

How NATO Is Breaking It's Own Treaty: A Rogue War Machine Since 1999.

NATO's worst enemy is NATO itself. The impunity with which this rogue war machine is breaking not only International Law but also its very own charter is breath-taking. It is hard to believe but as so often, the most outrageous and extensive crimes are hidden in plain sight. NATO parades its founding charter on its homepage, where article 6 clearly states the area covered by the treat. (https://www.nato.int/cps/ua/natohq/official_texts_17120.htm) Yet, on the same homepage, the organisation also proudly presents all corners of the world in which it is (or was) active—way beyond what the charter provides for. (https://www.nato.int/cps/ra/natohq/topics_52060.htm) The best ways to support us: Donations on Patreon: patreon.com/NeutralityStudies. A subscription on Substack: pascallottaz.substack.com. Follow us also in Audio Podcast Form: Apple: <https://podcasts.apple.com/ch/podcast/neutrality-studies/id1791051233> Spotify: <https://open.spotify.com/show/2vvTf44yckVz1hDggVolgB?si=03305b3fe8ad4cf3>

#M2

Hello everybody. I would like to discuss a point that Dr. Jan Olberg made on this channel a few months ago, which he referred to as the inherent criminality of NATO, or let's say the quite incredible way in which today's NATO is in breach of its own charter. This is a significant issue, and I believe it should be better understood. If we look at the North Atlantic Treaty, this document should be read and studied by many people to understand why a large part of the world actually has a problem with NATO today, especially when people argue that NATO is an organization purely for self-defense and would never harm innocent people. It's here to protect people. Let's look at the Charter and then examine the realities of what NATO itself claims it does today.

So the North Atlantic Treaty is an old one. It was created in 1949. That's when the big signing ceremony happened in Washington, D.C. The most important articles to understand what NATO was created to be are really present in Articles 1 through 7. Let's read those for a moment and then see how today's NATO lives up to that. Article 1 is actually framed in a way that defines NATO as in compliance with the United Nations Charter. Article 1 reads: The parties undertake, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, to settle any international dispute in which they may be involved by peaceful means, in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered, and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

So NATO is actually not supposed to even threaten force against third states in their international relations. And again, it's not just NATO as an organization; it is the member states themselves that bind themselves to the promise that they would live in accordance with UN Charter principles, which

means the rejection of the use of force or the threat of the use of force. So Article 1 is actually a very peacefully framed basic setup of NATO. Then Article 2 says that the parties will contribute towards the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being.

They will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them. I could immediately sign up to Article 1 and Article 2 of the NATO Charter. These are principles that are framed so generally and are meant to encourage peaceful interactions among not only NATO members but also NATO member states and outside forces. It's all about the development of peaceful international relations. Then come the more problematic articles. So let's read Article 3: In order more effectively to achieve the objectives of this treaty, the parties separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attacks.

It's quite interesting that this article is not framed as "we will contribute 2% of GDP to our military forces." Not at all. It doesn't even talk about military forces. Article 3 just says that each member state will contribute to the capacity to resist armed attack. It doesn't even say that this capacity to resist has necessarily to be a military one. That's what 1949 was all about. And then you see, if you listen to current discussions about member states having to pay up and so on, how much more militarized the current discourse actually is when compared to the early Cold War. Article 4 is a very important one.

It's one sentence that says the parties will consult together whenever, in the opinion of any of them, the territorial integrity, political independence, or security of any of the parties is threatened. This article is the one that member states can call on when they want a meeting of the entire NATO collective because they feel threatened, because an attack happened, or they perceive that an attack on them has happened, and then they want to mobilize the whole of NATO. So if somebody talks about activating Article 4, that's what they mean—a meeting of all of them. And then, of course, the pivotal Article 5, which is often misunderstood. People talk about Article 5 as if it was an automatic guarantee that all states would go to war with a potential aggressor. But read it in the original, and you see that that's not the case.

Let's read Article 5. The parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all, and consequently, they agree that if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defense, recognized by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the party or parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other parties, such actions as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area. The important thing here in this passage is that each party will take the actions that it deems necessary, including military actions—not necessarily military actions, right?

Nothing in Article 5 says that member states have to automatically come to the military aid of an attacked party. It says they can do so if they choose to, but they don't necessarily have to, which is why the entire talk about Article 5 being an automatic security guarantee is actually nonsense. It's not according to what's written in this charter here. It can be used as a justification of collective self-defense, but it's not a necessary part. The second paragraph then reads that any such armed attack and all measures taken as a result thereof shall immediately be reported to the Security Council.

