), allowing DISEC to focus on military affairs such as the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons. As a result, SPECPOL now deals with a broad spectrum of international political issues, particularly those that stem from territorial disputes or conflicts among former colonial powers. Recently, SPECPOL has focused on questions of autonomy and independence concerning several European colonies in the Caribbean and Oceania, Palestine, the Falkland Islands, and the Western Sahara. It has also discussed Israel/Palestine, space exploration, mine action (for instance, Vietnam), and the safety implications of nuclear testing. Readers may see that there are many uses for SPECPOL. For the sake of this conversation, it is sufficient to note that SPECPOL is merely a body for discussion and has no formal legal authority other than recommendations. The UN General Assembly includes it. While encouraging others to pay more attention to the different ways that the UN, other international organizations, member states, and the private sector have aggressively addressed these challenges, let us all go further into these topics. This will provide the analysis a solid foundation and make it possible to submit suggestions that demonstrate both original problem-solving and policy awareness. While SPECPOL does not have the power or resources to directly enforce these laws, it is still within our purview to recommend them to other parties.

Lastly, one thing to bear in mind is that, particularly for the delegates, the term "national sovereignty" will be brought up multiple times during the debate. According to the idea of national sovereignty, every country has the last word on choices made by the international community. Thus, for instance, a nation must consent if the UN wishes to oversee its nuclear weapons plants or distribute documents. For this reason, SPECPOL is limited to proposing solutions; even if a resolution is approved by the committee, it will not become legally binding unless member states agree to the policy being implemented within their borders.

## **Agenda Item: Post Soviet Sovereignty**

### **Introduction to the Topic**

On December 26, 1991, the Supreme Soviet of the USSR voted to dissolve itself.

Fifteen sovereign republics emerged from the collapse of the USSR: Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, Moldova, the three Baltic Republics (Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia), the three Caucasian Republics (Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan) and the Central Asia Republics (Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan).

However, the path of transition has been troublesome. Economic transition has been difficult everywhere in the Former Soviet Union (FSU), as the transformation of the command economy into market economy showed to be not as easy as expected. In the case of Russia, GDP fell by almost 50% in the first seven years of transition, while inflation skyrocketed to an astonishing four digit figure in 1992. Industrial recession was deeper than during Nazi invasion. Similar problems happened in Ukraine, Moldova and the Caucasian Republics.

The situation was somehow different in other republics. Baltic Republics suffered of initial problems, not differently from other Central and Eastern European countries but recovered quickly and recently joined the European Union. Countries of Central Asia and Belarus opted for an authoritarian path that blocked political and – partially – economic reforms, at the same time impeding the dramatic recession experienced in Russia.

The breakdown of the Soviet Union has vastly been peaceful. In fact, Russia – the dominant subject in the Soviet Union – promoted the independence of the other republics and, thus, the melt down of the USSR has been largely consensual. The only open dispute on borders was registered between Armenia and Azerbaijan, particularly on the enclave of Nagorno Karabak, an Armenian-populated region inside Azerbaijan. The conflict has not yet been solved, yet in 1994 a cease-fire has been signed.



## Dissolution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

On December 25, 1991, the Soviet Union ceased to exist as a sovereign state. The Soviet Union had a gradual and complex fall. Such a fall that the countries nearly 70 years of reign since December 30, 1922 still has a massive effect on the 15 new countries formed with the dissolution.

The Soviet Union was once the largest country in the world, covering more than 22 million square kilometers. It consisted of 15 Soviet socialist republics but was highly centralized for most of its history. Although the U.S.S.R.'s official language was Russian, more than 200 other languages and dialects were spoken, and it was home to more than 290 million people of various ethnicities.

On March 11, 1985, Mikhail Gorbachev got nominated as the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU). He was a committed communist with firm convictions around the necessity of reform, his attempts to democratise the Soviet political system and modernise the economy would ultimately see the downfall of his state. The road to this geopolitical climax was long. It is generally thought to have begun with the election that brought him to power.

