# Unilat/NATO Withdrawal CP

### Notes

# Top

### General --- 1NC

#### The United States federal government should send a notice of denunciation to all member states of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization that the United States is formally withdrawing from NATO.

#### The United States federal government should immediately cease all joint-operations with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

#### European NATO members are hyper-reliant upon American funding – withdrawal incentivizes European led funding and leadership.

Doug Bandow 15 [Doug Bandow is a senior fellow at the Cato Institute, specializing in foreign policy and civil liberties. He worked as special assistant to President Ronald Reagan and editor of the political magazine Inquiry. He writes regularly for leading publications such as Fortune magazine, National Interest, the Wall Street Journal, and the Washington Times. “Should the U.S. Leave NATO?”. December 7, 2015. https://www.cato.org/commentary/should-us-leave-nato]

The reason the Europeans don’t do so is because they don’t want to and don’t have to. Some don’t believe that Moscow actually poses much of a threat. Others figure only the nations bordering Russia face any risk, and there’s little interest in “Old Europe” for confronting Moscow over “New Europe.” And almost everyone assumes America will take care of any problems.

Particularly striking is the lack of military effort from those supposedly threatened by the supposed new Hitler to the east. This year NATO‐​Europe came in at 1.5 percent of GDP, well short of the two percent objective. Only Estonia, Greece (mostly to confront Turkey), Poland (first time ever), and the United Kingdom made that level. Notably missing are France, Germany, and Italy (the continent’s other major powers), Latvia and Lithuania (squealing loudly about Russian threats), and Turkey (challenging Russia over parochial rather than alliance interests).

Over the years American officials have pleaded, cajoled, contended, and begged the Europeans to do more. Even during the Cold War such efforts failed to yield much fruit. They have even less chance of working in the future. Reported Jan Techau of Carnegie Europe: “the dependence of European NATO allies on the United States has further increased since the end of the Cold War, not decreased.” Indeed, he added, “while European membership in NATO has nearly doubled since 1990, defense spending by Europeans has gone down by 28 percent since then.”

First, the U.S. insists that it will never leave. So long as it frenetically “reassures” allies, trying to convince them that Americans are worthy to subsidize Europe, the latter will respond by not doing much. Second, Russia doesn’t threaten America or most of Europe. The latter have little incentive to spend more. Third, domestic economic concerns remain paramount throughout the continent. There are few votes to be gained from supporting greater military expenditures to meet a phantom threat because it would gladden hearts in Washington, Vilnius, and Kiev.

The United States should do in 2016 what it failed to do in 1990. It should announce that the world has changed since creation of a U.S.-dominated NATO. It is time to refashion the alliance for a world in which allies had prospered and enemies had disappeared. One possibility for the future would be a European‐​run NATO, with America perhaps as an associate member. Another alternative would be a continental defense run alongside the European Union. Maybe there’s something else.

But the time for subsidizing, coddling and reassuring the Europeans is over. American taxpayers deserve as much consideration as European ones. U.S. military forces shouldn’t be deployed to advance interests of greatest concern to other nations. Any future alliances forged by Washington should act as serious military pacts, not international social clubs.

### Decrease Security Cooperation --- 1NC

#### The United States federal government should gradually decrease its security investments within NATO countries and threaten to leave the alliance if all member countries do not reach the 2% GDP goal.

#### Threats and decreased economic investment in NATO spur ally investments and follow-on – solves best.

Tad A. Schnaufer 21 [Tad A. Schnaufer II is a Ph.D. Candidate in the School of Politics, Security, and International Affairs (SPSIA) at the University of Central Florida. He also serves as an Infantry Officer in the Florida Army National Guard. “The US-NATO Relationship: The Cost of Maintaining Political Pressure on Allies”. January 15, 2021. https://gjia.georgetown.edu/2021/01/15/the-us-nato-relationship-the-cost-of-maintaining-political-pressure-on-allies/]

Policymakers have to balance the United States’ relationship with its North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) allies. If the United States gets too comfortable with allied relations, allies will feel more secure relying on US security guarantees. The tenser the relationship between them, the more NATO allies will pay in defense as US guarantees are brought into question and could, in turn, invite Russian adventurism. While the Trump administration’s pressure on NATO allies has increased their defense spending, policymakers must weigh that short-term gain with the long-term effects of a waning US commitment to NATO.

On July 29, 2020, Secretary of Defense Mark Esper announced the withdrawal of 11,900 US military personnel from Germany. This plan proposed to send roughly half of those troops back to the United States, while the rest would be redistributed around Europe. Secretary Esper explained that the troop movements were part of a broader military reorganization, but President Trump countered that claim by linking the reason for the withdrawal of troops to Germany’s “delinquent” payments to NATO. He noted that Germany had yet to meet the 2014 Wales Pledge to spend two percent of its GDP on defense. The Trump administration has used this troop withdrawal to pressure US allies to contribute more to the alliance or face the prospect of declining US commitments to Europe. While the Trump administration’s pressure will increase defense spending among European allies who fear a complete US withdrawal, it will also degrade the deterrence offered by the United States’ security obligations to the alliance.

The Trump administration has threatened NATO allies to the point that they fear the United States may withdraw from the organization or not fulfill its obligations to Article V unless the allies meet the objective of spending two percent of their GDP on defense. Past administrations have called for NATO allies to contribute more to the alliance for decades. However, they have never called into question the US commitment to Europe. Yet, this pressure has forced the European allies to start taking greater ownership of their security at the cost of warm relations with the United States as seen through allied leader’s statements.

In order to pressure allies, the United States has to send costly signals, such as withdrawing troops from Europe, to demonstrate that their security interests have diverged. This political pressure acts as a forceful method to motivate NATO allies to do more because it provides a credible threat of exclusion from the benefits of US protection. Within NATO, only the United States maintains and controls the conventional and nuclear capacity to deter and defend against existential threats to the alliance. No other ally has the expeditionary military capacity to do so. For example, Estonia is not worried about being abandoned by Romania, Portugal, or even Germany, knowing none of them could bring a sizable military force to bear in response to a Russian invasion or fait accompli. In this case, Estonia’s chief concern revolves around the United States’ guarantee of their sovereignty through NATO. Suppose the United States can make credible claims that it is willing to abandon an ally and not fulfill its treaty obligations. In that case, the ally will experience a drastic incentive to increase its military capabilities to defend itself.

It may seem that these tensions and fears will only lead to negative outcomes, but some disunity within an alliance can yield positive results. Several articles researching the implications of free-riding and burdening-sharing in alliances have supported this notion. In Olson and Zeckhauser’s seminal article on burden-sharing, they wrote, “This fact leads to the paradoxical conclusion that a decline in the amity, unity, and community of interest among allies need not necessarily reduce the effectiveness of an alliance…” and “The United States, at least, should perhaps not hope for too much unity in common ventures with other nations. It might prove extremely expensive.” Similarly, Plumper and Neumayer note in reference to the smaller allies (non-US allies), “Unless the interests of alliance members are independent, the existence of NATO allows the smaller allies to free-ride to some extent.”

Moreover, the breakdown of unity in the alliance caused by the Trump administration demands has compelled European allies to take a larger role in their defense. The former German Ambassador to the United States, Peter Wittig, described the Trump administration’s approach as a “healthy wakeup call for the Europeans…to not free-ride.” Currently, the leaders of NATO member-states feel they cannot rely on the United States as the sole guarantor of Europe’s security. Back in 2017, German Chancellor Angela Merkel stated, “We Europeans truly have to take our fate into our own hands” and, “We can’t rely on the superpower of the United States.” A year later, French President Emmanuel Macron reinforced this sentiment declaring, “It is up to us today to take our responsibilities and guarantee our own security, and thus have European sovereignty.” More recently, in response to the planned troop withdrawal announced this past summer, the German Defense Minister Annegret Kramp-Karrenbauer called the move “regrettable” and noted, “The truth is that a good life in Germany and Europe depends more and more on how we ensure our security ourselves.”

These responses from European leaders show that startling allies into thinking the United States will abandon them has influenced allies to increase defense spending in line with the 2014 Wales Pledge. However, in the long term, NATO policymaking should employ a balanced approach. If the United States brings its security guarantee of the alliance too much into question, Russia or other states may take action to test the United States’ resolve. During the Cold War, US leaders continually reaffirmed their commitment to allies, effectively deterring a Soviet invasion. Deterrence works best when allies clearly express their mutual obligations to all actors on the international stage.

The experience of the United Kingdom and Germany leading up to World War I provides an example of how the United Kingdom’s lack of a solid commitment to its allies allowed German leaders to think the British would stand aside in the war. Barbara Tuchman details this situation in her book The Guns of August. The failure of King George V and the UK Foreign Secretary to give a definite guarantee of joining the war should Germany invade allowed the Kaiser to think that he could attack without a British intervention. If the British had made a direct declaration of support for its allies, German leadership might have decided against escalating the war. This case gives policymakers an idea of what could happen if the United States does not maintain a firm commitment to its NATO allies. US leaders must watch how far they allow the US commitment to NATO wane in competitors’ eyes or risk possible adventurism on the eastern flank of NATO.

What do these two conflicting options mean for US policymakers? If the United States wants allies to meet the defense spending requirements, it needs them to fear the possibility that the United States may abandon them because their interests no longer align. The allies will only fear abandonment if the United States sends costly signals to them, such as troop withdrawals. As of 2020, the majority of allies that meet the elusive two percent spending goal sit on NATO’s eastern flank, fearing Russia and desiring US protection. Nevertheless, spending across the alliance has increased since 2014, in part, due to the Trump administration’s application of political pressure calling into doubt US interests in Europe. However, in the medium- and long-term, threatening to abandon allies will decrease the appearance of US security guarantees and invite competitors to push boundaries.

