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# Offense

## Miscellaneous Cards

NATO expansion would just be another US war (Doug Bandow – Forbes)

Bandow, Doug. "Washington Should Not Defend Ukraine Or Expand NATO: U.S. Should Shift Responsibility For Europe's Defense to Europe." Forbes. Forbes Magazine, 07 Apr. 2014. Web. 02 May 2014. <http://www.forbes.com/sites/dougbandow/2014/04/07/washington-should-not- defend-ukraine-or-expand-nato-u-s-should-shift-responsibility-for-europes- defense-to-europe/>.

In the end, the U.S. could find itself practically alone fighting a war with a nuclear power over minimal geopolitical stakes. Washington should bar further NATO expansion, whether de jure or de facto."

## Alternatives

Other options: creation of broader govt., referendum of EU relations, shift from presidential to parliamentary govt., greater regional autonomy (Seumas Milne – The Guardian)

Milne, Seumas. "In Ukraine, Fascists, Oligarchs and Western Expansion Are at the Heart of the Crisis." The Guardian. Guardian News and Media, 30 Jan. 2014. Web. 03 May 2014. <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/jan/29/ukraine- fascists-oligarchs-eu-nato-expansion>.

But nor do the main opposition and protest leaders offer any kind of genuine alternative, let alone a challenge to the oligarchy that has Ukraine in its grip. Yanukovych has now made sweeping concessions to the protesters: sacking the prime minister, inviting opposition leaders to join the government and ditching anti-protest laws passed earlier this month. Whether that calms or feeds the unrest will be clear soon enough. But the risk of the conflict spreading – leading political figures have warned of civil war – is serious. **There are other steps that could help defuse the crisis: the creation of a broad coalition government, a referendum on EU relations, a shift from a presidential to a parliamentary system and greater regional autonomy.**

Only Ukraine can deal with the crisis, any outside influence would lead to clash w/ China (Seumas Milne – The Guardian)

Milne, Seumas. "In Ukraine, Fascists, Oligarchs and Western Expansion Are at the Heart of the Crisis." The Guardian. Guardian News and Media, 30 Jan. 2014. Web. 03 May 2014. <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/jan/29/ukraine- fascists-oligarchs-eu-nato-expansion>.

The breakup of Ukraine would not be a purely Ukrainian affair. Along with China's emerging challenge to US domination of east Asia, the Ukrainian faultine has the potential to draw in outside powers and lead to a strategic clash. Only Ukrainians can overcome this crisis. Continuing outside interference is both provocative and dangerous.

US single-handedly could sink Russia’s financial system (The Washington Post)

The Washington Post Editorial Board. "Spell out the consequences for Russia’s invasion of Ukraine." 1 March 2014. www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/spell-out-the-consequences-for-russias-invasion-of-ukraine/2014/03/01/8ce1466a-a196-11e3-9ba6-800d1192d08b\_story.html.

The most powerful non-military tool the United States possesses is exclusion from its banking system. Mr. Obama should make clear that if Russia does not retreat from Ukraine, it will expose itself to this sanction, which could sink its financial system. Russia’s economy, unlike that of the Soviet Union, is heavily dependent on Western trade and investment. It must be made clear to the Kremlin that the Ukraine invasion will put that at risk.

#### A2: Only NATO Can Solve the Situation

##### NATO’s response would lead to even more aggression from Russia

###### Daniel Larison of The American Conservative finds that an alliance between NATO and Ukraine “would be exactly the sort of divisive and controversial move that Western governments should be discouraging the new government from making, and it could end up triggering more Russian intervention

##### It is not NATO’s responsibility to solve the situation

###### Doug Bandow of The CATO Institute explains, “Americans should sympathize with the Ukrainian people…but that does not warrant extending military support or security guarantees to Kiev. Doing so would defeat the original purpose of NATO: Enhancing U.S. security.”

##### The European Union is levying sanctions against Russia targeted at their energy sector that could be very effective

Ukraine-NATO alliance would lead to more Russian intervention (Daniel Larison – The American Conservative)

Daniel Larison (The American Conservative), “Ukraine Isn’t Joining NATO, and That’s a Very Good Thing,” March 19, 2014, http://www.theamericanconservative.com/larison/ukraine-isnt-joining-nato-and-thats-a-very-good-thing/

If it seems that way, that’s very unfortunate, because Ukraine’s membership ought to be much less likely now, and it is less desirable than ever. For their part, the current Ukrainian government understands this better than many in the West, since they say they have no desire to join the alliance. That isn’t surprising, since most Ukrainians opposed joining in the past, and a substantial number even viewed the alliance as a threat to their country. **Pursuing NATO membership would be exactly the sort of divisive and controversial move that Western governments should be discouraging the new government from making, and it could end up triggering more Russian intervention.** NATO expansion was a bad policy in the 2000s, and it’s still a bad policy. The difference now is that it is also a much more dangerous one.