When Mikhail Gorbachev was named general secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU), his primary domestic goals were to jump-start the Soviet economy and to streamline the government bureaucracy. When his initial attempts at reform failed to yield significant results, he instituted the policies of *glasnost* ("openness") and *perestroika* ("restructuring"). The former was intended to foster dialogue, while the latter introduced quasi free market policies to government-run industries. Rather than sparking a renaissance in Communist thought, glasnost opened the floodgates to criticism of the entire Soviet apparatus. The state lost control of both the media and the public sphere, and democratic reform movements gained steam throughout the Soviet bloc. Perestroika exhibited the worst of the capitalist and communist systems: price controls were lifted in some markets, but existing bureaucratic structures were left in place, meaning that Communist officials were able to push back against those policies that did not benefit them personally. In the end, Gorbachev's reforms and his abandonment of the Brezhnev Doctrine hastened the demise of the Soviet empire. By the end of 1989 Hungary had dismantled its border fence with Austria, Solidarity had swept into power in Poland, the Baltic states were taking concrete steps toward independence, and the Berlin Wall had been toppled. The Iron Curtain had fallen, and the Soviet Union would not long outlast it.

Economically, the Soviet Union looked like they were doing good, but when dug deeper there were some crucial problems. By some measures, the Soviet economy was the world's second largest in 1990, but shortages of consumer goods were routine and hoarding was

commonplace. It was estimated that the Soviet black market economy was the equivalent of more than 10 percent of the country's official GDP. Economic stagnation had hampered the country for years, and the perestroika reforms only served to worsen the problem. Wage hikes were supported by printing money, fueling an inflationary spiral. Mismanagement of fiscal policy made the country vulnerable to external factors, and a sharp drop in the price of oil sent the Soviet economy into a tailspin. Throughout the 1970s and '80s, the Soviet Union ranked as one of the world's top producers of energy resources such as oil and natural gas, and exports of those commodities played a vital role in shoring up the world's largest command economy. When oil plunged from \$120 a barrel in 1980 to \$24 a barrel in March 1986, this vital lifeline to external capital dried up. The price of oil temporarily spiked in the wake of Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in August 1990, but by that point the collapse of the Soviet Union was well under way.

It is a widely held belief that Soviet defense spending accelerated dramatically in response to the presidency of Ronald Reagan and proposals such as the Strategic Defense Initiative. In fact, the Soviet military budget had been trending upward since at least the early 1970s. Outside estimates of Soviet military spending ranged between 10 and 20 percent of GDP, and, even within the Soviet Union itself, it was difficult to produce an exact accounting because the military budget involved a variety of government ministries, each with its own competing interests. What can be said definitively, however, is that military spending was consistently agnostic of overall economic trends: even when the Soviet economy lagged, the military remained well-funded. In addition, the military took priority when it came to research and development talent. Technological innovators and would-be entrepreneurs who could have helped support Gorbachev's partial transition to a market economy were instead funneled into defense industries.

In addition to budgetary matters, the Soviet involvement in Afghanistan (1979–89) was a key military factor in the breakup of the U.S.S.R. The Soviet army, lionized for its role in World War II and a vital tool in the repression of the Hungarian Revolution and Prague Spring, had waded into a quagmire in a region known as the Graveyard of Empires. As many as a million Soviet troops participated in the 10-year occupation, and approximately 15,000 were killed and thousands more were wounded. More than a million Afghans—mostly civilians—were killed, and at least 4 million were externally displaced by the fighting. The army that had bested Hitler and crushed dissent during the Cold War found itself frustrated by mujahideen armed with American surface-to-air missiles. As long as the government controlled the press, dissent about the war in Afghanistan remained muted, but glasnost opened the door to the vocalization of widespread war weariness. The army, perhaps the single most powerful opponent of Gorbachev's reform efforts, found itself back-footed by the stalemate in Afghanistan, and it lost whatever leverage it might have had in checking the advance of perestroika. In the Soviet republics, the *Afgantsy* (veterans of the Afghan conflict) agitated against what they perceived to be Moscow's war. Many soldiers from the Central Asian republics felt closer ethnic and religious ties to Afghans than they did to Russians, and protests were widespread. In the European republics, the

cleavage with Moscow was even more dramatic. Antiwar demonstrations broke out in Ukraine, while opposition forces in the Baltic republics viewed the war in Afghanistan through the lens of the Russian occupation of their own countries. This fueled the secessionist movements that proceeded, largely unchecked, to declarations of independence by all three Baltic states in 1990.