Policymakers must balance the coercion needed to increase contributions of European allies by making them question US intentions, but not distance the United States to the point that it jeopardizes the alliance or the deterrence that the US military power provides. A snapshot of one such policy could involve pulling a significant number of permanently stationed US forces from Europe, while reassuring US commitments to its allies through rotational deployments (not of equal number to the withdrawal) in support of NATO’s Enhanced Forward Presence and other operations. This concept aims to incentivize allies to build up military strength for initial deterrence and defense on the continent with the backing of US security guarantees, but lacking the tangible comfort drawn from a large permanent US force presence. With the probability that the incoming Biden administration will quickly mend relations in Europe, it runs the risk of reversing the current trend of increasing defense spending across the alliance and fostering free-riding. The United States should not go running back into the arms of the Europeans. Rather, it should maintain blunt political pressure on the Europeans to do more while ensuring its commitment to its allies remains clear to NATO’s potential adversaries.

# Solvency

## General

### Solvency --- 2NC

#### Senate bill to allow it to challenge a unilateral NATO withdrawal failed to be taken up by the senate – Biden has the authority.

Rebecca Kheel 21 [Congressional Reporter. “Senators reintroduce bill to block NATO withdrawal”. April 15, 2021. https://thehill.com/policy/defense/548500-senators-reintroduce-bill-to-block-nato-withdrawal/]

Right now, presidents are required to get the consent of the Senate to enter into treaties. Article 13 of the NATO treaty requires a country give a one-year “notice of denunciation” before it can exit NATO. In addition to requiring Senate approval for Trump to withdraw, the bill reintroduced Thursday would authorize the Senate Legal Counsel and the General Counsel of the House to challenge in court any attempt by the administration to withdraw from NATO without the Senate’s consent. The measure advanced out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 2019, but was never taken up by the full Senate.

#### Withdrawal requires a notice of denunciation and a 1 year waiting period.

DBpedia ND [“About: Withdrawal from NATO”. https://dbpedia.org/page/Withdrawal\_from\_NATO]

Withdrawal from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is the legal and political process whereby a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation withdraws from the North Atlantic Treaty, and thus the country in question ceases to be a member of NATO. The formal process of doing this process is stated in article XIII of the Treaty. This says that any country that wants to leave must send the United States (as the depositary) a "notice of denunciation", which the U.S. would then pass on to the other countries in the alliance. After a one-year waiting period, the country that wants to leave would be out.

#### The president of the United States can unilaterally leave NATO – no judicial or legislative power to block.

Robble Gramer 19 [Diplomacy and national security reporter at Foreign Policy. “Trump Can’t Do That. Can He?”. January 16, 2019. https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/01/16/trump-cant-do-that-can-he-nato-russia-congress/]

If U.S. President Donald Trump decides to withdraw from NATO tomorrow, Congress might be unable to stop him.

That’s the conclusion a group of top lawmakers and some legal experts have reached, as Trump over the past two years has repeatedly bashed the alliance and extended olive branches to Russian President Vladimir Putin—even while his administration has taken some steps to support NATO.

The legal assessment is particularly worrying for some Democratic lawmakers in the wake of a New York Times report revealing that Trump had privately discussed leaving NATO. And it reflects a broader challenge that the Trump presidency poses on a number of issues, including trade policy, international treaties, and clean governance: The guardrails that curb a president’s powers are often traditions and norms but not actual laws.

U.S. membership in NATO retains broad public support and nearly unanimous backing in an otherwise fractious Congress. And any attempt to alter America’s role in the alliance would push the president into uncharted legal waters, even setting aside the geopolitical shockwaves.

Still, if Trump decided to withdraw unilaterally, it appears the law would be on his side, based on a series of court rulings over the past half-century and the Constitution itself.

“The president, in the foreign affairs realm, can exercise a lot of discretion where Congress is silent,” said Scott Anderson, a scholar at the Brookings Institution and former attorney for the State Department who has explored the issue in his research.

Anderson pointed to a case involving China and Taiwan in the 1970s. Sen. Barry Goldwater and other lawmakers in 1979 sued President Jimmy Carter after he unilaterally withdrew from a mutual defense treaty with Taiwan to pave the way for the “One China” policy. The Supreme Court dismissed the lawmakers’ challenge, saying foreign affairs issues were political ones, not judicial, and this was a fight for Congress and the executive branch to sort out among themselves.

Judges avoided intervening in subsequent cases as well. In 1986, a private company doing business in Nicaragua, Beacon Products Corp., sued the Reagan administration for damages after it slapped a trade embargo on the Central American country and withdrew from a joint treaty of friendship. The suit was dismissed in a U.S. district court.

And in 2002, 32 members of Congress sued George W. Bush for withdrawing from the Cold War-era Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty signed with the Soviet Union without prior congressional consent. That case was thrown out of a U.S. district court. The judge cited the Goldwater v. Carter precedent, saying the treaty withdrawal was a political issue and thus outside the scope of the judicial branch.

With that in mind, a bipartisan group of senators who support NATO drafted legislation last year that would bar the president from leaving NATO without two-thirds consent of the senate—the same ratio required for the United States to enter into any new treaty as directed by the Constitution. Ultimately, the Senate didn’t vote on the bill.

### Solvency --- European Fill-in --- 2AC

#### Gradual transition solves – European fill-in

Justin Logan 21 [Justin Logan is a senior fellow at the Cato Institute. He is an expert on U.S. grand strategy, international relations theory, and American foreign policy. His current research focuses on the shifting balance of power in Asia—specifically with regard to China—and the limited relevance of the Middle East to U.S. national security. “MAKE EUROPEAN DEFENSE EUROPEAN”. June 10, 2021. https://warontherocks.com/2021/06/make-european-defense-european/]

Suggesting that NATO should be transformed into a European alliance for securing Europe implies that it can do so, of course. There is a scholarly debate on the subject, but the fact that there is even discussion of whether Europe — with an economy more than nine times larger than Russia’s and three and a half times the Russian population — can defend itself against Russia speaks volumes on the extent to which the United States has infantilized Europe. European states — and the European Union — have made defense decisions from behind Captain America’s shield. Remove the shield, and you will likely get different decisions.

Europe Without the United States: Back to the Future?

Making any policy judgment involves uncertainty and counterfactuals, but skeptics about European autonomy should make perfectly clear: Which security scenario does American dominance of European defense really foreclose? German territorial expansionism? The parlous state of the German military and the nuclear arsenals of France and the United Kingdom would seem to preclude the possibility. A Russian conquest of Germany? The idea seems similarly fanciful and carries immensely high risks and dubious payoffs for a Putin government that seems clearly oriented to power realities. A unified Europe that establishes a bloc from which the United States would be excluded? To what end? Even engaging with these arguments feels like burning straw men. There just isn’t much menacing the continent’s major powers. And if nothing menaces its major powers, there isn’t much at stake for U.S. national security.

If we remember Lord Hastings Lionel Ismay — NATO’s first secretary-general — and his well-known remark that NATO’s founding mission was to keep the Soviet Union out, the United States in, and Germany down, American immovability begins to make more sense. The United States has doggedly opposed the creation of a third force in Europe, whether German, European, or otherwise. The question becomes: If there is no need to keep Germany — or European defense cooperation — down, what need is there to keep the United States in? Particularly in an era of scarce resources and growing needs elsewhere?

Last December, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Mark Milley suggested there should be a “holistic review of the disposition of the force and the tasking purposes of all of the forces worldwide. There’s a very strong argument to be made that we may have forces in places that they shouldn’t be.” In February, the Biden administration took up this task, announcing a global posture review. As it concludes that report, the Pentagon will likely come to the unhappy conclusion that freeing up resources for competition with China entails giving up big-ticket items elsewhere.

Looking Ahead

America’s self-appointed roles as European pacifier, Middle East policeman, and Asian great-power competitor are becoming too heavy to carry at the same time. Strategy is about choice. The unipolar era allowed the United States largely to avoid choice for decades, but U.S. defense budgets are flattening and the pressures of international politics are reemerging. The easiest place to divest American burdens should be Europe. The question for policymakers is whether they start a gradual process of replacing American leadership with European leadership, or whether they will wait until a crisis occurs, when airy assumptions and lax planning collapse under strain. A number of scholars argued for handing Europe off to the Europeans in the 1990s. The intervening years should have made clear that Europe’s wholeness and freedom do not require U.S. boots on the ground. Europe’s major powers are unlikely to attack one another and can defend themselves against Russia. The United States should be a friend to Europe, not its pacifier.

### European Fill-in --- Germany --- 2AC

#### Washington announcing withdrawal forces investments – Germany.

Doug Bandow 20 [Doug Bandow is a senior fellow at the Cato Institute, specializing in foreign policy and civil liberties. He worked as special assistant to President Ronald Reagan and editor of the political magazine Inquiry. He writes regularly for leading publications such as Fortune magazine, National Interest, the Wall Street Journal, and the Washington Times. “Time to Pull the Troops From NATO: What Good Is an Alliance Full of Cheap‐​Riders?”. June 8, 2020. https://www.cato.org/commentary/time-pull-troops-nato-what-good-alliance-full-cheap-riders]

Fourth, the deficiencies are woefully, ostentatiously outrageous. They would be comical if the burden of such shortcomings was not ultimately borne by America. Last year the Atlantic Council’s Jorge Benitez called the German military’s readiness “abysmal.” The Bundestag Military Commissioner, Hans‐​Peter Bartels, concluded that “There is neither enough personnel nor materiel, and often one confronts shortage upon shortage.”

Analysts cited inadequate numbers or availability of aircraft, helicopters, ships, and submarines. The military lacked sufficient recruits, winter clothing, radios, and spare parts. Defense & Security Monitor warned that: “These conditions render German contributions to security missions under an EU- or NATO‐​led mandate less than optimal, as its troop deployments lack proper logistical support and effective firepower capability.”

That Berlin fails to adequately provide for its force is properly its decision, not that of America. As long as Germany does not expect Washington to meet Germany’s defense needs if something goes wrong. Richard Grenell, the US ambassador to Berlin recently returned to America, made the same point in a slightly different fashion: “It is actually offensive to assume that the US taxpayer must continue to pay to have 50,000-plus Americans in Germany, but the Germans get to spend their surplus on domestic programs.”