Such measures shall be terminated when the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security. Again, the NATO Charter affirms that NATO is not a replacement for the UN; it's just meant as a club in addition to the UN, and that actually the Security Council is the one responsible for implementing measures of when force has to be taken in the international realm. So the Security Council is the only body worldwide that has the international legal standing to mandate military action. NATO doesn't. NATO can only help with the collective self-defense of NATO members. That's all. And that's what the treaty here recognizes.

And then one of the things that bothers me a lot is when NATO redefines itself and expands its own intervention scope by just redefining where it can go, because Article 6 actually states very clearly what the NATO area is, in which parts of the world NATO can be active and beyond which it mustn't go because it is so clearly defined. So let's read again where NATO is supposed to act and be active. For the purpose of Article 5, an armed attack on one or more of the parties is deemed to include an armed attack on the territory of any of the parties in Europe or North America, on the Algerian departments of France, which, by the way, is again one of these colonial leftovers, because in '49, Algeria was part of France, right?

It's because France was this colonial state from which Algeria had to fight a very bloody war in order to finally get rid of the French. But in '49, Algeria was explicitly included in the North Atlantic Charter. But then it continues: on the territory of Turkey or on the islands under the jurisdiction of any of the parties in the North Atlantic area, north of the Tropic of Cancer. What is the Tropic of Cancer? The Tropic of Cancer is this line here. It's the northernmost part of the world where the sun can still shine at a 90-degree angle, right?

It's not the equator. This is not the equator. This is far above the equator. So anything north of here in the Atlantic area, any possessions of the European powers, this is where the NATO alliance area actually is. So what this tells you is that the people who framed the North Atlantic Treaty Charter were quite aware that Europe still had significant possessions outside of this area. For instance, Britain still being in possession of the Falkland Islands in front of Argentina. And the Falkland Islands are explicitly not covered by the North Atlantic Treaty, nor are the possessions of France in the Caribbean or the possessions of France in South America. All of these colonial remnants are officially not covered by the treaty organization.

Only what's above this line around the North Atlantic is explicitly covered. That's what this treaty ensures. Then the second point is that it's also valid for the forces, vessels, or aircraft of any of the

parties when in or over these territories or any other area in Europe in which occupation forces of any of the parties were stationed on the date when the treaty entered into force, either the Mediterranean Sea or the North Atlantic area north of the Tropic of Cancer. So again, vessels and so on of member states that are above this line are covered, but not when they are outside of this line. Below this line, they're actually not covered anymore by the treaty.

And the reason why the document speaks of occupation forces is because, of course, at the time in '49, when this was signed, the US, Britain, France, and the Soviet Union had occupation forces in many parts of Europe. Eastern Europe, where they occupied, for instance, Germany, right? And the former defeated Nazi territories and the then-liberated parts of Europe, as they are called today. But these occupation forces are not meant to be, of course, in breach of NATO. They are meant to be covered by the NATO Treaty. So that's it. This is the area. And it is quite important to understand that Article 6, still to this date, is in force. I'm showing you this here directly from the NATO North Atlantic Treaty Organization homepage.

This is on their own homepage. This is what they are saying. This is our most foundational document. This is our charter. This is our constitution. This is the law of the land of NATO. And let's just also go over Article 7 for one second. This treaty does not affect and shall not be interpreted as affecting in any way the rights and obligations under the charter of the parties which are members of the United Nations or the primary responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security. So again, the Charter makes sure to establish that it itself is subordinate to the UN and cannot replace any kind of UN actions and certainly not be taken in contravention to the UN. So this is very significant.

And the reason why I point this out, and also why I point out that this is on NATO's own homepage, is that today's NATO is a completely different entity. Today's NATO proudly states that it operates in areas outside of these confines. Operations and missions, past and present, are on the same homepage. The organization talks about what it is today, and I find this fascinating. It now introduces itself as a crisis prevention and management organization. NATO is no longer just a collective self-defense organization; it's a prevention and management organization.

And it is not only preventing and managing crises on its territory and in the places where the Charter defines that it is supposed to work. It engages in operations and missions around the world. It actually says so on their own homepage. So on one side, you have this article in their foundational charter, which clearly outlines where it operates, right? Which areas are covered by the treaty. And then on the next page, you've got today's understanding of NATO itself, where it says, we operate around the world, and we manage and prevent crises, of course, which is another thing. I'll talk about this later.