Throughout the Cold War, the Soviet Union and the United States teetered on the edge of mutual nuclear destruction. What few had considered, however, was that the Soviet Union would be brought down by an incident involving a civilian nuclear plant. Gorbachev had been in power for just over a year when, on April 26, 1986, the Unit 4 reactor at the Chernobyl power station in Prypyat (now in Ukraine) exploded. The explosion and subsequent fires released more than 400 times the amount of radioactive fallout as the atomic bomb that was dropped on Hiroshima. The official response to the disaster would be a test of Gorbachev's doctrine of openness, and, in that regard, glasnost would be found fatally wanting. Communist Party officials acted quickly to suppress information about the severity of the disaster, going as far as to order that May Day parades and celebrations in the affected area should proceed as planned despite the known risk of radiation exposure. Western reports about the dangerously high levels of wind-transported radioactivity were dismissed as gossip, while apparatchiks

The radiation leak was under control on May 4, but Gorbachev did not issue an official statement to the public until May 14, 18 days after the disaster. He characterized the incident at Chernobyl as a "misfortune" and pilloried Western media coverage as a "highly immoral campaign" of "malicious lies." Over time, Communist Party propaganda was increasingly at odds with the daily experiences of those in the contamination zone who were dealing with the physical effects of radiation poisoning. Whatever trust remained in the Soviet system had been shattered. Decades later, Gorbachev marked the anniversary of the disaster by stating, "even more than my launch of perestroika, [Chernobyl] was perhaps the real cause of the collapse of the Soviet Union five years later."

On August 19 1991, A coup d'état against Gorbachev took place in Moscow. Acting in advance of the signing of the New Union Treaty, which was Gorbachev's initiative to preserve the Soviet Union by granting more autonomy to the constituent republics, a so-called 'State Committee on the State of Emergency' (GKChP) is formed by representatives of the Soviet State, KGB, CPSU, and the military-industrialists. The putschists place Gorbachev under house arrest in his Crimean dacha and, after his refusal to cooperate, replace him with Gennady Yanayev as Acting President of the Soviet Union. The coup openly opposes democratisation and liberalisation, which are blamed for the socio-economic crises plaguing the country.

On August 21, 1991, the coup got broken, and the Soviet Union has just days to live. Mass protests occur in Moscow when the coup is announced, and Yeltsin famously clambers atop a tank outside the Russian Parliament to give a speech denouncing the "right-wing, reactionary, anti-constitutional coup d'etat". Three civilians are killed in clashes with the

military. The coup is undermined by the weakness, indecision, and alcoholism of its instigators. Faced with mass unrest and an increasingly unsupportive military, the GKChP calls off its tanks.

On December 25, 1991, Gorbachev gave his farewell speech, announcing his resignation as President of the Soviet Union. Despite his attempts to preserve some semblance of a union and his own place within it, he is forced to concede his position to Yeltsin, the inaugural President of the Russian Federation. The Union is replaced with a much weaker Commonwealth of Independent States, which does not include many of the former constituent republics. One day later, the upper chamber of the Supreme Soviet votes both itself and the Soviet Union out of existence, formally bringing the empire to an end.

## Aftermath and details of the topic

Immediately after the dissolution of the Soviet Union, people's entire life savings got wiped out. The economy completely collapsed, people were put out of work, their pensions that they'd paid into for decades were gone, and the value of the ruble went into freefall. People began trying to exchange their money for any kind of western currency they could, which led to even more economic freefall.

It's estimated that between 3-4 million people died prematurely between 1992-1999, due to starvation, suicide, lack of medical services, violence, and a myriad of other problems. The life expectancy for a Russian Male dropped from about 64 years of age in 1992 to 57.5 years of age in 1994, which is staggering. Infant mortality rates skyrocketed, and there was a huge diaspora of Russians in western countries because of it. Furthermore, international adoption rates also skyrocketed, as parents put their children up for adoption because they could not feed them.