Grenell would have Berlin spend more. The better approach would be for Washington to return responsibility for Germany’s defense to Germany. Tensions in the relationship would ease dramatically if the US did not constantly browbeat its allies to do what American policymakers believe would be best. Instead, Washington should announce what it plans to do, and let friendly states plan accordingly. Which would make the president’s decision a positive one.

German policymakers finally might be learning an important lesson from Trump. Bundestag member and ruling party spokesman on international affairs Johann David Wadephul said: “It’s yet another wake‐​up call for us Europeans to take our fate into our own hands.”

#### Germany can lead without the US.

Tony Palocaren 20 [Major Antony (Tony) Palocaren is an instructor of International Affairs in the Department of Social Sciences at the United States Military Academy in West Point, NY. Tony was commissioned into the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers from the Pennsylvania State University in 2011. “A REALIST CASE FOR GERMANY TO RESURRECT NATO”. October 1, 2020. https://warroom.armywarcollege.edu/articles/germany-nato/]

Germany can provide the European leadership that NATO urgently requires to stay relevant. As the Eurozone powerhouse with one of the lowest consolidated gross debts among major western European economies, Germany has the wealth to invest in NATO’s defense strategy. France, Italy, Belgium, and the U.K. cannot sustain a higher debt-to-GDP ratio that would result from spending more on defense. Germany is a global leader in innovation and research and possesses the technological expertise required to spearhead NATO’s defense. Today’s NATO challenges differ from those at the height of the Cold War. There is no longer a threat of the Red Army marching across Europe and Russia’s dwindling population, economic stagnation, fallout from the COVID-19 pandemic, and subsequent oil war with Saudi Arabia have stymied Vladimir Putin’s ambitions. However, Russia can still achieve its goals of delegitimizing democracies and sowing division within Europe through hybrid warfare.

### Solvency --- NATO Survival --- 2NC

#### CP disbands NATO – leadership vacuum.

Patrick Savage 17 [Columnist at the Georgetown Security Studies Review. “NATO Without America: A Grim Prognosis.” [Georgetown Center for Security Studies: March 14, 2017]. <https://georgetownsecuritystudiesreview.org/2017/03/14/nato-without-america-a-grim-prognosis/>]

When looking at NATO’s short-term viability, the picture is far less positive without the substantial commitment of the United States. The most obvious item of concern if the US were to leave or moderate its commitment to NATO in the short term would be sheer manpower. In 2016, the alliance had a combined troop strength of around 3.1 million active duty personnel. Without the United States, that immediately drops by nearly half to somewhere below 1.9 million personnel.[vi] This ignores thousands of pieces of military equipment that would no longer support NATO, including armored vehicles, aircraft, and ships. Granted, Russia—the most prominent threat to NATO—has significantly cut down its active duty forces in recent years, estimated at just over 900,000 active duty personnel in 2016.[vii] However, the exact number of reservists Russia has at its disposal is unknown, and could be anywhere from 2 to 20 million personnel depending on the scale of a call up.[viii] While NATO forces may have an advantage in training, equipment, and organization, past a certain point quantity surpasses quality. Russia has also been increasing efforts to update its military arsenal, purchasing new weapons and equipment to close that gap as well.[ix]

The more important question, however, may be who would assume the burden of leadership for the alliance in the absence of the United States. Among the most influential of NATO’s members, there is no obvious candidate to take the lead if the United States were to step aside, and all the obvious candidates face their own significant political issues at home and abroad. The United Kingdom’s relationship with continental Europe has been strained in the aftermath of its vote to leave the EU. Its relationship will be further tested in the months and years to come as that process plays out.[x] Germany’s President-elect, former Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier, has broken with Chancellor Angela Merkel’s governing coalition with a more conciliatory tone towards Russia. He has criticized NATO policies on sanctions and military exercises.[xi] Meanwhile, France remains in a constant state of high alert following a string of terrorist attacks over the past several years—a threat it is not alone in facing—with new plots being uncovered and thwarted in February and troops remaining deployed on the streets.[xii]

These existing political issues are aggravated by the fact that the UK, Germany, and France all face populist or nationalist surges in their domestic politics, a trend seen across Europe. The UK Independence Party played an instrumental role in Britain’s decision to leave the EU. National Front candidate Marine Le Pen is highly likely to make it to the second round of the French presidential election this year. The Alternative for Germany party of Frauke Petry and Jorg Meuthen seems poised to gain its first seats in the Bundestag following elections this fall. Among a laundry list of controversial policy positions, these parties have tended to either have highly critical views of NATO, close ties to Russia, or both.[xiii] While the United States is obviously not without its own domestic political issues, the relative size, power, and strength of its institutions all put it in a better position to simultaneously deal with such issues and wrangle NATO at the same time. It is questionable if Britain, France, or Germany would be able to do the same if the mantle of leadership fell upon them.

# Perm

### Perm --- AT: Do Both

#### Biden is seen as the great unifier of NATO – reversing his position disrupts American leadership in Europe – any attempt to combine strategies undermines this.

Brent D. Griffiths and John Haltiwanger 4-12 [Brent Griffiths is a senior politics reporter at Insider. Previously, he worked at the Washington Post as a researcher on Power Up and the Finance 202. John Haltiwanger is a senior politics reporter at Business Insider. “US approval in most NATO countries rose by double-digits under Biden compared to Trump, who often criticized the alliance while praising Putin”. April 12, 2022. https://www.businessinsider.com/us-approval-in-nato-countries-rises-under-biden-versus-trump-2022-4]

The polling suggests that despite Biden's currently weak domestic approval, he is succeeding in his goal of restoring America's role as a global leader post-Trump, and was able to bring NATO together ahead of Russia's war in Ukraine.

### Perm --- AT: Do the CP

#### Severs the aff---NO PART of the CP enacts the aff, it ends the alliance crucial to plan action---their interp means no CPs compete---severance is a voting issue – reject the team it makes being negative impossible and destroys substantive clash and education.

#### CP disbands NATO – leadership vacuum.

Patrick Savage 17 [Columnist at the Georgetown Security Studies Review. “NATO Without America: A Grim Prognosis.” [Georgetown Center for Security Studies: March 14, 2017]. <https://georgetownsecuritystudiesreview.org/2017/03/14/nato-without-america-a-grim-prognosis/>]

When looking at NATO’s short-term viability, the picture is far less positive without the substantial commitment of the United States. The most obvious item of concern if the US were to leave or moderate its commitment to NATO in the short term would be sheer manpower. In 2016, the alliance had a combined troop strength of around 3.1 million active duty personnel. Without the United States, that immediately drops by nearly half to somewhere below 1.9 million personnel.[vi] This ignores thousands of pieces of military equipment that would no longer support NATO, including armored vehicles, aircraft, and ships. Granted, Russia—the most prominent threat to NATO—has significantly cut down its active duty forces in recent years, estimated at just over 900,000 active duty personnel in 2016.[vii] However, the exact number of reservists Russia has at its disposal is unknown, and could be anywhere from 2 to 20 million personnel depending on the scale of a call up.[viii] While NATO forces may have an advantage in training, equipment, and organization, past a certain point quantity surpasses quality. Russia has also been increasing efforts to update its military arsenal, purchasing new weapons and equipment to close that gap as well.[ix]

The more important question, however, may be who would assume the burden of leadership for the alliance in the absence of the United States. Among the most influential of NATO’s members, there is no obvious candidate to take the lead if the United States were to step aside, and all the obvious candidates face their own significant political issues at home and abroad. The United Kingdom’s relationship with continental Europe has been strained in the aftermath of its vote to leave the EU. Its relationship will be further tested in the months and years to come as that process plays out.[x] Germany’s President-elect, former Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier, has broken with Chancellor Angela Merkel’s governing coalition with a more conciliatory tone towards Russia. He has criticized NATO policies on sanctions and military exercises.[xi] Meanwhile, France remains in a constant state of high alert following a string of terrorist attacks over the past several years—a threat it is not alone in facing—with new plots being uncovered and thwarted in February and troops remaining deployed on the streets.[xii]

These existing political issues are aggravated by the fact that the UK, Germany, and France all face populist or nationalist surges in their domestic politics, a trend seen across Europe. The UK Independence Party played an instrumental role in Britain’s decision to leave the EU. National Front candidate Marine Le Pen is highly likely to make it to the second round of the French presidential election this year. The Alternative for Germany party of Frauke Petry and Jorg Meuthen seems poised to gain its first seats in the Bundestag following elections this fall. Among a laundry list of controversial policy positions, these parties have tended to either have highly critical views of NATO, close ties to Russia, or both.[xiii] While the United States is obviously not without its own domestic political issues, the relative size, power, and strength of its institutions all put it in a better position to simultaneously deal with such issues and wrangle NATO at the same time. It is questionable if Britain, France, or Germany would be able to do the same if the mantle of leadership fell upon them.

### Perm --- AT: Do the AFF then the CP

#### Biden is seen as the great unifier of NATO – reversing his position disrupts American leadership in Europe – any attempt to combine strategies undermines this.

Brent D. Griffiths and John Haltiwanger 4-12 [Brent Griffiths is a senior politics reporter at Insider. Previously, he worked at the Washington Post as a researcher on Power Up and the Finance 202. John Haltiwanger is a senior politics reporter at Business Insider. “US approval in most NATO countries rose by double-digits under Biden compared to Trump, who often criticized the alliance while praising Putin”. April 12, 2022. https://www.businessinsider.com/us-approval-in-nato-countries-rises-under-biden-versus-trump-2022-4]

The polling suggests that despite Biden's currently weak domestic approval, he is succeeding in his goal of restoring America's role as a global leader post-Trump, and was able to bring NATO together ahead of Russia's war in Ukraine.

