



ATAMODELUN

North Atlantic Treaty
Organization

STUDY GUIDE

Table of Contents

- 1. Letter from the Secretariat,**
- 2. Letters from the Co-Under-Secretaries-General,**
- 3. Introduction to the Committee,**
 - a. Historical Background,**
 - i. The Foundation of Transatlantic Security (1949–1990),**
 - ii. Post-Cold War Divergence and the Wales Summit (1991–2014),**
 - iii. The Pivot to Asia and American Burden-Sharing Frustrations (2011–2021),**
 - iv. The Present Structural Dilemma,**
 - b. Committee Structure,**
 - i. Procedural Governance and Operational Mechanics,**
 - ii. NATO Member States Matrix and Information,**
 - iii. Trump Cabinet Matrix and Information,**
- 4. Bibliography.**

1. Letter from the Secretariat,

Dear Delegates,

It is our distinct honor and privilege to welcome you all to ATAMUN '2026. On behalf of the Secretariat and the Executive Board, we extend our warmest greetings as we prepare to embark on an exceptional journey defined by constructive debate, diplomatic negotiation, and global problem-solving.

This year marks a monumental step forward for our conference. We are exceptionally proud to announce our affiliations with Yale Model United Nations (YMUN LIII) and Oxford Global. These partnerships underscore our unwavering commitment to maintaining world-class academic standards, fostering international educational exchange, and offering our delegates a diplomatic experience rooted in the highest global benchmark of MUN excellence.

This Study Guide has been meticulously drafted by the Academic Team of North Atlantic Treaty Organisation to provide you with a comprehensive, nuanced foundation for your committee deliberations. It outlines the core historical context, key political dynamics, and central questions facing your respective committees. We strongly encourage you to immerse yourselves in your delegation's foreign policy, push the boundaries of innovative policymaking, and engage with the debate in a spirit of true diplomatic leadership.

We wish you a fruitful and rewarding preparation process, and we eagerly look forward to seeing the impactful debates you will lead at ATAMUN '2026.

Warmest regards,

Kerem Veysel Düzgün & Hasan Arif Ege Başkurt

Co-Secretaries-General, ATAMUN '2026

2. Letters from the Co-Under-Secretaries-General,

Distinguished Participants,

First and foremost, I wholeheartedly welcome you all to this prestigious conference. I am Günel Ceritoğlu and I am delighted to announce that I will be serving as your Under-Secretary-General throughout this conference. I would also like to extend my sincere gratitude to the Executive, Academic, and Organisational Team for their excellent hard-work.

While extending my deepest gratitude, I would also like to express my appreciation towards my Co-Under-Secretaries-General Doğukan Yorgancı and Kaan Muştı. We have worked diligently in order to provide you with a well-prepared Study Guide and now it is your time to work hard in order to do well in this committee. As you will appreciate, we have included mostly everything you need to know for this committee, in this Study Guide. So please read it thoroughly.

Last but not least, I would like to remind you all that this committee is a very unique one with a Rules of Procedure that has never been seen before. That is why we offer our guidance so if you have any further questions do not hesitate to contact us.

Now the Floor is Yours.

Mail: gunelceritoglu@gmail.com

Phone: +90 546 919 20 10

Co-Under-Secretary-General,

Günel Ceritoğlu

Dear delegates,

It is with the utmost respect and sincere aspiration to welcome you all to this prestigious conference and committee. Before prelude, I would like to extend my thanks to the Secretariat, the rest of the Executive Team, and the Academic and Organization Teams for their meritorious efforts on the creation of this conference.

Besides, I would like to thank my Co-Under Secretaries General, Doğukan Yorgancı and Günel Ceritoğlu for their honorable, quite precious, in short; inutterable efforts. Their presence is incredibly valuable to me, no matter where I am, be it at MUN conferences or anywhere else you can imagine. My deepest gratitude goes to my dear friends, who has always been by my side, through both my darkest moments and my happiest days.

As your Co-Under Secretary General, I am highly suggesting you read this document thoroughly. We wrote a highly elaborated study guide for you all. It includes every detail you would need generally. You should be completely prepared with all of the information you require; your allocation's policies, positions, opinions, etc. In conclusion, I assure you all have your best times in this committee. Best wishes for your endeavors.