As this was happening, national elites (some who were high ranking CPSU party members with little ideological love for the USSR, others who had been dissidents and advocates for glasnost and perestroika, and other liberalizing policies) basically began to carve-up the massive amount of material wealth that was previously state-controlled. At first, Boris Yeltsin tried to limit this, but as Russia fell more and more into complete despair, he had little choice but to sell off extremely lucrative Russian enterprises and natural resources to the modern-day Russian oligarchy, often for the equivalent of pennies on the dollar. With this came massive amounts of political collusion and corruption; Yeltsin used the oligarchy to maintain his power, while the oligarchy used Yeltsin to amass exorbitant amounts of wealth in an extremely short amount of time, all while the average Russian citizen suffered with almost no positive future outlook. While the Oligarchy's ownership of the different industries did lead to some increase in jobs, the mismanagement of the wealth that came out of those industries led to only a tiny fraction of it going back into the pockets of the Russian people.

As this is happening in Russia, much of the same happens in the other smaller ex-SSRs. Some of them had been so underdeveloped that the results of the collapse harmed them less than the Russians, and some were hurt even more. In each country (as they were becoming again), power struggles developed and almost all of them had varying degrees of violence. Literacy rates plummeted across the board, as did nutrition and health services. Some countries went through revolving doors of corrupt leaders, while others traded what they perceived as one authoritarian regime for another.

And then there are the nuclear weapons. When the USSR collapsed, the world suddenly had a dozen or so brand-new countries who didn't even have constitutions yet, but they had nukes. So as these countries are often cycling through governments and leaders, each one they

cycle through gets their own set of nuclear launch codes. The west (rightly) feared that this instability would lead to the eventual sale of nuclear weapons to places where America didn't want them to go, and this led to some NATO/US involvement in these countries to try to buy the weapons from them so they could eventually be dismantled. The most famous was the 1994 Budapest Memorandum agreement in Ukraine, which today carries a very ominous sentiment among Ukrainians in the modern context.

### **The Baltic republics**

Since 1990, their economies have grown around fourfold, though not without the occasional financial convulsion. Population levels tell a different story though: all three countries have lost at least 10 percent of their populations, and only Estonia has seen a sharp increase in life expectancy. Democratic records are exemplary, but the countries sit surprisingly low on international measures for wellbeing and happiness.

### **The EU borderlands**

Ukraine, Belarus and Moldova, the other European former republics, have endured rather than relished independence. Ukraine and Moldova sustained catastrophic economic contraction through the 1990s when their GDP slumped by more than half. Belarus, under the autocratic rule of Alexander Lukashenko since 1994, suffered less, but taken together, the troika has the weakest economic figures of all post-Soviet regions, and populations have dwindled by more than 10 percent and life expectancy has fallen. Moldova has the best record of free and fair elections, but also became the first Soviet republic to return a communist (Vladimir Voronin) to power. Elections in 2009 sparked civil unrest. Moldova also hosts to one of the post-Soviet space's many frozen conflicts in which Russophones of the Transdnistr region sought secession. Ukraine's democratic turning point - the orange revolution of 2004 - rapidly gave way to paralysis and stalemate, the country deeply divided between russophone east and nationalist west. In Belarus, Lukashenko has faced lengthy international isolation for crushing opposition and dissent and rigging his own re-election.

### **The Caucasus**

Azerbaijan's oil dividend makes it one of the strongest performing economies in the post-Soviet space, and it is one of the few former Soviet republics with a growing population. Armenia and Georgia have both seen incipient growth through the 2000s rudely interrupted by the global recession of 2008/09. The frozen conflicts of Nagorno-Karabakh (Azerbaijan and Armenia) and Abkhazia (Georgia) have exacted a political and economic price, and in Georgia's case a fractured relationship with its dominant northern neighbour Russia has resulted in the only war between former Soviet republics (2008). Armenia suffers from the worst unemployment of all 15 republics, and democratic breakthroughs have been few - only Georgia has held free and fair

elections. Still, life expectancy has risen sharply across the region, and infant mortality rates have been reduced impressively.