#### Should means immediate

Summers 94 (Justice – Oklahoma Supreme Court, “Kelsey v. Dollarsaver Food Warehouse of Durant”, 1994 OK 123, 11-8, http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn13)

¶4 The legal question to be resolved by the court is whether the word "should"[13](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287" \l "marker3fn13) in the May 18 order connotes futurity or may be deemed a ruling *in praesenti*.[14](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287" \l "marker3fn14) The answer to this query is not to be divined from rules of grammar;[15](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287" \l "marker3fn15) it must be governed by the age-old practice culture of legal professionals and its immemorial language usage. To determine if the omission (from the critical May 18 entry) of the turgid phrase, "and the same hereby is", (1) makes it an in futuro ruling - i.e., an expression of what the judge will or would do at a later stage - or (2) constitutes an in in praesenti resolution of a disputed law issue, the trial judge's intent must be garnered from the four corners of the entire record.[16](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287" \l "marker3fn16)

[CONTINUES – TO FOOTNOTE]

[13](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker2fn13) "*Should*" not only is used as a "present indicative" synonymous with *ought* but also is the past tense of "shall" with various shades of meaning not always easy to analyze. See 57 C.J. Shall § 9, Judgments § 121 (1932). O. JESPERSEN, GROWTH AND STRUCTURE OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE (1984); St. Louis & S.F.R. Co. v. Brown, 45 Okl. 143, 144 P. 1075, 1080-81 (1914). For a more detailed explanation, see the Partridge quotation infra note 15. Certain contexts mandate a construction of the term "should" as more than merely indicating preference or desirability. Brown, supra at 1080-81 (jury instructions stating that jurors "should" reduce the amount of damages in proportion to the amount of contributory negligence of the plaintiff was held to imply an *obligation* *and to be more than advisory*); Carrigan v. California Horse Racing Board, 60 Wash. App. 79, [802 P.2d 813](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/deliverdocument.asp?box1=802&box2=P.2D&box3=813) (1990) (one of the Rules of Appellate Procedure requiring that a party "should devote a section of the brief to the request for the fee or expenses" was interpreted to mean that a party is under an *obligation* to include the requested segment); State v. Rack, 318 S.W.2d 211, 215 (Mo. 1958) ("should" would mean the same as "shall" or "must" when used in an instruction to the jury which tells the triers they "should disregard false testimony"). [14](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker2fn14) *In praesenti* means literally "at the present time." BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY 792 (6th Ed. 1990). In legal parlance the phrase denotes that which in law is *presently* or *immediately effective*, as opposed to something that *will* or *would* become effective *in the future [in futurol*]. See Van Wyck v. Knevals, [106 U.S. 360](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/deliverdocument.asp?box1=106&box2=U.S.&box3=360), 365, 1 S.Ct. 336, 337, 27 L.Ed. 201 (1882).

# Net Benefits

### Alliance Health --- 2NC

#### Stronger European initiatives outside of NATO and US influence increases alliance strength overall.

Steven Pifer and Doug Bandow 21 [Steven Pifer is a William J. Perry Research Fellow at Stanford's Center for International Security and Cooperation as well as a non-resident senior fellow with the Brookings Institution. Doug Bandow is a senior fellow at the Cato Institute, specializing in foreign policy and civil liberties. He worked as special assistant to President Ronald Reagan and editor of the political magazine Inquiry. He writes regularly for leading publications such as Fortune magazine, National Interest, the Wall Street Journal, and the Washington Times. “Should NATO be reformed and what role can the US play?”. December 28, 2021. https://dividedwefall.org/nato-russia-relations/]

The global balance of power has shifted dramatically, and the need for a U.S.-dominated transatlantic alliance has disappeared. Instead of promoting NATO’s expansion, the Biden Administration should be plotting the alliance’s transformation. That would conveniently coincide with increased European interest in greater continental military capabilities. For decades, successive U.S. administrations discouraged member governments from developing forces separate from the alliance. Today such a shift should be Washington’s objective.

The U.S. remains the world’s most important nation — largest economy, greatest soft power, dominant military. However, America’s edge in those areas is shrinking. And its weaknesses, compounding extraordinarily bitter political divisions with equally dramatic fiscal irresponsibility, are significant. Washington cannot forever underwrite wealthy states which have other priorities, such as investing in their own welfare states, as in Europe.

Moreover, allied relationships would be healthier if more equal. American demands that European governments do more, but only in ways seen as most advantageous in Washington, have undermined the transatlantic relationship. Donald Trump’s verbal eruptions on the issue differed only in tone from the rhetoric of his predecessors. Illustrating predictable hubris, Washington long has instructed the Europeans on the sort of militaries it believes they should maintain.

A European Solution to a European Problem

The basic problem is that there is agreement neither on the degree of threat nor the most appropriate response. Many NATO members see no serious dangers, and even those nations which worry about Russia, the only meaningful military threat to Europe, still mostly rely on Washington. Consider the Baltic countries: they claim to fear aggression by Moscow but devote just a couple of cents on the Euro to defense. Do they really value their independence so little? They should spend far more and create a territorial defense that would exact a high price for Russian aggression.

The solution is simple, if perhaps expensive for European states. They should assess the risks, decide on the objectives, and create the force structure necessary to achieve the latter. The U.S. should aid them in this process, giving the Europeans time to decide on the mode of organization and address existing military deficiencies. However, Washington — and especially the present administration, known for its Atlanticist orientation — should take the lead.

### Withdrawal Good --- 2NC

#### NATO undermines US security interests – withdrawal creates a more peaceful world.

Bruce Fein 16 [Bruce Fein was Associate Deputy Attorney General and General Counsel to the Federal Communications Commission under President Ronald Reagan. He served as Research Director for Republicans on the Joint Congressional Committee on Covert Arms Sales to Iran, and on the American Bar Association's Committee on Presidential Signing Statements. He has been a Visiting Fellow for Constitutional Studies at the Heritage Foundation and an adjunct scholar at American Enterprise Institute. He has advised numerous countries on constitutional reform, including South Africa, Hungary and Russia. He is regularly called to testify before the House and Senate Judiciary and Foreign Relations Committees. “The United States Should Withdraw from NATO”. August 29, 2016. https://www.huffpost.com/entry/the-united-states-should\_b\_11762584]

NATO is more ill-conceived at present, having expanded to 28 members, than it was in 1949. Among other things, we are committed to defending the Baltic States, Hungary, the Czech Republic, the Slovak Republic, Poland, Romania, and Bulgaria from Russian aggression. The previous occupation or domination of these nations by the Soviet Union during the Cold War weakened it financially and militarily. Why should we seek to prevent Russia from repeating that blunder? We are also absurdly committed to defending Slovenia, Albania, Greece, and Croatia--none of which have relevance to our self-defense.

NATO advocates argue that the spread of democracy makes the United States safer; that we know how to spread democracy; and, that tyranny anywhere is a threat to our security. They substantially echo President George W. Bush's counterfactual Second Inaugural gospel:

"Across the generations we have proclaimed the imperative of self-government because no one is fit to be a master, and no one deserves to be a slave. Advancing these ideals is the mission that created our Nation. It is the honorable achievement of our fathers. Now it is the urgent requirement of our nation's security, and the calling of our time. So it is the policy of the United States to seek and support the growth of democratic movements and institutions in every nation and culture, with the ultimate goal of ending tyranny in our world."

The NATO-Bush doctrine is unconvincing. The United States was born and has flourished amidst tyrannies. They include the French Empire, the Romanoff Empire, the Ottoman Empire, the Chinese Empire, and the Austrian-Hungarian Empire. Today, tyranny in Belarus or Zimbabwe, among other nations, is no danger to the United States. Our peaceful co-existence with tyrannies has been the rule, not the exception.

Additionally, we can no more create democracies from cultures and institutions with no democratic DNA hostile than we can build a perpetual motion machine. We have failed spectacularly attempting the impossible in South Vietnam, Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, and Yemen despite a staggering investment of resources. South Sudan is conclusive proof of our impotence to give birth to democratic dispensations. We midwifed its 2011 independence from Sudan, but It quickly succumbed to a grisly ethnic civil war between President Salva Kiir and the Dinka against Rick Machar and the Nuer featuring tens of thousands killed and millions displaced. South Sudan was a failed state on arrival, and remains so today. Our efforts to collaborate with its leaders and people to steer a democratic course were predictably futile.

The evidence is mixed as to whether democracies are inherently less threatening to the United States than are authoritarian or tyrannical nations. Hamas was popularly elected in the Gaza Strip, but is listed as an international terrorist organization by the United States. Egypt's former President Mohammad Morsi was a greater danger to United States interests than is his less democratically elected successor Abdel Fattah el-Sisi. The United States has refrained from clamor for free elections in Saudi Arabia for fear of the results, i.e., victory for Wahhabism. Tyranny by the majority is tyranny nonetheless. In any event, the evidence is far too inconclusive to assert that wars against non-democratic nations are, ipso facto, justifiable wars of self-defense.

In leaving NATO, the United States would dramatically lessen tensions or conflicts with Russia and strengthen our security against external aggression. Among other things, the stage would be set for a new treaty to reduce the nuclear arsenals of the two countries. Russia would probably claim a sphere of influence over its neighbors, but that would be unalarming. The United States has acted in the same way for more than two centuries, including the Monroe Doctrine, the Mexican-American War, the Spanish-American War, the Panama Canal, and military ventures in Cuba, Haiti, the Dominican Republic, Mexico, and Nicaragua. To maintain that all nations are equal, but that the United States is more equal than others is to encourage war.

To make the nation more secure in its safety, wealth, and liberty, NATO should be made a museum piece along with other artifacts of the American Empire.

#### Decreasing expansionist pressures against Russia good – prevents escalating retaliatory behaviours from Moscow.

Ted Galen Carpenter 22 [Ted Galen Carpenter, a senior fellow in defense and foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute, is the author of 12 books on international affairs. “Many predicted NATO expansion would lead to war. Those warnings were ignored”. 28 February 2022. <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2022/feb/28/nato-expansion-war-russia-ukraine>]

He was right, but US and Nato leaders proceeded with new rounds of expansion, including the provocative step of adding the three Baltic republics. Those countries not only had been part of the Soviet Union, but they had also been part of Russia’s empire during the Czarist era. That wave of expansion now had Nato perched on the border of the Russian Federation.