Not NATO’s responsibility to intervene (Doug Bando – CATO Institute)

Doug Bando (CATO Institute), “Washington Should Not Defend Ukraine or Expand NATO,” April 7, 2014, http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/washington-should-not-defend-ukraine-or-expand-nato-us-should-shift

In the end, the U.S. could find itself practically alone fighting a war with a nuclear power over minimal geopolitical stakes. Washington should bar further NATO expansion, whether de jure or de facto. Over the longer term America should turn responsibility for Europe’s defense back to Europe. Irish journalist Constantin Gurdgiev complained that “Europeans can’t afford” to take over NATO and their own defense: “Imagine the public debt levels [the] EU would have to run.” But that spending is even less affordable for the U.S., which possesses a smaller GDP, is committed militarily around the globe, and has less at stake in Europe’s freedom than does Europe.

**Americans should sympathize with the Ukrainian people, who have been ill-served by their own government as well as victimized by Moscow. But that does not warrant extending military support or security guarantees to Kiev. Doing so would defeat the original purpose of NATO: enhancing U.S. security.**

European Union Levying Sanctions (Luigi Serenelli – USA Today)

Luigi Serenelli (USA Today), “Sanctions Can Hurt Russia, if EU Can Take Pain,” March 26, 2014, http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/world/2014/03/26/russia-sanctions/6864355/

Dutch Prime Minister Mark Rutte framed the conundrum for the world when he took the stage with President Obama at The Hague, where world leaders are meeting on nuclear issues but also discussing Ukraine.

**"The Russia economy is very much gas and oil dependent," he said Tuesday. "If economic sanctions will be necessary … these things will hit Russia very badly."**

Then came the rub.

"Obviously, you can never guarantee that the people in Europe, in Canada, in the U.S. would not be hurt," by sanctions aimed at Russia, he said.

**"But obviously, we will make sure that we will design these sanctions in such a way that they will have maximum impact on the Russian economy and not on the European, the Canadian, the Japanese or the American economy."**

#### A2: Ukraine Cannot Deter Russia By Itself

##### NATO will not be able to deter Russia either

###### Con Coughlin of The Telegraph explains, “while John Kerry, the US Secretary of State, has warned Moscow that it would be making a "grave mistake" if it intervened militarily in Ukraine, there is precious little the Obama administration would do about it if they did.”

NATO will not deter Russia (Con Coughlin – The Telegraph)

Con Coughlin (The Telegraph), “Don’t Expect NATO to Save Ukraine from the Russians”

It is also likely that Russia is orchestrating the attempts by armed, pro-Russian groups to seize control of key government buildings, such as the government headquarters in Crimea in the regional capital Simferopol, which are now said to be controlled by a 60-strong group of Russian sympathizers.

**But if the Russians did decide to invade, would NATO really retaliate, as the tone of the defense ministers' bold communiqué implies? I think not.**

Firstly, while John Kerry, the US Secretary of State, has warned Moscow that it would be making a "grave mistake" if it intervened militarily in Ukraine, there is precious little the Obama administration would do about it if they did.

**President Barack Obama has made it abundantly clear he has no appetite for overseas military adventures, as his hopeless handling of the Syrian crisis has demonstrated.**

## Historical Examples

#### Georgia

This is my tag (Author – Institution)

Author (Institution). "Title." Date. URL.

This is my evidence.

## Status Quo

NATO’s current relationship with Ukraine (NATO)

NATO. "NATO’s relations with Ukraine." 2014. www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics\_37750.htm

Over time, Ukraine has reinforced political dialogue and practical cooperation with NATO and, since Russia’s illegal military intervention in Crimea, NATO and Ukraine have agreed to intensify this cooperation. NATO supports a range of initiatives in Ukraine, while Ukraine contributes to NATO’s missions in Afghanistan and Kosovo, and in 2013 became the first partner country to contribute to the NATO-led counter-piracy operation Ocean Shield. The formal basis for NATO-Ukraine relations is the 1997 Charter on a Distinctive Partnership, which established the NATO-Ukraine Commission (NUC), and the Declaration to Complement the Charter, signed in 2009.