## **Central Asia**

A mixed economic story: Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan, with their enormous hydrocarbon reserves, have expanded their economies more than 400 percent over the period; growth in the other three republics, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan has been more modest. Populations have grown in all republics bar Kazakhstan, but life expectancy has barely budged: central Asians can still expect to die in their 60s. And although these are the happiest post-Soviet republics, according to the Happy Planet Index, not one has held a genuinely free or fair election since 1990; central Asia is where elections are deferred or else won with 99 percent of the vote by dictators who lock up their opponents and even ban ballot and name a month of the year after their mother (Turkmenistan). In terms of leadership, Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan are not post-Soviet at all: they have simply stuck with the strongmen who led them out of the Soviet Union. Turkmenistan did the same until he died in 2006, while Tajikistan's Emomali Rahmon (Rahmonov during Soviet times) has run his republic uncontested since 1992. Only in Kyrgyzstan has popular will bucked the trend: Soviet-era leader Askar Akayev was ousted in 2005, as was his successor Kurmanbek Bakiyev five years later.

## **Russia**

Under Vladimir Putin, Russia has reversed its dramatic economic decline such that its economy is now twice as big as it was in 1990 - and four times bigger than in 2000. But that is a rare positive indicator in a country that has lost 7 million people since 1991, its life expectancy persisting stubbornly below 70 on account of, among other factors, chronic problems with drug and alcohol abuse. Russia has the highest HIV rate (along with Ukraine), the highest homicide rate and the highest prison population of the former Soviet Union. It languishes near the bottom of the Global Peace Index. Elections, once pluralistic and even commended by the OSCE, are once again foregone conclusions; governors, once elected, are now appointed. The 'vertical' of power centred on the Kremlin appears as strong as it was in Soviet times

## **Post-Soviet Background and Nostalgia**

### **Regional organizations:**

- Belarus, Russia, and Ukraine founded the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) in December 1991. It was conceived as a successor organization to the USSR, and in December 1993 it included 12 of the 15 former Soviet republics (except the three Baltic states). It currently consists of nine of the 15 former Soviet republics, with one associate state (Turkmenistan). Georgia withdrew from the CIS in August 2008, while Ukraine stopped participating from the CIS in May 2018.
- The three Baltic states have not sought membership in any of these post-Soviet organizations, seeking and achieving membership in the European Union and NATO instead, although their electricity and rail systems remain closely connected with former Soviet organizations. The sole exception to the above has been their recent membership in the Community of Democratic Choice.
- The Central Asian states of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan (as well as Belarus) are members of the CIS and participate in several regional organizations that have Russia as a primary mover. Such organizations are the Eurasian Economic Community (later merged with Eurasian Economic Union, which Tajikistan and Uzbekistan are not members of), Collective Security Treaty Organization, and the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation. The last two groups only became distinct once Uzbekistan withdrew from GUAM and sought membership in EurAsEcand CSTO (which it subsequently withdrew from in 2008 and 2012, respectively).
- Armenia, besides its membership in CIS participates in the Collective Security Treaty Organization and the Eurasian Economic Union.
- Moldova and Azerbaijan participate in the CIS but other than that they mostly cooperate within regional organizations that are not dominated by Russia. Such organizations are GUAM and the Community of Democratic Choice. Although Ukraine is one of the three founding countries of the CIS, it is legally not a member because it has never ratified the 1993 CIS Charter.
- Turkmenistan is an associate member of CIS (having withdrawn from full membership in August 2005) and a member in the Economic Cooperation Organization; it has not sought closer integration in any of the other Western or post-Soviet organizations.
- In 2008, Georgia notified the CIS executive bodies of its decision to leave the regional organization, and according to the CIS Charter (sec. 1, art. 9) this decision went into force 12 months after the notification date.



#### *Eurasian Economic Community:*

The Eurasian Economic Community (EAEC or EurAsEC) was a regional organisation between 2000 and 2014 which aimed for the economic integration of its member states. The organisation originated from the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) on 29 March 1996, with the treaty on the establishment of the Eurasian Economic Community signed on 10 October 2000 in Kazakhstan's capital Astana by Presidents Alexander Lukashenko of Belarus, Nursultan Nazarbayev of Kazakhstan, Askar Akayev of Kyrgyzstan, Vladimir Putin of Russia, and Emomali Rahmon of Tajikistan. Uzbekistan joined the community on 7 October 2005, but later withdrew on 16 October 2008.