Kind regards,

Co-Under Secretary General,

Kaan MUŞTU

Mail: kaansettar@gmail.com

It is with immense pleasure and pride to have you in our committee.

The study guide is your main source for research and is the main guideline for the committee.

Günel and Kaan are great Co-USGs to have.

I thank the Executive Board for the great opportunity and support and also for believing in us and our dream.

If you have any inquiries please do not hesitate to contact me via the contact info below.

Most sincerely,

Doğukan YORGANCI.

Co-Under-Secretary-General of NATO

dogukanyorganci@gmail.com

+90 (541) 813 20 08

3. Introduction to the Committee,

The North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) is a security alliance currently led by 32 countries from North America and Europe. It was formed in 1949 with the “*North Atlantic Treaty*” in order to safeguard the member countries’ freedom and security by political and military means. Originally NATO was created by 12 countries which are Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Norway, Portugal, The Netherlands, United Kingdom and last but not least, the United States of America. These countries are called “*The 12 Founding Members*”.

a. Historical Background,

i. *The Foundation of Transatlantic Security (1949–1990),*

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was established in 1949 on an asymmetrical security bargain forged in the aftermath of World War II. Under the Washington Treaty, particularly Article 5's collective defense clause, the United States extended its conventional military capacity and nuclear umbrella to safeguard war-torn European allies against Soviet expansionism. In return, Western European nations provided strategic forward-basing access, local logistical support, and political alignment during the Cold War. While this architecture successfully deterred major conflict in Europe for four decades, it embedded a structural dependency: the United States assumed the role of primary security guarantor, while European nations relied heavily on American military power to underwrite their territorial defense.

ii. *Post-Cold War Divergence and the Wales Summit (1991–2014),*

The dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991 removed NATO's primary existential threat, prompting Western nations to cash in on a "peace dividend." European governments systematically reduced defense budgets, scaled down active armed forces, and redirected public expenditure toward social and economic programs. Simultaneously, the United States shifted its strategic focus

toward out-of-area operations, notably in the Balkans during the 1990s and across the Middle East following the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks.

This operational divergence gradually exposed significant military capacity gaps between American forces and European allies. The tension reached a critical turning point during the 2014 Wales Summit, following Russia's annexation of Crimea. Recognizing the systemic underfunding of European militaries, NATO member states pledged to reverse declining defense budgets and move toward spending at least 2% of their Gross Domestic Product (GDP) on defense within a decade, with 20% allocated to major equipment procurement and research.

iii. The Pivot to Asia and American Burden-Sharing Frustrations (2011–2021),

Alongside European defense shortfalls, American foreign policy underwent a fundamental realignment. Beginning with the Obama administration's "Pivot to Asia" in 2011, Washington increasingly identified the Indo-Pacific, and the rise of China, as its primary long-term strategic challenge. This strategic reorientation generated growing frustration among American policymakers across the political spectrum, who argued that US taxpayers were heavily subsidizing European security while European capitals remained unwilling to meet their agreed-upon 2% GDP spending targets.

Under the Trump administration, these long-standing diplomatic tensions escalated into open geopolitical friction. Washington explicitly conditioned the reliability of US security guarantees on member states meeting their financial commitments, threatening troop redeployments and questioning the traditional interpretation of Article 5. Although the Biden administration subsequently restored traditional diplomatic norms, the core strategic dilemma persisted: the United States could no longer maintain a heavy, permanent force posture in Europe without compromising its military readiness and strategic posture in the Indo-Pacific.

iv. *The Present Structural Dilemma*

The full-scale invasion of Ukraine introduced a complex paradox to transatlantic relations. On one hand, it validated American warnings regarding European vulnerability, triggering historic increases in defense spending across allied capitals and revitalizing NATO's unity. On the other hand, it deepened European operational reliance on American intelligence, surveillance, logistics, and heavy firepower, precisely at a moment when Washington faced mounting domestic pressure to curb foreign expenditures and prioritize Pacific deterrence.