**Following recent developments in Crimea, NATO Allies reiterated their full support for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine within its internationally recognised borders. Echoing a fundamental point made in the 1997 Charter, it stated that “a sovereign, independent and stable Ukraine, firmly committed to democracy and the rule of law, is key to Euro-Atlantic security.” The Alliance added that it would intensify its partnership with Ukraine and strengthen cooperation to support democratic reforms, complementing international efforts to support the people of Ukraine as they shape their future.**

At the Chicago Summit in May 2012, NATO leaders marked the 15th anniversary of the 1997 Charter and welcomed Ukraine’s commitment to enhancing political dialogue and interoperability with NATO, as well as its contributions to NATO-led operations. **They also declared that NATO was ready to continue to develop its cooperation with Ukraine and assist with the implementation of reforms in the framework of the NATO-Ukraine Commission and the Annual National Programme. This continued support was reiterated by NATO Defence and Foreign Ministers at their spring 2014 gathering.**

Dialogue and cooperation between NATO and Ukraine has become well-established in a wide range of areas. In particular, Ukraine has proved to be an important contributor to Euro-Atlantic security in the framework of NATO-led operations. Another important aspect of relations is the support given by NATO and individual Allies for Ukraine’s ongoing reform efforts, particularly in the defence and security sector. These reforms are vital for the country’s democratic development.

#### Cease Fire

Ceasefire talks continuing (David Herszenhorn – NY Times)

ANDREW E. KRAMER and DAVID M. HERSZENHORN. "Despite Clash in Ukraine, Cease-Fire Talks Advance." 10 June 2014. www.nytimes.com/2014/06/11/world/europe/ukraine-opens-corridors-for-civilians-to-flee-violence-in-the-east.html

DONETSK, Ukraine — The foreign ministers of Russia, Poland and Germany on Tuesday signaled progress toward a cease-fire in Ukraine, even as up to 40 separatists were reported to have been killed in a fierce battle for control of an airport in the east of the country.

Talks aimed at a diplomatic resolution to the unrest have achieved some progress in recent days, the ministers said, but no firm agreement. Past efforts to broker a truce, including one by European and American officials, failed because separatists insisted that Russia did not speak for them at the talks.

Ceasefire likely to be successful (Ukraine President Petro Poroshenko)

Sky News. "Poroshenko positive about Russia talks." 7 June 2014. www.skynews.com.au/news/world/europe/2014/06/07/poroshenko-positive-about-russia-talks.html

Ukrainian president-elect Petro Poroshenko on Friday welcomed the start of a dialogue with Russia following a meeting with Vladimir Putin in Normandy, saying it had 'a good chance' of succeeding.

'The dialogue has begun, and that's a good thing,' he said on Ukrainian television.

'A Russian representative will travel to Ukraine, and we will discuss with him the first steps towards a plan (to resolve) the situation... We have a good chance of implementing it.'

### Putin’s Motives

#### Troops Pullback

Troop withdrawal is a power play / warning to the world (David Francis – The Fiscal Times)

David Francis (The Fiscal Times). "Four Reasons Why Putin Pulled Back His Troops." 7 May 2014.

It's all a power play and a warning to the west and the rest of the Soviet bloc. This all could have been a simple show of force to both the west and the former Soviet bloc. Putin shows that his military could mobilize quickly and seize territory with impunity while sending shockwaves through a complacent NATO and European defense establishment. If he had invaded Ukraine, the west conceded that they would do nothing to stop him. This could be Putin’s formal announcement of Russia’s return as an international power.

Troop withdrawal is only temporary (David Francis – The Fiscal Times)

David Francis (The Fiscal Times). "Four Reasons Why Putin Pulled Back His Troops." 7 May 2014.

It's fake ­ he'll put them right back when something he doesn't like happens in Ukraine, perhaps the results of the elections. “Good old-fashioned Mohammad Ali rope-a-dope,” said Edward Goldberg, a professor at Baruch College and the New York University Center for Global Affairs, when asked what Putin was doing.

For instance, if Putin doesn’t like the results of the May 25 presidential election, troops could return to increase pressure at a time when Ukrainian political institutions are fragile.