#### *North Atlantic Treaty Organization:*

Three former Soviet states are members of NATO: Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Georgia, where both public opinion and the ruling government favor NATO membership, is in the Intensified Dialogue program with NATO. Ukraine also declared joining NATO as its geopolitical goal once again in 2017 (the first time being right after the Orange Revolution and in the beginning of presidency of Viktor Yushchenko), after the presidency of Viktor Yanukovych, during which the government officially declared neutrality and ceased to seek NATO membership.

Other states in the Partnership for Peace and Individual Partnership Action Plan program include Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Russia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan.

#### *GUAM:*

Four member states, namely Georgia, Ukraine, Azerbaijan and Moldova, established the GUAM group that was largely seen as intending to counter Russian dominance in the region. Notably, these four nations do not participate in any of the other regional organizations that sprang up in the region since the dissolution of the Soviet Union (other than the CIS).

### *Union State:*

The Union State of Russia and Belarus was originally formed on 2 April 1996 under the name *Commonwealth of Russia and Belarus*, before being tightened further on 8 December 1999. It was initiated by the president of Belarus, Alexander Lukashenko. On paper, the Union of Russia and Belarus intends further integration, beyond the scope of mere cooperation, including the introduction of the Rouble as a common currency.

### **Political integration and security alliances:**

- Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe (SPforSEE) with Moldova (similar in structure to CEFTA, but does not focus on economy but security, for those countries that are not NATO members); this organization largely cooperates with NATO, and is related to the group of observers at Western European Union (WEU).
- The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), for Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Central European countries that have also joined the EU (the EU membership includes also WEU membership because they follow the Common Foreign and Security Policy and European Security and Defence Policy policies shared now by the EU, the WEU and all European NATO members).
- The other remaining countries are those part of the former Yugoslavia, but their recent conflict and political tensions still does not allow them to cooperate efficiently for their political integration and for their mutual security; in addition, they still do not have full sovereignty in this domain (some of them are still under surveillance by EU or NATO, as mandated by UNO). They still need to find an internal stability and they can collaborate economically with the help of other organizations focusing on economy or political cooperation and development. However a more limited cooperation for security is possible through their membership to the larger Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE).
- The only exception is Belarus (whose post-soviet democratic transition did not occur) that still rejects political integration, and all security alliances with NATO, OSCE, WEU or other countries in Europe other than Russia (which the process of reintegration of Belarus has been tightened in almost all domains).

## **Politics:**

Regarding political freedom in the former Soviet republics, Freedom House's 2021 report listed the following:

- Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania as "free" countries.
- Armenia, Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine were listed as "partly free".
- Azerbaijan, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan were listed as "not free".

Similarly, the Press Freedom Index published by Reporters Without Borders in 2022 recorded the following as regards press freedom:

- Estonia — "Good situation"
- Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova — "Satisfactory situation"
- Armenia, Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, Ukraine — "Problematic situation"
- Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan — "Difficult situation"
- Azerbaijan, Belarus, Russia, Turkmenistan — "Very serious situation"

It has been remarked that several post-Soviet states did not change leadership for decades since their independence, such as Nursultan Nazarbayev in Kazakhstan until his surprise resignation in 2019, and Islam Karimov in Uzbekistan, until his death in September 2016. All of these had originally more limited terms but through decrees or referendums prolonged their stay in office (a practice also followed by Presidents Alexander Lukashenko of Belarus and Emomali Rahmon of Tajikistan). Askar Akayev of Kyrgyzstan had likewise served as President since its independence until he was forced to resign as a result of the Kyrgyz revolution of 2005. Saparmurat Niyazov in Turkmenistan ruled from independence until his death in 2006, creating a personality cult around himself. His successor, Gurbanguly Berdimuhamedov, has maintained a personality cult of his own that has replaced the worshipping of Niyazov.

The issue of dynastic succession has been another element affecting the politics of some post-Soviet States. Heydar Aliyev, after constructing an extensive and ongoing cult of personality, handed the Presidency of Azerbaijan to his son, Ilham Aliyev. Theories about the children of other leaders in Central Asia being groomed for succession abound. The participation of Akayev's son and daughter in the 2005 Kyrgyz parliamentary elections boosted fears of dynastic succession being used in Kyrgyzstan as well, and may have contributed to the anti-Akayev climate that led to his overthrow.

