# NATO Cohesion/Focus Aff Answers

## Uniqueness answers

### Non-unique – unity fraying – Ukraine war costs

#### Ukraine war costs to Europe fraying unity now

**Brotman, 2022**

[Alexander, political risk and intelligence analyst with a focus on EU politics and security developments, “Opinion – The NATO Madrid Summit and the Alliance’s New Dawn” E-International Relations, July 5 2022 <https://www.e-ir.info/2022/07/05/opinion-the-nato-madrid-summit-and-the-alliances-new-dawn/> GDI-TM]

As NATO members meet in Madrid, there are two main challenges that alliance members will have to contend with. The first is continued isolationism and retrenchment in the U.S. amongst both Democrat and Republican lawmakers, including former President Trump. Washington is increasingly keen to pivot its resources to the Indo-Pacific and its strategic competition with China. As such, the U.S. is eager to see European member states spend more on their own defence to be able to rapidly respond to their security threats should U.S. leadership be absent or directed elsewhere. Defence spending amongst alliance members is increasing, and while Germany’s Zeitenwende or ‘turning point’ marks a notable shift in German defence policy, there is the risk of it being a cosmetic rather than a practical watershed, with tangible results likely years away. Support for an increase in German defence spending remains stubbornly low, with notable resistance coming from Chancellor Scholz’s own Social Democrats as well as other coalition members.

In addition, the cost-of-living crisis, economic, and energy security factors are likely to test European member states’ support for Ukraine as the autumn and winter loom. This has already divided NATO member states between those who wish to see a full Russian withdrawal and for Ukraine to regain control of the entirety of its territory, versus those who think Kyiv should accept a peace settlement with Russia to avert further bloodshed and economic pain in Europe. Poland, the Baltic states, the US, and the UK fall into the first camp, whilst France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, and several others fall into the second. The alliance may now be formally united in recognizing the scale of the threat from Russia, but it is not united as to the degree that that threat should trump individual member states’ economic and security needs. ‘Ukraine fatigue’ is already setting in and it looks likely to increase as the months drag on, something that Moscow is all too eager to exploit.

### No impact uniqueness - China Low Priority

#### China low on the priority list – Strategic Concept clearly makes it a low priority

Pavel 22 [Barry, Senior Vice President and Director, Scowcroft Center for Strategy and Security, “Scowcroft strategy scorecard: NATO’s Strategic Concept clear on threats, but will require sustained commitment from Alliance,” 07/07/22, <https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/content-series/scorecard/scowcroft-strategy-scorecard-natos-strategic-concept/>, accessed 07/12/22, GDI-JCR]

The new Strategic Concept contains a bit more continuity in many of its elements with the 2010 version than had been expected. While accounting for the dramatically different security environment—and, for example, pointing to an enhanced force posture to address it—there was not really a clear theme, concept, or label. The strategic context section is solid, capturing the Russian threat very well (“the Euro-Atlantic area is not at peace”) and the “systemic challenges” posed by China, for example. However, I was startled that the China section was so low on the priority list, coming after humanitarian and other challenges, and that the threat of terrorism was so high (coming immediately after Russia). It also would have been good to have seen a bit of foresight applied, with some projections of where the security environment might be headed.

## Internal link answers

### No implementation – funding

#### The Strategic Concept success or failure depends on implementation – and lack of sustained budget support cannot support its massive vision

Scheunemann 22 [Leah, Deputy Director, Transatlantic Security Initiative at the Atlantic Council, “Scowcroft strategy scorecard: NATO’s Strategic Concept clear on threats, but will require sustained commitment from Alliance,” 07/07/22, <https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/content-series/scorecard/scowcroft-strategy-scorecard-natos-strategic-concept/>, accessed 07/12/22, GDI-JCR]