## Russia Can’t Be More Aggressive

Economically, Russia can’t be more aggressive (Justin Logan – CATO Institute)

Justin Logan (CATO). "Hitting the ‘stop’ button on nato expansion." object.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/articles/friedman\_logan\_hittingstopbuttononnatoexpansion.pdf

The story U.S. analysts tell to justify another round of NATO expansion is that Russia—fueled by energy wealth and Vladimir Putin—has reinvigorated its economy, cast off any pretenses of democracy and repaired its military. According to this scenario, Moscow is now poised to overrun its democratic neighbors and reclaim the Soviet empire, all the while gathering energy supplies to use to blackmail Western clients. Hitler and Stalin taught us that aggressors must be stopped early, so **it follows that we must now contain Russia by extending security guarantees to its neighbors.**

**This narrative is devoid of strategic logic.** Leaving aside nuclear weapons, which deterrence renders unusable, **Russia is not a great power, and is incapable of threatening Western Europe, let alone the United States. The World Bank predicts that Russia’s economy will shrink by 4.5 percent this year, and its unemployment will hit 12 percent.** Even close to the height of oil prices, Russia possessed a GDP only roughly equivalent to that of Italy and Portugal combined. Its stock market is down by more than half since this time last year spending. **Its defense totals about $70 billion annually (less than what the U.S. spends on defense research and investment alone), for what remains a second-rate military.**

## Russia Will Retaliate

Russia will respond politically & militarily if NATO continues putting troops on border

Mary Chastain. 9 June 2014. "Russia Prepared to Act If NATO Increased Presence Near Borders." www.breitbart.com/Big-Peace/2014/06/09/Russia-Prepared-to-Act-if-NATO-Increases-Presence-Near-Borders

Russia said Moscow will respond if NATO continues to build up forces on Russia’s borders. Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Titov said Russia considers considers NATO unit movements as a hostile act against Moscow.

"We cannot see such a build-up of the alliance's military power near the border with Russia as anything else but a demonstration of hostile intentions," he said. "It would be hard to see additional deployment of substantial NATO military forces in central-eastern Europe, even if on a rotational basis, as anything else but a direct violation of provisions of the 1997 Founding Act on relations between Russia and NATO.”

"We will be forced to undertake all necessary political and military measures to reliably safeguard our security,” he continued.

# Defense

#### A2: NATO has an obligation to help Ukraine

##### Ashton B. Carter (Harvard University): NATO only has an obligation help out member states

###### Since Ukraine isn’t part of NATO, NATO has no obligation to the country

###### In the definition of NATO, it is very clearly outline the organization only has responsibilities to meet for its members

##### NATO intervention in Ukraine would only worsen the situation

###### Kim Mackrael (The Global and Mail): NATO involvement would only make it harder to find a diplomatic solution between Russia, Ukraine, and the western countries

##### Jim Shelton (New Haven Register): According to Kolinda Grabar- Kitarovic, NATO assistant secretary general for public diplomacy, NATO has no legal basis for entering Ukraine

R1- The purpose of NATO (Ashton B. Carter – Harvard University)

Ashton B. Carter (Harvard University). “Defining NATO’s purpose.” 1999.

What is NATO's purpose? In fact, NATO does not serve a single purpose; it serves three purposes, the first two military and the third politico-military. First, and originally paramount, is territorial defense, enshrined in Article 5's pledge that an attack on any member ‘shall be considered an attack against them all.’ Second, deriving from Article 4 as well as Article 5 is NATO's provision of a standing mechanism for the rapid formation of combined military forces with prearranged mechanisms for command and control and for a habit of working together. These forces can be mobilized to protect common interests either in Europe, as in the Bosnian peacekeeping force, or outside Europe, as when the U.S.-led coalition that defeated Iraq in 1991 drew upon forces and habits of cooperation forged in NATO. Third is NATO's historic role of drawing members together, encouraging them to resolve disputes peacefully, causing them to plan and work with rather than against one another, and fostering respect for democratic values and institutions.

R2- No place for NATO to intervene (Kim Mackrael – The Global and Mail)

Kim Mackrael (The Global and Mail). “No role for NATO in ending Ukraine's crisis, Russian envoy says.” May 8th, 2014.

Russia’s ambassador to Canada says NATO has no role to play in resolving the crisis in Ukraine as pro-Russian separatists in the country’s east prepare for a referendum that is stoking fears of more violence.

Georgiy Mamedov told reporters Thursday that the military alliance’s involvement could make it more difficult for Russia and the West to find a diplomatic solution to tensions over Ukraine. Earlier this week, NATO's supreme allied commander for Europe, Philip Breedlove, said the alliance should consider stationing troops in Eastern Europe on a permanent basis in light of Russia’s aggression in Ukraine.