Today, the transatlantic alliance stands at an inflection point. The historical framework constructed in 1949 is no longer sustainable in its original form. The central challenge facing both sides is no longer whether the alliance should exist, but how to redefine its military, financial, and command structures to reconcile American global flexibility with European security guarantees.

b. Committee Structure,

This committee operates as a dual-cabinet Bilateral Deal Summit designed to simulate high-stakes international negotiations between the executive leadership of the United States and the member states of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation.. Rather than functioning as a traditional multi-lateral parliamentary assembly drafting non-binding resolutions, the committee operates through two distinct, co-equal governing bodies working to negotiate and execute a single, legally binding international treaty titled The Dual-Sovereignty Strategic Compact.

i. Procedural Governance and Operational Mechanics

The committee's procedural framework balances internal cabinet deliberation with joint bilateral negotiation.

1. Dual-Cabinet System: The committee is divided into two primary decision-making bodies: the United States Cabinet, encompassing executive, military, and legislative officials, and the NATO Cabinet, encompassing the North Atlantic Council, Secretary General, and allied member-state representatives. Each cabinet maintains independent procedural authority over its internal strategy and position alignment.

2. Deliberative Modes: During Cabinet Caucuses, joint debate is suspended to allow each cabinet to confer internally, refine strategy, and draft counter-proposals. Official inter-cabinet communication during these periods occurs through written diplomatic notes or the formal dispatch of up to two Diplomatic Envoys for time-limited side consultations.

During Bilateral Moderated Debate, formal joint sessions take place where designated representatives from both cabinets engage in alternating debate to contest specific policy pillars, financial figures, and legal commitments.

3. Presidential Dual-Seated Status: The President of the United States holds full speaking, debating, and negotiating privileges across both cabinets simultaneously. The President functions as the primary diplomatic bridge, moving between internal cabinet deliberations and direct bilateral exchanges with allied heads of state. However, any tentative deal reached by the President remains subject to final domestic legislative approval by the US Cabinet.

4. Line-by-Line Redlining: During drafting phases, both cabinets review a single, projected master document titled The Dual-Sovereignty Strategic Compact. Delegates propose direct line edits, numerical modifications, and conditional insertions to achieve consensus text.

5. Dual-Ratification Mechanism: The final treaty enters into force only upon satisfying a strict three-tier threshold:

1. A two-thirds supermajority vote in the NATO Cabinet.
2. Formal executive execution by the President of the United States.
3. A two-thirds supermajority vote in the US Cabinet, simulating *US Senate Treaty Ratification* under *Article II of the US Constitution*.

ii. NATO Member States Matrix and Information,

The NATO Cabinet represents a coalition of sovereign nations bound by mutual defense obligations, yet divided by geographic priorities, domestic economic constraints, and varying degrees of reliance on American security guarantees. Member states are broadly grouped into *three* strategic blocs:

1. Eastern Flank and High-Deterrence Bloc: Prioritizes immediate territorial defense and an irrevocable US military presence above all other issues. Willing to meet high spending targets to keep American troops anchored on their soil.

2. European Autonomy and Central European Bloc: Pushes for European industrial defense self-reliance and resists mandatory spending that requires purchasing exclusively American-made military hardware.

3. Southern Flank and Fiscal Pragmatist Bloc: Advocates for expanding NATO mandate to cover Mediterranean security, migration, and cyber threats while seeking flexibility in how the defense spending floor is calculated.

Also, we would like to remind you all that your allocations are the representatives of each NATO Member State so you have to research both your countries policy and each one of your allocations interest and their goal thoroughly.

Individual Member Positions:

- ***United Kingdom***

Primary Focus: Nuclear deterrence, maintaining the transatlantic alliance, NATO's maritime posture, and preserving NATO as Europe's primary security framework.

Key Red Lines and Leverage: Red line is any weakening of NATO's central role in European security or a significant reduction in the U.S. commitment to Europe. Leverage includes Britain's

nuclear deterrent, intelligence capabilities through Five Eyes, and deployable naval and carrier strike capabilities.

- **Germany**

Primary Focus: European security and deterrence, fiscal sustainability, defense-industrial cooperation, and serving as NATO's central logistics hub in Europe.

Key Red Lines and Leverage: Red lines are sudden defense-spending increases that create severe domestic fiscal pressure and policies that undermine German industrial interests. Leverage includes Ramstein Air Base, Landstuhl Regional Medical Center, major NATO logistics infrastructure, and Germany's central geographic position for reinforcement of the Eastern Flank.