Moscow’s patience with Nato’s ever more intrusive behavior was wearing thin. The last reasonably friendly warning from Russia that the alliance needed to back off came in March 2007, when Putin addressed the annual Munich security conference. “Nato has put its frontline forces on our borders,” Putin complained. Nato expansion “represents a serious provocation that reduces the level of mutual trust. And we have the right to ask: against whom is this expansion intended? And what happened to the assurances our western partners made after the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact?”

In his memoir, Duty, Robert M Gates, who served as secretary of defense in the administrations of both George W Bush and Barack Obama, stated his belief that “the relationship with Russia had been badly mismanaged after [George HW] Bush left office in 1993”. Among other missteps, “US agreements with the Romanian and Bulgarian governments to rotate troops through bases in those countries was a needless provocation.” In an implicit rebuke to the younger Bush, Gates asserted that “trying to bring Georgia and Ukraine into Nato was truly overreaching”. That move, he contended, was a case of “recklessly ignoring what the Russians considered their own vital national interests”.

The following year, the Kremlin demonstrated that its discontent with Nato’s continuing incursions into Russia’s security zone had moved beyond verbal objections. Moscow exploited a foolish provocation by Georgia’s pro‐​western government to launch a military offensive that brought Russian troops to the outskirts of the capital. Thereafter, Russia permanently detached two secessionist‐​minded Georgian regions and put them under effective Russian control.

Western (especially US) leaders continued to blow through red warning light after a red warning light, however. The Obama administration’s shockingly arrogant meddling in Ukraine’s internal political affairs in 2013 and 2014 to help demonstrators overthrow Ukraine’s elected, pro‐​Russia president was the single most brazen provocation, and it caused tensions to spike. Moscow immediately responded by seizing and annexing Crimea, and a new cold war was underway with a vengeance.

Could the Ukraine crisis have been avoided?

Events during the past few months constituted the last chance to avoid a hot war in eastern Europe. Putin demanded that Nato provide guarantees on several security issues. Specifically, the Kremlin wanted binding assurances that the alliance would reduce the scope of its growing military presence in eastern Europe and would never offer membership to Ukraine. He backed up those demands with a massive military buildup on Ukraine’s borders.

The Biden administration’s response to Russia’s quest for meaningful western concessions and security guarantees was tepid and evasive. Putin then clearly decided to escalate matters. Washington’s attempt to make Ukraine a Nato political and military pawn (even absent the country’s formal membership in the alliance) may end up costing the Ukrainian people dearly.

### Avoids --- Russia DA --- 2NC

#### Collapsing NATO solves tensions with Russia – ends the war in Ukraine too.

John Mearsheimer 3-19 [John J. Mearsheimer is the R. Wendell Harrison Distinguished Service Professor of Political Science at the University of Chicago. “John Mearsheimer on why the West is principally responsible for the Ukrainian crisis.” March 19th, 2022. https://www.economist.com/by-invitation/2022/03/11/john-mearsheimer-on-why-the-west-is-principally-responsible-for-the-ukrainian-crisis]

But that story is wrong. The West, and especially America, is principally responsible for the crisis which began in February 2014. It has now turned into a war that not only threatens to destroy Ukraine, but also has the potential to escalate into a nuclear war between Russia and NATO.

The trouble over Ukraine actually started at NATO’s Bucharest summit in April 2008, when George W. Bush’s administration pushed the alliance to announce that Ukraine and Georgia “will become members”. Russian leaders responded immediately with outrage, characterising this decision as an existential threat to Russia and vowing to thwart it. According to a respected Russian journalist, Mr Putin “flew into a rage” and warned that “if Ukraine joins NATO, it will do so without Crimea and the eastern regions. It will simply fall apart.” America ignored Moscow’s red line, however, and pushed forward to make Ukraine a Western bulwark on Russia’s border. That strategy included two other elements: bringing Ukraine closer to the eu and making it a pro-American democracy.

These efforts eventually sparked hostilities in February 2014, after an uprising (which was supported by America) caused Ukraine’s pro-Russian president, Viktor Yanukovych, to flee the country. In response, Russia took Crimea from Ukraine and helped fuel a civil war that broke out in the Donbas region of eastern Ukraine.

The next major confrontation came in December 2021 and led directly to the current war. The main cause was that Ukraine was becoming a de facto member of NATO. The process started in December 2017, when the Trump administration decided to sell Kyiv “defensive weapons”. What counts as “defensive” is hardly clear-cut, however, and these weapons certainly looked offensive to Moscow and its allies in the Donbas region. Other NATO countries got in on the act, shipping weapons to Ukraine, training its armed forces and allowing it to participate in joint air and naval exercises. In July 2021, Ukraine and America co-hosted a major naval exercise in the Black Sea region involving navies from 32 countries. Operation Sea Breeze almost provoked Russia to fire at a British naval destroyer that deliberately entered what Russia considers its territorial waters.

The links between Ukraine and America continued growing under the Biden administration. This commitment is reflected throughout an important document—the “us-Ukraine Charter on Strategic Partnership”—that was signed in November by Antony Blinken, America’s secretary of state, and Dmytro Kuleba, his Ukrainian counterpart. The aim was to “underscore … a commitment to Ukraine’s implementation of the deep and comprehensive reforms necessary for full integration into European and Euro-Atlantic institutions.” The document explicitly builds on “the commitments made to strengthen the Ukraine-u.s. strategic partnership by Presidents Zelensky and Biden,” and also emphasises that the two countries will be guided by the “2008 Bucharest Summit Declaration.”

Unsurprisingly, Moscow found this evolving situation intolerable and began mobilising its army on Ukraine’s border last spring to signal its resolve to Washington. But it had no effect, as the Biden administration continued to move closer to Ukraine. This led Russia to precipitate a full-blown diplomatic stand-off in December. As Sergey Lavrov, Russia’s foreign minister, put it: “We reached our boiling point.” Russia demanded a written guarantee that Ukraine would never become a part of NATO and that the alliance remove the military assets it had deployed in eastern Europe since 1997. The subsequent negotiations failed, as Mr Blinken made clear: “There is no change. There will be no change.” A month later Mr Putin launched an invasion of Ukraine to eliminate the threat he saw from NATO.

This interpretation of events is at odds with the prevailing mantra in the West, which portrays NATO expansion as irrelevant to the Ukraine crisis, blaming instead Mr Putin’s expansionist goals. According to a recent NATO document sent to Russian leaders, “NATO is a defensive Alliance and poses no threat to Russia.” The available evidence contradicts these claims. For starters, the issue at hand is not what Western leaders say NATO’s purpose or intentions are; it is how Moscow sees NATO’s actions.

Mr Putin surely knows that the costs of conquering and occupying large amounts of territory in eastern Europe would be prohibitive for Russia. As he once put it, “Whoever does not miss the Soviet Union has no heart. Whoever wants it back has no brain.” His beliefs about the tight bonds between Russia and Ukraine notwithstanding, trying to take back all of Ukraine would be like trying to swallow a porcupine. Furthermore, Russian policymakers—including Mr Putin—have said hardly anything about conquering new territory to recreate the Soviet Union or build a greater Russia. Rather, since the 2008 Bucharest summit Russian leaders have repeatedly said that they view Ukraine joining NATO as an existential threat that must be prevented. As Mr Lavrov noted in January, “the key to everything is the guarantee that NATO will not expand eastward.”

Tellingly, Western leaders rarely described Russia as a military threat to Europe before 2014. As America’s former ambassador to Moscow Michael McFaul notes, Mr Putin’s seizure of Crimea was not planned for long; it was an impulsive move in response to the coup that overthrew Ukraine’s pro-Russian leader. In fact, until then, NATO expansion was aimed at turning all of Europe into a giant zone of peace, not containing a dangerous Russia. Once the crisis started, however, American and European policymakers could not admit they had provoked it by trying to integrate Ukraine into the West. They declared the real source of the problem was Russia’s revanchism and its desire to dominate if not conquer Ukraine.

My story about the conflict’s causes should not be controversial, given that many prominent American foreign-policy experts have warned against NATO expansion since the late 1990s. America’s secretary of defence at the time of the Bucharest summit, Robert Gates, recognised that “trying to bring Georgia and Ukraine into NATO was truly overreaching”. Indeed, at that summit, both the German chancellor, Angela Merkel, and the French president, Nicolas Sarkozy, were opposed to moving forward on NATO membership for Ukraine because they feared it would infuriate Russia.

The upshot of my interpretation is that we are in an extremely dangerous situation, and Western policy is exacerbating these risks. For Russia’s leaders, what happens in Ukraine has little to do with their imperial ambitions being thwarted; it is about dealing with what they regard as a direct threat to Russia’s future. Mr Putin may have misjudged Russia’s military capabilities, the effectiveness of the Ukrainian resistance and the scope and speed of the Western response, but one should never underestimate how ruthless great powers can be when they believe they are in dire straits. America and its allies, however, are doubling down, hoping to inflict a humiliating defeat on Mr Putin and to maybe even trigger his removal. They are increasing aid to Ukraine while using economic sanctions to inflict massive punishment on Russia, a step that Putin now sees as “akin to a declaration of war”.

America and its allies may be able to prevent a Russian victory in Ukraine, but the country will be gravely damaged, if not dismembered. Moreover, there is a serious threat of escalation beyond Ukraine, not to mention the danger of nuclear war. If the West not only thwarts Moscow on Ukraine’s battlefields, but also does serious, lasting damage to Russia’s economy, it is in effect pushing a great power to the brink. Mr Putin might then turn to nuclear weapons.

At this point it is impossible to know the terms on which this conflict will be settled. But, if we do not understand its deep cause, we will be unable to end it before Ukraine is wrecked and NATO ends up in a war with Russia.