R3 – NATO has no legal basis to enter Ukraine (Jim Shelton – New Haven Register)

Jim Shelton (New Haven Register). “At Yale, NATO official says Ukraine crisis is ‘a wake-up call’. May 5th, 2014.

At Yale, Grabar-Kitarovic explained that NATO troops have no legal basis for entering Ukraine, because Ukraine is not a NATO member. NATO’s actions are limited to such things as reassuring neighboring allies by putting more aircraft in the Baltic states and shifting some military assets to the Baltic and Black seas.

Although Ukraine has been a candidate for NATO membership for several years, Grabar-Kitarovic said it still “would take a while” for the country to meet NATO criteria for inclusion.

This is my tag (Jim Shelton – New Haven Register)

Jim Shelton (New Haven Register). “At Yale, NATO official says Ukraine crisis is ‘a wake-up call’. May 5th, 2014.

This is my evidence.

#### A2: Ukraine could get nukes

##### Alexander Sich (National Review): EVEN if Ukraine wanted to build nukes they do not have the infrastructure, uranium, or energy to produce anything close to a nuclear weapon device.

##### Alexander Sich (National Review): Further, Ukraine has essentially no expertise (and certainly no real experience) in the design and production of nuclear warheads — another expensive, high-tech proposition that would take years to establish while draining its treasury of resources that must be directed to rebuilding an economy plundered by pro-Russian oligarchs who sent the country’s wealth to off-shore accounts.

Ukraine can’t get nukes (Alexander Sich – National Review)

Alexander Sich (National Review) “Ukraine needs NATO, not nukes” March 21st, 2014.

Second, while Ukraine has 15 operating nuclear reactors at four plants (including the largest in Europe, the Zaporizhzhia NPP), its nuclear-weapons infrastructure is essentially non-existent and practically impossible to develop. Ukraine has a modest amount of uranium in the ground, but it has no enrichment capabilities beyond the production of yellow cake, which is many steps away from weaponized uranium. The enrichment portion of a nuclear-fuel cycle is an expensive, energy-intensive, high-tech undertaking for which Ukraine neither has the economic resources nor expertise to develop any time soon.

### Good for NATO

#### A2: Stronger relationship with Ukraine benefits NATO

##### This argument is unresolutional, as a stronger relationship that simply benefits NATO does not prevent further Russian aggression. This isn’t offense for the pro team in the round.

##### An increase in defense spending by European NATO countries wouldn’t be beneficial

###### David Kashi (International Business Times): Any increase in defense spending wouldn’t have an impact for a number of years, thus there would no benefit to Ukraine

###### European countries are currently being asked to increase their defense spending to 2% of GDP, though that bright line isn’t a sufficient metric to measure the effectiveness of a country’s military capabilities. Thus, this increase may only provide trivial benefits.

R2 – Increase in defense spending wouldn’t have a benefit for a number of years (David Kashi – International Business Times)

David Kashi (International Business Times). “US Asks Europe To Spend More Money For Defense, But It's Not Going To Happen.” April 4th, 2014.  
So while NATO officials said Russia may invade Ukraine "any day now," Korteweg believes the threat won't push governments to change their budgets in the short term, especially not in the 2014 fiscal year. “If you, for instance, decide to increase defense spending today, the impact will only let itself be felt in four or seven years down the line, so when dealing with the current Ukraine crisis, it won’t matter,” Korteweg said.

R2- The 2% bright line isn’t a sufficient mark to measure a countries military capabilities (David Kashi – International Business Times)

Alex Berezow (Forbes). “Berezow, Alex. "How Should U.S. And NATO Respond To Russia Over Ukraine?.” March 3rd, 2014.

Korteweg’s point raises a contentious issue with many NATO experts, who believe that increasing defense spending to 2 percent of GDP average is not a sufficient metric to measure the effectiveness of a country’s military capabilities.

The Pentagon itself acknowledges as much. “The relevant challenge for us today (…) is no longer the total level of defense spending by allies but how these limited and dwindling resources are allocated and for what priorities,” Gates said.

For example, Greece spends 2.4 percent of GDP on defense, but contributes relatively little to the alliance. In contrast, Denmark’s military capability is one of the most valued in NATO, but the country only spends 1.4 percent on defense.