- **France**

Primary Focus: European strategic autonomy, an independent European defense-industrial base, nuclear deterrence, and reducing excessive European dependence on the United States.

Key Red Lines and Leverage: Mandatory procurement requirements that force European allies to prioritize U.S. defense equipment over European alternatives. Leverage includes France's nuclear deterrent, military capabilities, leadership in European defense initiatives, and its influence within the North Atlantic Council.

- **Canada**

Primary Focus: Maintaining transatlantic unity, NATO collective defense, Arctic and Northern security, and strengthening Canada's role within the alliance.

Key Red Lines and Leverage: Weakening of NATO's collective-defense commitment or policies that marginalize Canada's strategic role in the alliance. Leverage includes Canada's Arctic geography, military contributions to NATO's Northern Flank, and its close defense and intelligence relationship with the United States and European allies.

- **Poland**

Primary Focus: Eastern Flank deterrence, permanent U.S. and NATO military presence, rapid reinforcement capabilities, and strong air and missile defense.

Key Red Lines and Leverage: Any unilateral U.S. or NATO troop withdrawal from Eastern Europe or a reduction in resources dedicated to the Eastern Flank. Leverage includes Poland's exceptionally high defense spending, its strategic location bordering Russia and Belarus, and its role as a major host and logistics point for U.S. and NATO forces.

- **Türkiye**

Primary Focus: Southern Flank security, Mediterranean and Black Sea security, counter-terrorism, regional autonomy, and maintaining NATO attention on threats originating from the Middle East and Mediterranean.

Key Red Lines and Leverage: Diversion of NATO resources away from the Southern Flank toward the Eastern or Northern Flanks without adequate compensation. Leverage includes control over the Turkish Straits, strategic access between the Black Sea and Mediterranean, NATO's southern airspace, and Turkey's substantial military capabilities.

- **Italy**

Primary Focus: Mediterranean security, NATO's Southern Flank, migration and counter-terrorism, maritime security, and maintaining a strong U.S. and European security relationship.

Key Red Lines and Leverage: The neglect of Southern Flank security in favor of exclusively Eastern European priorities and insufficient NATO support for Mediterranean security challenges. Leverage includes Italy's central Mediterranean position, naval capabilities, military bases, and role in NATO operations in the Mediterranean.

- **Netherlands**

Primary Focus: NATO collective defense, European defense cooperation, maritime security, and strengthening the alliance's Northern and Eastern Flanks.

Key Red Lines and Leverage: Weakening NATO's collective-defense commitments or an excessive fragmentation of European defense policy. Leverage includes advanced naval and air capabilities, participation in multinational NATO formations, and its strategic position connecting the North Sea to continental Europe.

- **Romania**

Primary Focus: Black Sea security, Eastern Flank deterrence, air and missile defense, and maintaining a strong U.S. and NATO military presence in Southeastern Europe.

Key Red Lines and Leverage: Any significant reduction of NATO military presence or air-defense coverage on the Black Sea and Southeastern Flank. Leverage includes Romania's strategic Black Sea position, NATO infrastructure, and its role as a key location for reinforcing the Eastern and Southeastern Flanks.

- **Sweden**

Primary Focus: Baltic and Northern European security, deterrence against Russia, air and maritime defense, and strengthening NATO's Northern Flank.

Key Red Lines and Leverage: Inadequate NATO protection of the Baltic region and any reduction in allied commitments to Northern European security. Leverage includes Sweden's advanced defense industry, strong air and naval capabilities, and strategic geographic position in the Baltic Sea and Northern Europe.

iii. Trump Cabinet Matrix and Information,

The United States Cabinet operates under a doctrine of transactional realism and rebalanced transatlantic relations. The administration's overarching policy objective is to address long-standing burden-sharing disparities, compel European member states to assume primary responsibility for conventional territorial defense, and liberate American military, naval, and intelligence assets for re-allocation toward Indo-Pacific deterrence and homeland security.

Individual Institutional Roles:

- ***Donald Trump - President of the State***

Core Institutional Mandate: Protect U.S. national interests under an America First foreign-policy framework, strengthen U.S. military power, secure greater allied burden-sharing, and ensure that NATO commitments produce tangible benefits for the United States.