Again, one has to view the Strategic Concept as a top-level strategy that paves the way for continued adaptation at all levels of the Alliance. I do think the Strategic Concept will provide the top cover needed for leaders in key areas to advance necessary adaptations, specifically on deterrence and defense, where there is a need for NATO to accelerate its good steps taken since the Russian invasion of Ukraine in 2014. The devil will really be in the details of implementation, only some of which we have seen so far with the vague announcements of the new force model and new regional plans discussed at the summit that would require thousands of more ready troops assigned to NATO without an articulation of how readiness will be bolstered especially without all countries meeting a defense spending minimum, let alone going above and beyond the notorious 2 percent metric. Realistic implementation guidelines Is it feasible to implement this strategy? Are there resources available to sustain it? NATO has agreed to a historic new strategy at a time of war on the European continent at a scale not seen since World War II. I have great confidence in the many leaders at NATO and throughout the Alliance’s member states to continue to advance and accelerate the changes the Alliance has made since 2014 to address the renewed threat of a revisionist Russia, while also tackling new challenges that exacerbate global insecurity with greater vigor. What I am more pessimistic about is NATO’s ability to sustain upward pressure on defense budgets to implement this very expensive vision and continue to safeguard collective security.

## Impact Answers

### No Tradeoff – China

#### No tradeoff between bolstering security cooperation in Europe and NATO’s strategic recognition of China

Geist & Donfried 22 [Radovan, Publisher of Euractiv.sk & HEMA enthusiast, Karen, US Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs, “US official: No trade-off between European and Indo-Pacific security,” 07/11/22, <https://www.euractiv.com/section/defence-and-security/interview/us-official-no-trade-off-between-european-and-indo-pacific-security/>, accessed 07/12/22, GDI-JCR]

NATO’s new strategy is not about the alliance shifting its attention toward the Indo-Pacific, but instead that there is a need to acknowledge and address China’s increased strategic influence in Europe, US Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs, Karen Donfried told EURACTIV Slovakia in an interview. Karen Donfried is US Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs in the Biden administration. Before her current position, she served as president of the German Marshall Fund (GMF) of the United States. The United States announced at the NATO Madrid Summit in June that they are strengthening its military presence in Europe. Does it mean they will have to revise their plans for extended presence in the Indo-Pacific? I don’t think there’s a trade-off between security in Europe and security in the Indo-Pacific. In fact, one of the striking aspects of the NATO summit in Madrid was that not only did the thirty NATO allies come together, but also, for the first time, we had four leaders from the Asia-Pacific attending the summit. The message was not about NATO going to Indo-Pacific, but that China has in many ways come to Europe through Belt and Road by buying strategic infrastructure in Europe, so NATO needs to have a holistic view of this situation. And it was very beneficial to have those four leaders there and help us in the alliance better understand China’s challenge.

### Impact Turn - China Pivot Leads to War

#### US provocations over Taiwan will only be possible with NATO pivot to Asia – leads to nuclear war

Haiphong 22 [Danny, independent journalist & weekly contributor to the Black Agenda Report, “Taiwan and the making of an ‘Asian’ NATO,” <https://mronline.org/2022/07/09/taiwan-and-the-making-of-an-asian-nato/>, accessed 07/13/22, GDI-JCR]