#### A2: Good for member states for NATO to deter Russia

##### NATO intervention would actually increase aggression towards member states

R? – This is my tag (Author – Institution)
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### NATO Involvement Necessary

#### A2: Russia would escalate efforts in Ukraine without NATO involvement

##### Alec Luhn (The Guardian): May 19 Vladimir Putin has already ordered Russian forces on the border of three regions in Ukraine back to their bases

##### Russia will not increase its efforts in Ukraine

###### Voice of America News: NATO’s top military commander, General Philip Breedlove, has come out and said that he doesn’t think Russia will invade Ukraine. Rather, they will merely continue what they’re doing and create unrest in the country

##### Russian Defense Minister Sergei Shoygu: Russian forces would not invade Ukraine

R1 – Russian forces will not invade Ukraine (Kristina Wong – The Hill)

Kristina Wong (The Hill). “Russia assures Hagel it won’t invade Ukraine.” April 28th, 2014.

Russian Defense Minister Sergei Shoygu assured Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel during a phone call on Monday that Russian forces would not invade Ukraine, according to the Pentagon.

"The two leaders discussed a wide range of issues related to the situation in Ukraine, with Sec. Hagel requesting clarification of Russia's intentions in Eastern Ukraine. Minister Shoygu reiterated his assurance that Russian forces would not invade Ukraine," said a statement by Pentagon press secretary Adm. John Kirby.

R2 – Putin ordering Russian troops on Ukrainian border back to their bases (Alec Luhn – The Guardian)

Alec Luhn (The Guardian). “Putin orders Russian troop withdrawal from Ukrainian border.” May 19th, 2014.   
On Monday the Kremlin said in a statement on its website that it was pulling back forces from three regions along the Ukrainian border. "In connection with the completion of the routine springtime training phase for troops that involved their deployment to training grounds in the Rostov, Belgorod and Bryansk regions, among others, the president of Russia gave the command to the defence minister to return the troops taking part in the exercises to their home bases," the Kremlin said.  
A Nato officer reportedly said on Monday that it had seen no sign of troop movements. However, Russian defence experts said troops would need at least 24 hours to begin moving. The fact that Russia's national security council held a special meeting with Putin on Monday also lent weight to the announcement.

R3 – Russia will not escalate its efforts any further in Ukraine (Voice of America News)

Voice of America News. “NATO's Top Commander: Russia Won't Invade Ukraine.” May 5th, 2014.   
NATO's top military commander, General Philip Breedlove, said he does not think Russia will invade Ukraine, adding that the Kremlin has other ways to achieve its goals.  
Breedlove told an audience in Ottawa, Canada Monday that he thinks Russian President Vladimir Putin will keep doing what he is doing - creating unrest, discrediting the Ukrainian government and stirring up a separatist movement. He predicted Moscow will keep a hold on eastern Ukraine without sending regular troops across the border.

### 

## Russian Aggression

#### A2: Military Aggression
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#### A2: Energy Aggression

##### NATO caused it (see old con case)

#### A2: Cyber Aggression
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#### A2: Pro-Russian Separatists in Ukraine

##### Russian separatists are actually going against the wishes of Vladimir Putin

###### C.J. Chivers (New York Times): Vladimir Putin asked Russian separatists to delay a vote of a referendum seeking autonomy, yet the troops defied his orders

##### Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov: Separatists will stop fighting if Ukraine agrees to a cease fire

###### No need for NATO

R1 – Those involved in the separatist groups are not linked to Russia (Andrew Roth – New York Times)

Andrew Roth (New York Times). “A Separatist Militia in Ukraine With Russian Fighters Holds a Key.”

“We are an international battalion,” said Aleksandr Khodakovsky, the rebel commander, who led the government’s Alfa special forces unit in the Donetsk region until he resigned after the February revolution in Kiev. Mr. Khodakovsky said that Russian citizens were among his fighters, but that the “overwhelming majority” of his force of more than 500 came from eastern Ukraine. He denied any link to Russia.

R1- Leader of separatist groups says it is largely autonomous (Andrew Roth – New York Times)

Andrew Roth (New York Times). “A Separatist Militia in Ukraine With Russian Fighters Holds a Key.”

In an interview, Mr. Khodakovsky said that he was largely autonomous, that he coordinated on some matters with other separatist military commanders and that he would even turn against the separatist government “if the interests of the politicians and the people diverge.”

R2 – Russian separatists are going against the wishes of Vladimir Putin (C.J. Chivers – New York Times)

C.J. Chivers (New York Times). “Separatists Defy Kiev and Putin on Referendum.” May 8, 2014.