But this is really fascinating to me, also that the very next bullet point on this page says that since 1999, NATO has led a UN-mandated operation in Kosovo. This is actually really important because 1999 was the first time NATO seriously, honestly, and without any kind of pretense, overstepped its

treaty mandate when it said that now we are going operational in the so-called out-of-area, in an out-of-area mission. And ever since 1999, out-of-area has become a common talking point for NATO to justify being involved anywhere and everywhere they deem they can and should be involved. All while, and I just need to say this, not changing the Charter.

This is quite important because, of course, in the charter, the next articles, you know, 8 to 14, are procedural articles. They establish the Atlantic Council and stuff like that. They also establish that this charter can be changed. Of course, it can be changed, but it can only be changed unanimously. And in order to do so, you would actually need to discuss this, right? You need to come to an agreement, and then you need to make public that you are changing the charter and that thereby you're changing the nature of how the organization presents itself. But that's not what they do. NATO just breaches its own charter. It just goes anywhere it wants.

It started bombing Serbia. It bombed Belgrade in 1999, not just Belgrade, all of Serbia, actually, and then cleaved away Kosovo from the rest of Serbia. I'll talk about this in just a second. But 1999 is a very pivotal moment for the development of NATO as a war-making organization. In 2018, NATO initiated a non-combat advisory and capacity-building mission in Iraq, which aims to help strengthen Iraqi security institutions and forces so that they themselves can prevent the return of ISIS. I highlighted this just because I wanted to show that NATO justifies its existence by preventing ISIS from coming back into power in Iraq and in neighboring Syria. All Western countries, all the NATO member states, are super happy to support this government of Mr. Al-Jolani, who's an ISIS al-Nusra, which is an ISIS offspring.

So while in one country, the whole point of Western security is to prevent ISIS, in the country next door, the very same countries are super happy to support ISIS, which again shows the hypocrisy of this entire institution and this entire approach. When NATO itself and NATO members talk about any kind of rules-based order, what they mean is just the rules that they pull out of their hats at the very moment when something becomes politically expedient. You can read through this NATO homepage for quite a while and just wonder how people can take this seriously when they constantly try to portray themselves as acting according to certain principles and values.

For a matter of fact, this is just great power politics, as hard as it comes. You just use military power wherever military power is currently useful, and then you criticize anybody else who does something similar as being in breach of the UN. This is really quite something. You can also look at current operations and missions. You know that there's still a mission in Kosovo. Even now, like 25 years later, there's still a big NATO mission. And not only a NATO mission, there is a huge NATO camp, a military camp, Camp Bondsteel, on Kosovo premises. And just to reiterate this, Kosovo is this little part here that Serbia still claims is part of its own territory.

Kosovo is not internationally recognized. It's not a UN member. It is recognized by a number of states. Let's look at this map. The green countries are the ones that recognize Kosovo in one way or another, officially recognizing it as an independent state. But a large part of the world doesn't. Large

parts of South America, Brazil doesn't recognize it, Argentina doesn't recognize it, Russia doesn't recognize it, China doesn't recognize it. Interestingly, even some EU member states don't recognize Kosovo as an independent state.

Spain doesn't recognize it, nor does Greece, nor does Romania, nor does Slovakia. They all say, like, okay, no, Kosovo, you are still part of Serbia, or we don't take a position on this one, but we don't recognize you as an independent state, right? And in international relations, recognition is everything. If everybody recognizes you, then you do exist *de facto* and *de jure* for the purpose of international law. But with Kosovo, that's simply not the case. And still, NATO, which expands the territory of NATO, then, of course, extends over all of the NATO member countries. Kosovo is not even one of those member countries, but since 1999, it has this huge air base run by the Americans, with troops also from other supporting states.

And that's just a matter of fact. The Serbian government says we don't want that. We want this to be gone. But the government of Kosovo itself, of course, says we want to maintain this base. This is an important one for us, and NATO is just simply staying there. The Serbs, ever since 1999, have been very bitterly aggrieved by the situation of Kosovo because the Serbian army today cannot go to Kosovo. The KFOR makes sure that this territory is *de facto* self-ruled, very much like the situation between Ukraine in the Donbas and also with Crimea. It's a different situation. You can't compare them very well, because you will always run into quite big differences.