Still, NATO’s decision to shift attention on the Pacific is a clear and present threat to world peace. Even the Washington Post-owned Foreign Policy magazine has warned of a “Global Cold War” arising out of NATO’s interest in China. The U.S. government, Northrup Grumman-funded Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) has admitted that NATO is returning to a “Cold War posture.” A better term for the strategy is full-spectrum dominance. The alliances that the U.S. is attempting to build in the Pacific are nothing more than an extension of a decade-long militaristic posture toward China which has brought more than half of the U.S.’s military arsenal to the region. This brings the question of Taiwan into view. It’s clear to anyone paying attention that the U.S. views Taiwan as the single most important flashpoint for its military strategy against China. U.S. President Joe Biden has already approved four different weapons transfers to Taiwan over the course of eighteen months. Biden has also verbalized on three different occasions that his administration is committed to defending the island from a so-called invasion from China. These moves are dangerous violations of the status quo on the Taiwan question established during the tumultuous latter stages of the Cold War. The recognition of the People’s Republic of China by the United Nations in 1971 and the normalization of relations between the U.S. and China in 1979 affirmed Taiwan as a Chinese province under the One-China principle. However, the United States under successive administrations has moved away from the status quo by providing clear political support to separatist forces in legislation such as the Taipei Act which advocates for Taiwan’s participation within prominent international bodies. Furthermore, the United States has increased arm sales to Taiwan in violation of Article 6 of the 1982 Joint Communiqué between China and the U.S. which states: Having in mind the foregoing statements of both sides, the United States Government states that it does not seek to carry out a long-term policy of arms sales to Taiwan, that its arms sales to Taiwan will not exceed, either in qualitative or in quantitative terms, the level of those supplied in recent years since the establishment of diplomatic relations between the United States and China, and that it intends gradually to reduce its sale of arms to Taiwan, leading, over a period of time, to a final resolution. To get a picture of just how much the U.S. has violated this clause, the U.S. maintains a backlog of weapons transfers to Taiwan worth $14 billion and this number is only set to grow with the announcement of $120 million more in assistance to Taiwan’s naval forces earlier this month. Taiwan is intimately connected to the U.S.’s overall strategy of developing a NATO-like infrastructure in the Pacific. U.S. military strategists and talking heads have become obsessed with likening Ukraine to Taiwan. Their argument is that Russia’s special military operation in Ukraine means that the U.S. must escalate in Taiwan to protect the island from China. The problem with this formulation is two-fold. Ukraine is a sovereign country. Taiwan is a province of China. Where the parallel truly resides is that similar to Ukraine being used as a pawn to forward the NATO encirclement of Russia, Taiwan is being used as a chip in the U.S.’s plans to militarily encircle China. A key country to watch following the NATO summit is Japan. Japan’s former Prime Minister Shinzo Abe pre-empted the NATO summit by stating that China should be forced to “give up seizing Taiwan.” Japan currently stations more than 120 U.S. military bases and has already made a commitment to increase military spending in a show of loyalty to the U.S.’s anti-China geopolitical strategy. With South Korea’s election of a new pro-U.S. president and Australia’s adoption of a hostile policy toward China, the U.S. will likely seek firmer commitments from its so-called allies on the question of Taiwan. The U.S. sees in the Taiwan question both a profitable venture for its defense industry and an opportunity to build the case for war with China. But the U.S.’s legitimacy is on the decline and China’s prestige in Asia, the Pacific, and the rest of the world is on the rise. The U.S. doesn’t merely seek alliances; it needs them. Military encirclement and the host of aggressive policies that the U.S. employs against China cannot succeed in isolation, if they can succeed at all. The U.S. understands that any conflict with China over Taiwan would require a level of support in the region similar to the servitude demonstrated by Europe against Russia. Such a pursuit is incredibly reckless for a host of reasons. First, China presents no tangible military threat and in fact makes peace a fundamental priority in the international arena. China has only a single military base abroad and has not participated in a military conflict in more than four decades. Furthermore, while China seeks peaceful resolution to the issue of reunification with Taiwan, it will not tolerate any attempt by the U.S. to engineer independence or separatism. So-called Taiwan “independence” is China’s red-line, just as Russia’s red-line was NATO expansion into Ukraine and beyond. The U.S.’s provocations in Taiwan thus risk a hot war with China that would inevitably lead to nuclear exchange. A hot war with China would destroy whatever stability exists around the world and create an economic and human catastrophe far greater than what has occurred over the course of Russia’s special military operation in Ukraine. Those who dismiss these real and legitimate threats to humanity in favor of Sinophobia, Yellow Peril, and New Cold War talking points are walking in lock-step with the U.S. empire. It is critical that we resist this reactionary defeatism, oppose any and all attempts of the U.S. to form a NATO-like infrastructure in the Pacific, and align ourselves with all global forces, including China, standing on the side of self-determination and peace.