Official Strategic Constraints: Cannot allow NATO commitments to create what the administration considers an excessive or unequal burden on U.S. taxpayers and forces. Must prioritize U.S. homeland defense and other strategic theaters, particularly the Indo-Pacific, while maintaining sufficient credibility to deter adversaries. U.S. defense commitments must therefore be balanced against finite military resources and domestic political expectations.

Strategic Leverage Assets: Presidential authority over U.S. foreign and defense policy; control over U.S. military force posture; ability to condition diplomatic and security commitments; influence over U.S. defense exports; and the overall credibility of the U.S. security guarantee. The administration can also use U.S. defense procurement to strengthen American industry while encouraging allies to assume greater responsibility.

- ***JD Vance - Vice President of the State***

Core Institutional Mandate: Support the President's America First agenda and advocate for a NATO structure in which European allies assume greater responsibility for their own security. The Vice President should function as a political and strategic counterweight to arguments that the United States must indefinitely remain the primary guarantor of European security.

Official Strategic Constraints: Must remain aligned with presidential policy and cannot independently undermine NATO or U.S. foreign-policy commitments. Must balance demands for European self-reliance with maintaining enough alliance cohesion to preserve U.S. strategic influence and deterrence.

Strategic Leverage Assets: Direct access to the President, influence within the administration and Congress, ability to shape domestic political support for NATO policy, and a strong platform for arguing that European allies must increase their military contributions.

- **Marco Rubio - Secretary of State**

Core Institutional Mandate: Conduct U.S. diplomacy and translate the President's America First foreign policy into relations with NATO allies. The State Department's strategic objective is to protect core American interests while using alliances as instruments of U.S. national power.

Official Strategic Constraints: Diplomatic commitments must remain consistent with U.S. national interests and presidential direction. Rubio must preserve alliance cohesion while negotiating harder burden-sharing requirements and cannot sacrifice broader U.S. strategic priorities simply to maintain European consensus.

Strategic Leverage Assets: Diplomatic recognition and negotiations, bilateral relations with NATO governments, U.S. security guarantees, defense cooperation agreements, sanctions and diplomatic pressure, and influence over U.S. arms-transfer policy. The administration has also linked defense sales to greater allied burden-sharing.

- **Pete Hegseth - Secretary of Defense**

Core Institutional Mandate: Strengthen U.S. military readiness and deterrence while transferring a greater share of European conventional defense responsibility to European allies. Hegseth has explicitly stated that European NATO members should take primary responsibility for the defense of Europe and that increased allied spending and capabilities are essential.

Official Strategic Constraints: U.S. military resources are finite. The Pentagon, which is the headquarters building of the Department of Defense, cannot maintain an unlimited global military presence while simultaneously prioritizing homeland defense and the Indo-Pacific.

Hegseth has therefore emphasized that European allies must become force multipliers rather than permanent dependents on U.S. forces.

Strategic Leverage Assets: U.S. troops stationed in Europe, air and missile defense systems, intelligence and surveillance capabilities, strategic airlift, nuclear capabilities, military exercises, arms sales, logistics infrastructure, and the ability to alter U.S. force posture. The U.S. also possesses enormous defense-industrial capacity.

- ***Scott Bessent - Secretary of the Treasury***

Core Institutional Mandate: Protect U.S. economic security, strengthen domestic manufacturing and industrial capacity, and use economic policy as an instrument of national power. Treasury's current approach links tariffs, deregulation, domestic investment, and economic security to the broader America First strategy.

Official Strategic Constraints: Cannot support NATO policies that impose excessive economic costs on the United States or preserve trade arrangements the administration considers structurally unfair. Must balance defense spending with U.S. fiscal sustainability and economic growth.

Strategic Leverage Assets: U.S. financial power, sanctions, tariffs, access to the U.S. financial system, economic incentives, trade policy, and the enormous purchasing power of the U.S. defense market. The Treasury also has a major role in connecting economic security with national security.

- ***Kristi Noem - Secretary of Homeland Security***

Core Institutional Mandate: Protect the U.S. homeland from terrorism, transnational crime, illegal immigration, drug trafficking, cyber threats, and other cross-border security threats. Under Noem, DHS has emphasized border enforcement and returning the department to its core homeland-security mission.