SLOVYANSK, Ukraine — Pro-Russian militants in eastern Ukraine vowed on Thursday to press ahead with a referendum seeking autonomy, a risky move that seemed to defy their political patron, President Vladimir V. Putin of Russia, whose motives in urging a delay in the vote came under furious attack by officials in Kiev.

A day after Mr. Putin scrambled the political landscape by suggesting the vote be put off, militant leaders in Donetsk, Luhansk and Slovyansk said they would go ahead on Sunday as scheduled. Far from mollified by Mr. Putin’s new stance, Ukrainian officials expressed deep suspicions, accusing him of trying to replay events preceding Russia’s annexation of Crimea.

Separatists will stop fighting if Ukraine agrees to a cease fire (Sergey Lavrov)

David Herszenhorn (NY Times). "Progress Reported on Cease-Fire Talks on Ukraine." 10 June 2014.

Foreign Minister Sergey V. Lavrov of Russia said he was confident that after the latest round of talks, any decision by the Ukrainian government to halt its military activities in the east would be met with a similar cease-fire by the rebels. Mr. Lavrov also welcomed a proposal by Ukraine’s president, Petro O. Poroshenko, to open a humanitarian corridor for civilians to leave conflict areas.

## Solvency

#### A2: Full NATO Membership

##### ABC News: Newly elected Petro Poroshenko has said that he is against any sort of vote that includes Ukraine joining NATO

###### Even if NATO wanted to include Ukraine, Ukraine would reject the offer, meaning this solvency doesn’t matter within todays debate

##### The American Conservative: having Russia be surrounded by NATO countries would be detrimental and only incite more instability

###### Surrounding Russia with member nations would make it more authoritarian, liberal, and paranoid.

##### Russian Armed Forces Chief of Staff: Russia will take military and other steps along its borders if Ukraine were to join NATO

###### Russia feels such a move would be a direct to danger to its security and endanger the balance of powers in Europe

###### Including Ukraine would actually achieve the opposite of its intended purpose, and incite more Russian aggression

R1– Isolation Russia is a bad decision (The American Conservative)

The American Conservative. “NATO expansion makes less sense than ever.” March 4th, 2014.

There are a lot of bad ideas for the U.S. and EU response to Russia’s incursion, but the idea that they should rush to expand NATO is one of the very worst. Aside from the fact that NATO won’t and officially is not supposed to bring in new members that have ongoing territorial disputes with their neighbors, advocates for expansion don’t seem to understand that “surrounding Russia with NATO members” is one of the things that makes Russia so hostile to the idea in the first place. It is the fear of being surrounded by an alliance that it still regards as a major threat that has driven much of its opposition to bringing former Soviet republics into the alliance. Western governments have repeatedly failed to anticipate how Russia would react to their plans for incorporating more countries into the alliance, and for a while they could afford to do that because Russia was not prepared to do anything in response. Over the last decade, that changed, but many Westerners remained oblivious to the change. Dragging Ukraine into NATO–and it would probably still have to be dragged in against the wishes of a large part of its population–is just the sort of thing that could trigger the escalation and conflict that everyone should be trying to prevent. One of the worst things that the alliance could do to itself at this point is to undermine its existing security guarantees by extending them to countries that we already know we’re not going to fight to defend. It wouldn’t anyone any favors, and would be more likely to invite the intervention that it is supposed to deter.

P.S. Surrounding Russia with NATO members is more likely to cause the state to become more authoritarian, illiberal, and paranoid, and it would make it much less likely that Russia would undergo peaceful political change to a more pluralistic and liberal order.

R2 – Russia would take action if Ukraine were to join NATO (Dalje)

Dalje. “Russia Vows Steps if Georgia, Ukraine Join NATO.” April 11th, 2008.

Russia will take military and other steps along its borders if ex-Soviet Ukraine and Georgia join NATO, Russian news agencies quoted the armed forces' chief of staff as saying on Friday.

"Russia will take steps aimed at ensuring its interests along its borders," the agencies quoted General Yuri Baluyevsky as saying. "These will not only be military steps, but also steps of a different nature," he said, without giving details.

Russia is opposed to NATO plans to grant membership to ex-Soviet Ukraine and Georgia, saying such a move would pose a direct threat to its security and endanger the fragile balance of forces in Europe.

Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov said earlier this week that Moscow will do everything it can to prevent the two countries, run by pro-Western governments, from becoming NATO members.

R1 – New president Petro Peroshenko says Ukraine will not join NATO (Nataliya Vasilyeva – ABC News)

Nataliya Vasilyeva (ABC News). “Chocolate King Tipped as Ukraine's Next President.” June 1st, 2014.