### Avoids --- Russian War (US military dominance in region bad) --- 2AC

#### NATO currently operates as a trojan horse of American imperialism and American military dominance in Europe threatens militarisation and aggression – nuclear war.

Phil Hearse 3-15 [Phil Hearse writes for the Socialist Resistance and Mutiny websites, is co-author of Creeping Fascism (2019). “NATO, imperialism and the war.” 15 March 2022. https://internationalviewpoint.org/spip.php?article7563]

At the other extreme, some left-wingers seem to regard the Ukraine crisis merely as a national liberation war, in which Ukraine is fighting a just war against Russia, and the role of NATO is simply to provide large amounts of weaponry to the Ukrainian people. As we discuss below, this is naïve. NATO is clearly trying to use the war to advance its own objectives, particularly those of American imperialism.

One socialist website opposes any end to the war in which Ukraine makes concessions. [2] This is the wrong way to pose it. The crucial thing now from the viewpoint of the Ukrainian people is to have a ceasefire and to stop the war. It is up to the Ukrainian people themselves to decide on any concessions—temporary or long-term— to Russia, however much they may rankle. There is a long history of schematic sectarians opposing necessary concessions to end wars—starting with the opposition in the Bolshevik party, led by Bukharin and Radek, to the signing of the 1918 Treaty of Brest-Litovsk in which multiple concessions were made by Russia to Germany in order to end the war between them. The charge of ‘capitulation’ was also made against North Vietnam when it engaged in negotiations that led to the withdrawal of American troops in 1973. The Ukrainian government has indicated that it supports a ceasefire and negotiations, and we should back that.

So what is the real role of NATO? There are two aspects to this. The first is the danger of a clash between NATO and Russian forces which could lead to a central European war, something that would be disastrous. A no-fly zone, even one policed by planes provided by NATO member Poland, could lead to a direct conflict between Russia and NATO. A wider war against Russia in Europe would collapse the world economy and could lead to the use of nuclear weapons. Anti-war activists should be absolutely opposed to any involvement of NATO forces in the fighting.

Washington’s negative response to Poland’s offer of 28 reconditioned MiG29 planes to operate a no-fly zone indicates that, for the moment, the United States doesn’t want to risk a wider war with Russia. But Biden’s government is weak and the pressure from the political right — in Britain and well as the US — is very strong. At a future stage, popular outrage at Russian atrocities could lead to calls for NATO intervention that would be difficult to resist.

But the second aspect to the role of NATO, and a key one, is as a political-military alliance dominated by the United States and its loyal British followers, using the war to reshape the relationship between the most powerful imperialist states in the world today—Russia, China and the United States itself. This is the inter-imperialist conflict which is increasingly interwoven with the war in Ukraine itself.

Such a complex configuration should come as no surprise, especially to Marxists, who have long pointed out how particular wars can become entwined with more over-arching conflicts. Ernest Mandel in his brilliant book, The Meaning of the Second World War, explains how, in countries such as Greece, Italy, Vietnam, Yugoslavia, China, France and many others, Allied governments like those of Britain and the United States intervened directly or through local reactionary forces to defeat Germany and Japan, but at the same time to defeat progressive or revolutionary local movements. Inter-imperialist conflicts became entwined with wars of national liberation and revolutionary advance.

Today, the US economic war against Russia, designed to collapse the Russian economy and hobble Russia’s economic and political clout in the long-term, is becoming interwoven with the war in Ukraine. By his brutal and utterly ruthless unleashing of Russian military power against Ukraine, Vladimir Putin has handed a series of massive victories to the United States in its battle against Russia, a battle waged in preparation for the more decisive battle to come, the United States against China.

Putin’s war will have savage costs for both middle-class and working-class Russians but much less so for the oligarchs, who always find ways to hide their wealth. Car factories are already closing in Russia, as Western companies pull out and Russian firms can’t find essential components. The blockade on computer chips will mean dozens of hi-tech firms won’t find the necessary components to continue unless China can step in and provide them, something unlikely given the already existing world shortage of silicon chips.

Dozens of retail brands are pulling out and that means thousands of lost jobs. Apple, Samsung and Microsoft are pulling out together with scores of other hi-tech companies. H&M, Levis and Zara are leaving, as is Nike, Puma and Adidas. This is not just a matter of fashion-conscious young urbanites being unable to get their favourite brands, it is a matter of many thousands of lost jobs. Even Russian Vodka, fish products and diamonds are to be sanctioned. It is estimated that Russian GDP will decline by 20% in the next year, a level which goes beyond recession and slump to onrushing economic collapse. The result will be mass unemployment and mass poverty in Russia as a consequence, not of the actions of the Russian workers, but as a result of the actions of Putin and his fellow oligarchs and criminals in power. This is another example of punishing the civilian population. No socialist or democrat should support this kind of imperialist economic warfare.

Russia will also suffer from sanctions on exports, not just energy exports but also exports of wheat. Russia and Ukraine together produce 30% of the world’s wheat, and its elimination will skyrocket the price of bread in the region, and worldwide. Preventing the export of Russian energy will also hit the working class worldwide as the price of just about everything which at some stage needs oil and gas increases in price, giving another twist to the worldwide inflationary cycle. The stage is being set for a massive world slump in which the effects of the Covid pandemic combine with the effects of the war and sanctions.

A key US target is the relationship between Russia and Europe. The United States has long campaigned against Europe’s reliance on Russian energy and even before the Ukraine crisis blew up, was urging Germany to stop importing huge amounts of Russian gas and oil. The United States pointed out that the shortfall of such a transition could be made up by imports from…the United States itself! America has long campaigned against any improvement of political and diplomatic relations with Russia. It has tried at every stage to characterise Russia as a terrorist state, an effort greatly aided by the behaviour of Putin’s state apparatus, especially the assassination of exiled Russian opponents living in the UK.

The United States is opposed to the European Union establishing its own international political and military presence just about anywhere. That, thinks Washington, would encroach on NATO’s role. So for example the AUKUS military alliance in the Pacific —composed of the US and its loyal allies Britain and Australia— was announced on the very day that the EU had planned to unveil its Strategy for Cooperation in the Indo-Pacific. [3] The EU document represented an attempt to get Europe to speak with one voice on the region, and chart an independent course, especially in relation to China, away from the hostile US position. AUKUS was a precisely aimed torpedo that badly holed the EU strategy.

NATO from its beginning has been designed to tie European states to American diplomatic, military and political leadership. It has had the effect in Britain itself of building up a strong ‘Atlanticism’ political trend, represented especially by the mainstream of the Conservative Party. But economic links between Europe and Russia inevitably reconfigured political relations.

Disrupting economic and diplomatic relations between Russia and Germany has been an enormous victory for the United States. American commentators have been complaining for years that Germany’s economic and political model is based on getting its energy from Russia, its security from the United States and its cheap consumer goods from China. It might be added that China is the place where a big proportion of Germany’s manufacturers, raw materials and chemical products go. Now the United States wants Germany and other European states to stop their energy imports from Russia and look elsewhere, particularly to the United States itself.

Western sanctions against Russia are enormous and at a level you might expect if NATO was at war with Russia. The seizure of most of Russia’s foreign exchange reserves –—more than $600 billion worth—is designed to hobble the Russian economy. There is no guarantee that this will be a short term measure designed to stop the war in Ukraine.

Now the rightwing Western media and foreign policy establishment is turning the attack against China. This combines a number of levels. First, Western rightwing politicians say that China, by failing to condemn the Russian invasion, is acting in a way that gives economic and political cover to Russia. Second, China itself could organise its own ‘Ukraine’ by invading Taiwan, and this eventuality is being prepared for by the export of ever-larger amounts of military aid to Taiwan, despite Xi Jinping’s repeated statements that China seeks reunification only by peaceful means, and that Beijing’s economic relations with Taipei are extremely profitable for both sides. For Western analysts, China’s seizure of reefs and small islands in the South China Sea is proof of its militarist expansionism.

However, there is no doubt that the militarisation of the South China Sea is primarily the work of the United States and its allies, whose military doctrine is preparing for a possible war aimed at Chinese coastal cities and military bases.

Obviously, the United States is using its massive military power to influence the outcome of the fighting in Ukraine, and the resistance in that country is massively armed with powerful US anti-tank and anti-aircraft missiles. According to the New York Times, the United States sent 17,000 anti-tank missiles to Ukraine in one week. But those who support the Ukrainian right to resist invasion cannot complain about where the weapons of the Ukrainian military and civilian resistance come from. However, if a no-fly zone were to be implemented, even if it involved Polish planes flown by Ukrainian pilots, it is highly likely that they would be co-ordinated by American or British AWACS planes, (literally early warning and control radar platforms) with the ability to ‘see’ what the Polish planes themselves cannot. This could be done by AWACS planes flying from outside Ukraine, but the temptation for advanced Russian fighter planes to shoot them down would be enormous. A no-fly zone cannot be engineered without the danger of a direct clash between NATO and Russia.

Both in relation to Russia and China, the United States has adopted the position of the 1997 Project for the Next American Century, which projected American military dominance as the road to political and economic dominance. It also argued for rearmament to a level where the United States could simultaneously fight two major wars, obviously against Russia and China. The profligate use of military power has led to catastrophes in Iraq and Afghanistan and could lead to a much worse catastrophe in a nuclear exchange with Russia.

Raising the slogans of ‘No to NATO Expansion’ and ‘No to Nuclear War’ is clearly correct for the anti-war movement, but cannot be the central demands, which remain Russian troops out and stop the war. Nonetheless, NATO’s role in Eastern Europe since the final collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 has been pernicious. American President George Bush Snr, absolutely refused to respond to the demise of its military enemies in Russia and Eastern Europe by disbanding NATO or responding to Mikhail Gorbachev’s project of a ‘Common European Homeland’ of states outside military pacts. Disbanding NATO would have disrupted the key instrument of American military, and hence political, control. Moreover, the United States has insisted on expanding the boundaries of NATO right up to the borders of Russia in every case. This of course is something that the United States— the inclusion of Mexico or Canada in a hostile military alliance on US borders —would bever accept.