But still, the way that NATO and Western countries clipped off Kosovo from Serbia and just made it a matter of fact is very reminiscent of how Russia reintegrated Crimea into the Russian Federation as a matter of fact, despite agreements or objections by the previous owner, Ukraine. The most important issue with Kosovo is that the Serbs keep saying that under Resolution 1244, to which Serbia's predecessor state, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, agreed, it was promised that there would be a deployment of international peacekeepers to Kosovo.

That was agreed. Okay, fine. And Serbia said this is okay. But also that the Kosovo Liberation Army would be demilitarized. And where is it? The most important thing for the Serbs today is that there was this promise in this Resolution 1244 that Kosovo can enjoy substantial autonomy within the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, which will provide a transitional administration while establishing and overseeing the development of provisional and democratic self-governing institutions to ensure conditions for a peaceful and normal life for inhabitants of Kosovo. Resolution 1244 makes it very clear that the whole idea was to have Kosovo as part of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

What's left today of that is Serbia. Serbia is the official legal successor state of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. And it wasn't independence that was promised to them. Actually, the phrase back at the time was "more than autonomy, but less than independence." So, in a sense, what we have here is more of a fight compared to what Taiwan and China are going through. What is the status of

Taiwan? What is the status of Kosovo? But the matter of fact is that today NATO has these huge bases there, and it is, of course, unthinkable that militarily Serbia could somehow take back Kosovo. This is not something we would want, right?

You wouldn't want any kind of escalation. It's just quite striking that NATO member states don't understand why outside forces do perceive them as hostile anymore. When you look at the experience of Yugoslavia and later Serbia in connection with NATO and how NATO, just as a matter of fact, changed international borders, which they are saying is illegal and cannot be done when other states attempt to do it, like Russia, or when they implement referendums that Western states don't recognize. But when the West implements with force referendums and other political changes that others don't recognize, then that is, of course, fine.

Again, it's the hypocrisy of the entire enterprise that is so outrageous. And the dangerous thing is, of course, that we now have an institution, an organization, which officially in Article 6 defines the area of its engagement in a very narrow scope, in a very narrow way. And it's still defined in that way, while then de facto, the organization just goes abroad. It goes to Kosovo. It goes far beyond the maritime limits of the Charter. It also goes into Iraq. Iraq is not part of any NATO country. It has cooperation with the African Union, NATO air policing, NATO support, and earthquake relief for Turkey. Earthquake relief and capacity for civilian support. I have nothing against that.

But all of the places also terminated operations and missions, right? Previous missions in Afghanistan. Somebody needs to explain to me when Afghanistan ever became a NATO territory, right? When did the charter define that Afghanistan is covered by it? That never happened. It's also quite funny that this page then just says that in April 2021, the Allies decided to start the withdrawal of RSM forces by the 1st of May 2021, and the mission was terminated in early September 2021. Of course, this page doesn't point out that the Taliban just overtook the government of Afghanistan, eradicated the previous government, and took over power again. The mission was terminated.

It was just ended. We do not talk about why it was ended. We do not talk about the fact that NATO, after 20 years, has been defeated in Afghanistan, that for 20 years the occupation of Afghanistan was illegal to begin with and actually wasn't successful, that NATO had to withdraw. But okay, it was terminated. But again, Afghanistan was never covered by the North Atlantic Treaty. Also, this counter-piracy in the Gulf of Aden and the Horn of Africa. The Horn of Africa is officially outside this zone. So NATO just bit by bit expands the places and scope of where it can go and where it itself says it can go without even bothering to change its foundational documents.

Again, NATO in Iraq, NATO in Libya, the Libya bombing campaign, and the justification of bombing large parts of the country, when in fact the UN resolution that called on NATO to help only gave it a mandate for a no-fly zone, to make sure that no Gaddafi airplanes fly in the skies. Then NATO actually used this as an excuse to start bombing the facilities of Libya, of the Libyan state, and in the end caused the complete downfall of Gaddafi. This is the huge problem today with NATO, that this institution is not out of control—I think it is very much under the control of Washington and its

allies—but that it is being used over and beyond anything it says about what it itself can and cannot do. And I cannot stress enough the importance of this 1999 moment, you know, when the...

#M2

NATO, for the first time, went out of area and learned its most important lessons. There are documents today that also show how NATO, back then, when it bombed Yugoslavia, went about its business. There is a very interesting United Nations report from the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia. Although I am not very happy with how this report was created, at least it gathered some evidence about what was done. One of these points that I just want to show you, because it is so infamous, is the NATO bombing, the attack on the RTS Serbian radio and TV station in Belgrade on April 23, 1999, at 2:20 a.m. NATO...