Official Strategic Constraints: Homeland security priorities must remain focused on direct threats to the United States. DHS resources cannot simply be redirected toward European security at the expense of U.S. border and domestic-security requirements.

Strategic Leverage Assets: CBP, ICE, border-security capabilities, counterterrorism coordination, information-sharing, customs enforcement, maritime security, and DHS's role in addressing transnational threats.

- ***Doug Burgum - Secretary of the Interior***

Core Institutional Mandate: Advance U.S. energy dominance, develop domestic natural resources, secure critical-mineral supply chains, and reduce strategic dependence on foreign resources. The Interior Department has explicitly connected domestic energy and critical-mineral production to national and economic security.

Official Strategic Constraints: U.S. energy and mineral policy must prioritize domestic supply and reduce dependence on strategic competitors. International arrangements cannot undermine U.S. resource security or American energy production.

Strategic Leverage Assets: U.S. energy production, critical minerals, federal lands and waters, energy exports, mineral supply chains, geological data, and the enormous scale of the U.S. resource base.

- ***Robert F. Kennedy Jr. - Secretary of Health and Human Services***

Core Institutional Mandate: Protect the health and well-being of Americans, food and drug safety, environmental health, scientific integrity, and restructuring government programs for efficiency.

Official Strategic Constraints: HHS must prioritize domestic health outcomes and cannot divert major resources away from American public-health needs for conventional NATO defense objectives. International cooperation must provide a clear benefit to U.S. health security.

Strategic Leverage Assets: U.S. public-health institutions, biomedical research capacity, pharmaceutical and medical industries, disease surveillance, emergency preparedness, and scientific cooperation.

- ***Chris Wright - Secretary of Energy***

Core Institutional Mandate: Strengthen U.S. energy dominance, expand reliable energy production, protect American energy security, and use energy capacity as an element of economic and national power.

Official Strategic Constraints: Energy policy must prioritize U.S. affordability, production, industrial competitiveness, and strategic independence. The administration's energy approach strongly favors expanding domestic production and reducing dependence on foreign energy sources.

Strategic Leverage Assets: U.S. oil and natural-gas production, LNG exports, energy technology, nuclear-energy capabilities, energy infrastructure, and America's ability to provide alternatives to Russian energy supplies.

4. Bibliography.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization. (1949). The North Atlantic Treaty. Washington, D.C.:

NATO. https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_17120.htm

North Atlantic Treaty Organization. (2014). Wales Summit Declaration. Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Wales.

NATO. https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_112964.htm

U.S. National Archives and Records Administration. (1787). The Constitution of the United States: Article II. U.S. National Archives.

<https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/constitution-transcript#toc-article-ii->

Asmus, R. D. (2002). *Opening NATO's Door: How the Alliance Moved East to Rebuild Europe*. Columbia University Press. <https://doi.org/10.7312/asmu12286>

Biddle, T. D. (2020). *Coercion, Deterrence, and the Future of Transatlantic Security*. Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College. <https://press.armywarcollege.edu/monographs/912/>

Campbell, K. M. (2016). *The Pivot: The Future of American Statecraft in Asia*. Twelve / Hachette Book Group. <https://www.hachettebookgroup.com/titles/kurt-m-campbell/the-pivot/9781455568956/>

Howorth, J. (2014). *Security and Defence Policy in the European Union* (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan. <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-1-137-30811-0>

Webson, D. S., & Wallander, C. A. (1999). Imperfections and Institutions: NATO After the Cold War. *International Security*, 23(4), 54–82. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2539348>

Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS). (2023). *European Defense Capability Gaps and the Transatlantic Burden-Sharing Dilemma*. CSIS Europe, Russia, and Eurasia Program. <https://www.csis.org/analysis/europe-defense-and-transatlantic-burden-sharing>

Congressional Research Service (CRS). (2024). *NATO: Current Issues and U.S. Policy Options* (CRS Report No. R46066). U.S. Library of Congress. <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R46066>

International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS). (2024). *The Military Balance 2024: Chapter Three – Europe and NATO*. Routledge. <https://www.iiss.org/publications/the-military-balance/>

RAND Corporation. (2022). *Reinforcing the NATO Eastern Flank: Assessing Deterrence and Defence Options*. RAND Strategic Readiness Initiative. https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RRA1081-1.html