The iron grip of NATO is designed to ensure American dominance, and hence loyalty in inter-imperialist conflicts of European states to the United States. It is no wonder then that the question of NATO has become a key line of a divide as far as the Keir Starmer leadership in the Labour Party is concerned. Starmer and his parliamentary whips threatened to exclude 12 Labour MPs from the Parliamentary Labour Party if they spoke at a rally with an anti-NATO message. Starmer has repeatedly stated Labour’s complete loyalty to NATO, a message to the British capitalist class that under him Labour can be trusted. Technically any member of CND could be excluded from the Labour Party because of the campaign’s anti-NATO position, although for the moment this is unlikely to be implemented. In the context of Starmer’s prostration before NATO and British capitalism, it is strange to find a left-wing website attacking Jeremy Corbyn for making ‘an anti-NATO speech. [4]

In the context of the present war, it is utterly cynical for Russian foreign minister Sergei Lavrov to excuse atrocities committed by Russian forces by reference to what the West did in Iraq and Afghanistan. ‘If you can commit anti-civilian atrocities, then so can we’ is unlikely to be a convincing argument as far as world public opinion is concerned. Even worse, Russian commentators on Channel 4 News merely say ‘war is hell, this is war’. The death, pain, suffering and misery imposed on the Ukrainian people cannot be justified by any reference to the crimes of the West, whether the leading Western states were wearing their NATO hats or not. The central slogans of the Left and all progressive forces have to be against the Russian war, for a ceasefire and a withdrawal of all Russian troops.

In Britain, there is an enormous mobilisation of ordinary people and even whole communities to give material aid to refugees from Ukraine. Polish centres up and down the country, as well as Ukrainian community centres, are awash with donations of money, clothes, sleeping bags and other necessities that refugees might need for their onward journeys. Of course, this outburst of social solidarity is promoted by the awful scenes of carnage and destruction in Ukraine. It’s true that the incredible brutality of the Western-backed and organised bombing campaign by the Saudi-led coalition in Yemen has not produced such an outpouring of solidarity, because it has been barely covered in the mass media, and because Ukrainians are ‘people like us.’

Nonetheless, people who collect support for Ukrainian refugees, and millions more, are rightly horrified by the Russian attacks and their dreadful consequences. The anti-war movement cannot turn its face away from these people but should participate, to the best of our ability, in such actions. We must get people giving material aid and demand refugees be admitted to Britain.

Because of the ongoing inter-imperialist conflict, there are competing narratives about what is happening on a world scale. The overwhelming narrative in the Western media is about the defence of democracy against Russian and Chinese dictatorship and aggression. But in reality, there is a huge and developing inter-imperialist conflict, in which the United States is a major source of militarisation and aggression.

## CC Add-on

### CC Add-on --- 2NC

#### Recent events have diverted attention from forthcoming climate discussions – NATO bulwarks clean energy transition in favor of more oil and gas production to combat Russia control of the market – ‘net zero’ is only conceivable outside of the confines of NATO.

Iain Bruce 3-9 [Iain Bruce is a journalist and eco-socialist activist living in Glasgow. He was formerly Latin America correspondent for IVP. He is author of “The Porto Alegre Alternative: Direct Democracy in Action” (IIRE - International Institute for Research and Education). “Against War and Climate Change – Scotland must break with ‘net zero’ and NATO.” 9 March 2022. https://internationalviewpoint.org/spip.php?article7554]

Some of those involved in the report have already expressed their fear that the war in Ukraine may destabilise the UN climate talks system and divert attention from the seriousness of the threat to human wellbeing and the need for urgent action. But the connections run deeper. Sections of the Tory right argue that the need for NATO’s European members to break their dependence on Russian fuel means more oil and gas will be needed from elsewhere – whether shale oil from the United States or additional gas from the North Sea. NATO becomes another justification, alongside the fiction of ‘net zero’, for fossil capital to continue business as usual while talking of a transition to clean energy.

#### COP-27 in November is key to solidifying financing initiatives to reach ‘net zero’ – EU leadership is key.

Daily News Egypt 6-8 [Egypt’s Only Daily Independent Newspaper In English. “Main objective of COP27 is turning pledges into reality: Al-Mashat”. June 8, 2022. https://dailynewsegypt.com/2022/06/08/main-objective-of-cop27-is-turning-pledges-into-reality-al-mashat/]

Minister of International Cooperation Rania Al-Mashat said that the main objective of the 27th Conference of the Parties on climate change (COP27), that will be held in Egypt later this year, will be turning pledges into a reality.

During her participation in the “Investing in Net Zero: Leading the Way” conference, Al-Mashat said: “Global climate financing is significantly lower than needed, and is also unevenly distributed, with Africa receiving less than 5.5%. Hence, innovative solutions, such as de-risking instruments and blended finance, are therefore more important than ever in attracting investment for green, sustainable, inclusive, and resilient development – particularly within developing countries and emerging economies. This requires multi-stakeholder engagement, including cooperation between governments, multilateral development banks, and the private sector.”

Vice-President of the European Investment Bank (EIB) Ambroise Fayolle commented: “The COVID-19 pandemic and Russia’s war against Ukraine are a human tragedy and impact global energy and food security. Both crises also have significant consequences for the global fight against climate change. This conference we are hosting with the European University Institute presents an important opportunity to take stock and discuss how businesses, cities, governments and financial institutions can collectively accelerate their support for a just energy transition, drive innovation in new technologies and support the successful outcome of COP27 climate conference. I want to thank our partners at the European University Institute for the excellent cooperation in promoting best climate policy practices across the world.”

Alexander Stubb, Director of the School of Transnational Governance, said: “Climate change is a defining challenge of our time, which will impact generations to come. It is even more crucial to step up efforts in light of the ramifications of the war in Ukraine. We are delighted to partner with the European Investment Bank to discuss concrete steps on the energy transition and innovation in a joint conference, building among others on the excellent research by the EIB Climate Chair team at the EUI’s School of Transnational Governance.”

Meanwhile, Jos Delbeke, the European University Institute’s EIB Chair on Climate Change Policy and International Carbon Markets, said: “My team brings together the best talents for research and teaching in support of climate innovation and a just energy transition around the world. We work closely with our partners at the European Investment Bank to inform policy making on climate change. This conference will allow us to take discussions on climate finance, the energy transition and innovation further and to prepare for the successful outcome of COP27 later this year.”

EIB, together with the European University Institute (EUI), is organising the “Investing in Net Zero: Leading the Way” conference, to discuss investments needed to attain net zero emissions and the European Union’s global leadership in mobilising the necessary climate finance.

#### Climate financing k2 solve.

Mark Carney 22 [UN Special Envoy for Climate Action and Finance. “Financing net-zero: Can banks and investors help prevent climate catastrophe?”. (Davos Conference: 2022). https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2022/06/financing-net-zero-davos-2022/]

Mark Carney UN Special Envoy for Climate Action and Finance: Thank you, Martin. Thank you all for taking the time and those watching online. First is just on the scale – we need an energy transformation on the scale of the industrial revolution at the speed of the digital transformation. And therefore, we need a revolution in finance. I mean, just to be clear, we need to change mainstream finance. This is not, we're not going to get to net-zero in a niche. I'm on double that number that you quoted in terms of the orders of magnitude that need to be invested.

And if you think about what's the change, with the industrial revolution, what we had was fractional reserve banking, increased leverage and maturity transformation. You had central banks playing a new role, lender of last resort and starting to supervise. And you had an international monetary system that was put together around the gold standard. And the Bank of England at the centre of that (just wanted to get that in there)! Everything was fine with it.

Now what do we need for our financial system? We need to, instead of increased leverage, we need to reduce carbon leverage. Instead of maturity transformation, we need net-zero alignment. And it's not just the banking system, it's the entire financial system. Central banks have a role and supervisors in terms of disclosure, foundational things, and focus on transition risk, not credit risk.

#### Climate change causes cascading biodiversity loss, escalating inequality, new and more fatal diseases and extinction.

Phoebe Weston 21 [Phoebe Weston is a biodiversity writer for the Guardian. “Top scientists warn of 'ghastly future of mass extinction' and climate disruption”. 13 January 2021. https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2021/jan/13/top-scientists-warn-of-ghastly-future-of-mass-extinction-and-climate-disruption-aoe]

The planet is facing a “ghastly future of mass extinction, declining health and climate-disruption upheavals” that threaten human survival because of ignorance and inaction, according to an international group of scientists, who warn people still haven’t grasped the urgency of the biodiversity and climate crises.

The 17 experts, including Prof Paul Ehrlich from Stanford University, author of The Population Bomb, and scientists from Mexico, Australia and the US, say the planet is in a much worse state than most people – even scientists – understood.

“The scale of the threats to the biosphere and all its lifeforms – including humanity – is in fact so great that it is difficult to grasp for even well-informed experts,” they write in a report in Frontiers in Conservation Science which references more than 150 studies detailing the world’s major environmental challenges.

The delay between destruction of the natural world and the impacts of these actions means people do not recognise how vast the problem is, the paper argues. “[The] mainstream is having difficulty grasping the magnitude of this loss, despite the steady erosion of the fabric of human civilisation.”

The report warns that climate-induced mass migrations, more pandemics and conflicts over resources will be inevitable unless urgent action is taken.

“Ours is not a call to surrender – we aim to provide leaders with a realistic ‘cold shower’ of the state of the planet that is essential for planning to avoid a ghastly future,” it adds.

Dealing with the enormity of the problem requires far-reaching changes to global capitalism, education and equality, the paper says. These include abolishing the idea of perpetual economic growth, properly pricing environmental externalities, stopping the use of fossil fuels, reining in corporate lobbying, and empowering women, the researchers argue.

The report comes months after the world failed to meet a single UN Aichi biodiversity target, created to stem the destruction of the natural world, the second consecutive time governments have failed to meet their 10-year biodiversity goals. This week a coalition of more than 50 countries pledged to protect almost a third of the planet by 2030.