## **Current Situation**

A quarter of a century has passed since the disintegration of the Soviet Union, yet the fundamental character of relations between the former Soviet states remains contested. There is no agreement on what is legitimate in relations between these states, and the limits and constraints on the exercise of sovereignty by the former Soviet republics. The post-Soviet ‘space’ remains precisely a politically undetermined area, with questions raised over whether it represents a coherent region at all. It is not even clear what to call this part of the world, since the use of the prefix ‘post’ by definition accentuates what came before, rather than focusing on what the region now is or what these countries could become.

The question of what is legitimate in post-Soviet Eurasia is fundamentally contested, and reflects broader divisions about the end of the Cold War, the security promises made at that time and, ultimately, conceptualization of the ‘imperial’ character of the Soviet Union and its continuer state, Russia. The concept of legitimacy is always relational, dependent on understanding the broader political context, the character of historical time and a country’s relative position in a power system. Equally, sovereignty is rarely absolute but part of a broader dynamic of international relations.

## Expectations and Rules of Procedure of the Committee

- How will this committee function?

Although this committee is a General Assembly committee, it will be handled a little differently from the GA committees as a matter of course. You will be in a discussion environment that will mostly work in the format of a beginner committee.

- Characteristics that are separate from GA committees

Depending on how long the delegates participate in the committee, your document writing speed and quality, some crisis committee procedures may be processed in this committee. Such details will be given as a workshop during the conference.

- The document to be written

The Resolution Paper will be written as the final document for the solutions you will discuss in this committee.

- Additions

As mentioned above, the CC procedure could be used during the sessions. It can be with general debate governing rules(for example Tour de Table can be used instead of General Speakers List), updates even responding and taking actions to these with directives.

Furthermore, **it does not mean that this committee will be mostly governed by CC procedure. It will be mostly governed by General Assembly(GA) procedure.** The delegates should be aware of that before the committee actually begins.

## Crisis Committee Procedure

### *Tour de Table*

Typically, the Committee comes to choices by letting the conversation go on until everyone is in agreement. The Committee may employ a tour de table if negotiations come to a standstill.

The President will decide how to hold the Tour de Table. To ensure that every member state has a chance to express their position and to provide the Presidency some time to gather information, the Presidency asks each delegate to provide a brief summary of their thoughts on the topic of discussion.

### *Directives*

#### Personal Directive

Your personal directives are shared with the backroom, or chairboard in this case. You are the only one who can see the responses, and nobody else can view them outside of the backroom (unless they are spying on you). You may utilize these instructions to serve your own interests or the interests of the cabinet.

#### Joint Directive

Directives filed on behalf of a few characters are known as joint directives. Joint directives, which are typically prepared by a single crisis delegate, are sent by characters who share responsibilities or are used to pool resources. However, if two characters in separate cabinets have a cause to collaborate, they can also send combined directives.

Directives are similar to resolutions in traditional committees, with the notable exception that they do not include preambulatory clauses and are much shorter and more concise. Directives are generally written in response to a specific crisis update, and can be as short as two or three clauses. Once a directive has collected the required number of signatories, it is sent to the Dias. A delegate can then motion to introduce all directives on the table. Some Chairs may elect to set a cap on the maximum number of directives, and in which case an unmoderated caucus will often be necessary for delegates to compare similar directives and merge them.

## **Questions to be Addressed**

- 1) What can be done to improve the economical power and stability in the post soviet countries?
- 2) How can regional and political stability in the region be improved?
- 3) How can the living and economic standards of people be improved and what can be done to assure the improvements continue in the future?
- 4) Which solutions can be implemented to prevent any military escalations in the region?
- 5) How can the surplus of nuclear weaponry in the region be managed and how should they be regulated to prevent nuclear threats?

## **Further Reading and Bibliography**

<https://www.chathamhouse.org/2016/12/russia-question-sovereignty-and-legitimacy-post-soviet- Eurasia>

<https://huri.harvard.edu/news/return-history-post-soviet-space-thirty-years-after-fall-ussr>

<https://carnegieendowment.org/2017/06/30/whose-rules-whose-sphere-russian-governance-and-influence-in-post-soviet-states-pub-71403>

<https://www.hnmun.org/specpol>