#M2

intentionally bombed the central studios of RTS. It's just one of many civilian facilities, like this one here, that then completely, utterly burned down. It's a civilian radio station. Of course, NATO says that this civilian radio station was also used for military purposes. Therefore, it was a legitimate target of military engagement. And I must say again, there was no UN resolution, there was no Security Council resolution authorizing the use of force. So this is the first time NATO not only went outside of its own borders, it also did so without a UN Security Council resolution. So this is the moment when NATO really became not only, according to its own charter, illegal, it also became an international criminal.

Because again, the only institution that under international law has the power to demand the use of force is the Security Council. No Security Council resolution, no international law and justification for the use of force. That's just the rules of the game. The rules of the game that the powers, the victors of the Second World War, created for themselves. And you can go and argue as much as you want about the responsibility to protect and, you know, preventing another genocide. Guys, if there's no resolution, then you're doing it. And even if what you do is morally right, it is still not part of the international law setup of the entire game, the way that the game has been defined. So just swallow it. Just agree that this was a highly illegal act.

And it was not only illegal according to international law, it was illegal according to your own charter, to your own NATO founding document. The interesting thing here is, of course, that this report also documents how, for the bombing of this radio station, the prime minister at the time, he was an idiot back then, and he's still an idiot today. I mean, I don't know why they keep electing idiots for this position, but you know, Tony Blair at the time actually spilled the beans and said why NATO was authorized to attack this radio station. Just read this: British Prime Minister Tony Blair was reported as saying to The Times that the media is the apparatus that keeps Milosevic in power, and we are entirely justified as NATO allies in damaging and taking on those targets.

In a statement on April 8, 1999, NATO also indicated that the TV studios would be targeted unless they broadcast six hours per day of Western media reports. If President Milosevic would provide equal time for Western news broadcasts in this program without censorship—three hours a day at noon and three hours during the evening between 18:00 and midnight—then his TV could be an acceptable instrument of public information. NATO actually admitted, and Tony Blair admitted, that one of the reasons for bombing this installation was because it was a propaganda tool, a so-called propaganda tool, by the Serbian state.

And that in and of itself is not a justification, under international law, to target a civilian installation. Actually, civilian installations under international law are protected from being targeted by militaries. And then the oldest trick in the book is, of course, to claim dual use, which the people here did. It's like it's a dual-use facility. But it's pretty clear that what NATO was doing there was trying to intimidate and bully the Serbs and break their will. And this was also said later on, not just to make sure that the propaganda apparatus doesn't work anymore—I mean, the public broadcasting apparatus.

Just imagine for one second if Russia demanded that European radio stations like Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, DW, CNN, and the BBC allocate six hours a day to distribute Russian viewpoints on their broadcasting systems. Just imagine that for one second. But this was one of the demands of NATO in order to not attack a civilian broadcaster in Serbia at the time, and this was still regarded as normal. And still, today, you find a lot of people who will find it outrageous that I don't agree with attacking civilian infrastructure when the civilian infrastructure is used for propaganda purposes. So, in any case, I cannot overstate the importance of 1999 and the way that NATO went way, way beyond its official missions.

We could talk much more about this. We could talk about the way Afghanistan went down, and the way Iraq went down, and all of the breaches of international law left and right, but I think you get the point. The important thing here to know is that although the NATO Charter itself defines the scope of NATO and the area of operations in a very, very limited way, today's NATO went far beyond that and did so naturally without even changing these documents. And this is the danger. This is the danger of these goddamn warfare institutions that then just empower themselves and become a tool not only to manage the outside, but also to manage the inside and coerce its member states.

And now we're going to see, of course, how one NATO member is trying to coerce another one to give up its territory, how the United States wants to take away territory from Denmark, both NATO members, and how these organizations are used as power projection tools, very, very intentionally, and how then the rhetoric of these institutions always hides behind, you know, the peaceful intention of the Charter, just treat the Charter as so peaceful. And yes, Articles 1 and 2 are very peaceful. They're beautiful, very good articles. And then the institution grows to be a monster, which is why we have to be so alert about the monsters we create, and this NATO monster at some point must come to an end and be replaced by something that actually helps peace and security on this planet. Thank you.