“Environmental deterioration is infinitely more threatening to civilisation than Trumpism or Covid-19,” Ehrlich told the Guardian.

In The Population Bomb, published in 1968, Ehrlich warned of imminent population explosion and hundreds of millions of people starving to death. Although he has acknowledged some timings were wrong, he has said he stands by its fundamental message that population growth and high levels of consumption by wealthy nations is driving destruction.

He told the Guardian: “Growthmania is the fatal disease of civilisation - it must be replaced by campaigns that make equity and well-being society’s goals - not consuming more junk.”

Large populations and their continued growth drive soil degradation and biodiversity loss, the new paper warns. “More people means that more synthetic compounds and dangerous throwaway plastics are manufactured, many of which add to the growing toxification of the Earth. It also increases the chances of pandemics that fuel ever-more desperate hunts for scarce resources.”

The effects of the climate emergency are more evident than biodiversity loss, but still, society is failing to cut emissions, the paper argues. If people understood the magnitude of the crises, changes in politics and policies could match the gravity of the threat.

#### Timeframe is the 7th of November.

UNFCCC COP 27 [Climate Conference. “UN Climate Change Conference 2022 (UNFCCC COP 27)”. https://sdg.iisd.org/events/2021-un-climate-change-conference-unfccc-cop-27/#:~:text=The%2027th%20session%20of%20the,November%202020%20to%20November%202021.]

COP 27 was originally expected to take place from 8-20 November 2021. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, COP 26 was rescheduled from November 2020 to November 2021. As a result, COP 27 will take place from 7-18 November 2022.

# Affirmative Answers

## NATO Good

### Impact

#### Collapse of NATO causes increased Russia aggression and terrorism, economic collapse, and more.

Hans Binnendijk 19 [Hans Binnendijk is a distinguished fellow at the Atlantic Council. He previously served as senior director for defense policy on the Clinton administration’s National Security Council. “5 consequences of a life without NATO”. March 19, 2019. https://www.defensenews.com/opinion/commentary/2019/03/19/5-consequences-of-a-life-without-nato/]

The most catastrophic impact of NATO’s retirement would be the risk of Russian aggression and miscalculation. Without a clear commitment to defend allied territory backed up by an American nuclear deterrent, President Vladimir Putin will certainly see opportunities to seize land he believes is Russian. He has already done this in Georgia and Ukraine. Had they not joined NATO, the Baltic states would probably already be occupied by Russian troops. Certainly Putin would also see an opportunity to seize more of Ukraine without the “shadow” of NATO to protect it.

History teaches us that major wars start when aggressive leaders miscalculate. German leader Adolf Hitler attacked Poland in 1939, believing that after then-British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain’s Munich Agreement, England would be unlikely to respond. North Korea attacked South Korea in 1950 after the United States appeared to remove Seoul from its defensive perimeter. Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait in 1990, believing the United States had signaled that it would not respond.

In each case, miscalculation led to larger conflict.

Secondly, NATO’s retirement would also decrease American military reach, its political influence and its economic advantage. American bases throughout Europe not only provide for the defense of Europe — they bring the U.S. a continent closer to trouble spots that threaten vital American interests. Fighting the Islamic State group, clearly an American interest, would have been markedly more difficult without permanent U.S. bases in Europe and without the American-built coalition that included every NATO nation. Without NATO, the mutual security interests that underpin both U.S. bases and coalition operations would be undermined.

This extends to the economic realm. U.S. annual trade in goods and services with Europe exceeds $1 trillion, and U.S. total direct investment in Europe nears $3 trillion. These economic ties enhance U.S. prosperity and provide American jobs, but they require the degree of security now provided by NATO to endure.

NATO’s retirement would thirdly exacerbate divisions within Europe. NATO’s glue not only holds European militaries together — it provides the principal forum to discuss and coordinate security issues. The European Union is unlikely to substitute for NATO in this respect because it has no military structure, few capabilities and no superpower leadership to bring divergent views together.

Germany and France already seek a plan B should NATO collapse, but without the United Kingdom in the European Union, an all-European approach is likely to fail. The added insecurity of NATO’s collapse would also amplify current populist movements in Europe. The consequence could be renationalization of European militaries, a system that brought conflict to the 19th and early 20th centuries.

The fourth consequences of life without NATO would be global. American bilateral alliances in Asia would each be shaken to their core should NATO fail. America’s defense commitments there would become worthless. With China determined to claim a dominant position in Asia, the collapse of NATO would cause America’s Asian partners to seek accommodation with China, much as the Philippines is in the process of doing.

Trump’s decision to abandon the economic Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement has already given China new advantages in the region. Without credible American security commitments, there would be little to stop China from controlling the South China Sea and probably occupying Taiwan as well. Add to this equation the new footholds that China is building in central Asia, Africa and Europe: Abandoning NATO would help assure China’s competitive success.

The final impact of NATO’s retirement would be the near collapse of what has been called the “liberal international order.” This order consists of treaties, alliances, agreements, institutions and modes of behavior mostly created by the United States in an effort to safeguard democracies.

This order has kept relative peace in the trans-Atlantic space for seven decades. The Trump administration has begun to unravel elements of this order in the naive notion that they undercut American sovereignty. The entire European project is built on the edifice of this order. NATO is its principal keystone. Collapsing this edifice would undercut the multiple structures that have brought seven decades of peace and prosperity.

### Prevents Russian Expansion --- 2AC

#### American power in Europe protects it from Russian encroachment and eastern European nuclear proliferation.

Hal Brands 3-13 [Hal Brands is a senior fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, where he studies US foreign policy and defense strategy. Concurrently, Dr. Brands is the Henry A. Kissinger Distinguished Professor of Global Affairs at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS). He is also a columnist for Bloomberg Opinion. Dr. Brands has previously worked as special assistant to the secretary of defense for strategic planning and lead writer for the National Defense Strategy Commission. “Putin’s Biggest Lie: Blaming NATO for His War”. March 13, 2022. https://www.aei.org/op-eds/putins-biggest-lie-blaming-nato-for-his-war/]

The argument isn’t wholly wrong. Putin’s wars are indeed meant, in part, to push Western influence back from Russia’s frontiers. But the idea that NATO expansion is the root of today’s problems is morally and geopolitically bizarre.

Far from being a historic blunder, NATO expansion was one of the great American successes of the post-Cold War era. Far from being the act of a domineering superpower, it was part of a long tradition of vulnerable states begging to join America’s liberal empire. And far from posing a mortal threat to Moscow, NATO enlargement actually provided Russia with far greater security than it could have provided itself.

NATO was founded in 1949 with 12 members in Western Europe and North America. It gradually added additional states — Turkey, Greece, West Germany, Spain — over the course of the Cold War. But the big bang of enlargement came once the superpower conflict ended. NATO incorporated the former East Germany into the alliance in 1990; it then added three Eastern European countries (Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic) in 1999; then seven more, including the Baltic states, in 2004.

To understand why NATO grew so rapidly, we have to remember something that nearly everyone has now forgotten: There was no guarantee that Europe would be mostly stable, peaceful and democratic after the Cold War. In fact, many of the analysts who now view NATO expansion as a catastrophe once warned that a post-Cold War Europe could become a violent hellscape.

It wasn’t an outlandish scenario. A reunified Germany might once again try to dominate its neighbors; the old enmity between Moscow and Berlin could reignite. The collapse of Soviet influence in Eastern Europe could liberate those states to pursue long-suppressed territorial claims and nationalist agendas. Ethnic tensions and nuclear proliferation might explode as the Cold War order crumbled.

If the U.S. pulled back once the Soviet threat was gone, there would be no extra-European superpower to put out fires on a continent with lots of geopolitical kindling. “The prospect of major crises, even wars, in Europe is likely to increase dramatically,” Mearsheimer predicted in 1990.

NATO enlargement was the logical answer to these fears. Expansion was a way of binding a reunified Germany to the West and surrounding it with democratic allies. Joining NATO required new members to lay aside any revanchist designs, while allowing them to pursue economic and political reforms rather than investing heavily in military capabilities to defend their newly won autonomy.

NATO’s move to the east also ensured that Poland and other states that easily could have built nuclear weapons didn’t need to, because they had American protection. Most important, enlargement kept the U.S. firmly planted in Europe, by preventing the centerpiece of the transatlantic relationship from becoming obsolete.

No other initiative could have accomplished these objectives. Partnership for Peace — a series of loose security cooperation agreements with former Soviet-bloc states — didn’t offer the ironclad guarantees that came with NATO membership. (If you want to understand the difference between “security partner” and “NATO ally,” just look at what is happening today to Ukraine, one of the former.)

The idea of creating a pan-European security architecture (one that included Russia) had the same defect; plus, it would have given Moscow veto power over the security arrangements of the countries the Soviet Union had so recently dominated.

Only American power and promises could provide stability in Europe, and NATO was the continent’s critical link to the U.S. Since 1949, Washington had tamped down rivalries between old enemies such as France and Germany, while also protecting them from external threats. After 1991, NATO expansion took this zone of peace, prosperity and cooperation that had emerged in Western Europe and moved it into Eastern Europe as well.

The revolutionary nature of this achievement seemed obvious not so long ago. “Why has Europe been so peaceful since 1989?” Mearsheimer asked in 2010. The answer, he acknowledged, was because “America has continued to serve as Europe’s pacifier,” protecting the continent from dangers within and without.

#### NATO division is good for Russia.

Emily Stewart 19 [Staff writer Vox. “Trump has reportedly discussed withdrawing from NATO. That would be great for Russia.” January 15, 2019. https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2019/1/15/18183759/trump-pull-out-of-nato-nyt-mattis]

Trump’s antipathy toward NATO is a good thing for Russia, whether he ultimately withdraws from the agreement (which would require a one-year notification period and likely see pushback from Congress) or not. Moscow benefits from divides between the US and Europe, and Putin has been trying to undermine ties between the two for years.