Although he allied himself with Ukraine's pro-West demonstrations, Poroshenko has spoken against holding a vote on whether Ukraine should seek NATO membership. After Russia occupied Crimea ahead of the March secession referendum, pro-NATO sentiment spiked in much of Ukraine, but many in the eastern regions oppose it.

R2 – NATO membership would be met with retaliation from Russia (Dalje)

Dalje. “Russia Vows Steps if Georgia, Ukraine Join NATO.” April 11th, 2008.

Russia will take military and other steps along its borders if ex-Soviet Ukraine and Georgia join NATO, Russian news agencies quoted the armed forces' chief of staff as saying on Friday.

"Russia will take steps aimed at ensuring its interests along its borders," the agencies quoted General Yuri Baluyevsky as saying. "These will not only be military steps, but also steps of a different nature," he said, without giving details.

Russia is opposed to NATO plans to grant membership to ex-Soviet Ukraine and Georgia, saying such a move would pose a direct threat to its security and endanger the fragile balance of forces in Europe.

Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov said earlier this week that Moscow will do everything it can to prevent the two countries, run by pro-Western governments, from becoming NATO members.

R2 – NATO membership would be met with retaliation from Russia (Ray McGovern – Consortium News)

Ray McGovern (Consortium News). “How NATO Jabs Russia on Ukraine.” May 15, 2014.   
Ambassador Burns continued: “Russia has made it clear that it would have to ‘seriously review’ its entire relationship with Ukraine and Georgia in the event of NATO inviting them to join. This could include major impacts on energy, economic, and political-military engagement, with possible repercussions throughout the region and into Central and Western Europe.”  
Burns’s closing comment: “Russia’s opposition to NATO membership for Ukraine and Georgia is both emotional and based on perceived strategic concerns about the impact on Russia’s interest in the region. … While Russian opposition to the first round of NATO enlargement in the mid-1990s was strong, Russia now feels itself able to respond more forcefully to what it perceives as actions contrary to its national interests.”

#### A2: Border Control
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#### A2: “Security Guarantee”

Security guarantee is the worst thing NATO could do: provokes Russia, doesn’t give any enforceable backing to Ukraine (Daniel Larison – The American Conservative)

Daniel Larison (The American Conservative). 8 April 2014. "The U.S. and NATO Aren’t Going To War Over Ukraine."www.theamericanconservative.com/larison/the-u-s-and-nato-arent-going-to-war-over-ukraine/

Loyola makes the unusual and ridiculous argument that Ukraine shouldn’t be brought into NATO, but that NATO should defend it nonetheless: “NATO may have little reason to admit Ukraine as a member, but it has every reason to defend it now.” **Doing that would be the worst of both worlds: pledging to defend a state that the alliance doesn’t really want to defend, but not extending the official security guarantee to it that would at least make that pledge seem remotely plausible. Agreeing to bring Ukraine into NATO would be foolish and would most likely make things worse with Russia, which is never going to permit Ukraine to join the alliance. Pledging to defend the country while it is still outside of the alliance would be even more reckless.** If the defense of NATO isn’t limited to the borders of its members, there is no limit to what could be justified in “defense of its collective interests.”

Sets terrible precedent (Daniel Larison – The American Conservative)

Daniel Larison (The American Conservative). 8 April 2014. "The U.S. and NATO Aren’t Going To War Over Ukraine."www.theamericanconservative.com/larison/the-u-s-and-nato-arent-going-to-war-over-ukraine/

Loyola makes the unusual and ridiculous argument that Ukraine shouldn’t be brought into NATO, but that NATO should defend it nonetheless: “NATO may have little reason to admit Ukraine as a member, but it has every reason to defend it now.” Doing that would be the worst of both worlds: pledging to defend a state that the alliance doesn’t really want to defend, but not extending the official security guarantee to it that would at least make that pledge seem remotely plausible. Agreeing to bring Ukraine into NATO would be foolish and would most likely make things worse with Russia, which is never going to permit Ukraine to join the alliance. Pledging to defend the country while it is still outside of the alliance would be even more reckless. **If the defense of NATO isn’t limited to the borders of its members, there is no limit to what could be justified in “defense of its collective interests.”**

Paper guarantees are the worst form of alliance 🡪 leads to [global] war e.g. Budapest memorandum (Ira Straus – Atlantic Council)

Ira Straus (Atlantic Council). "A Crimea in Russia, a Ukraine in NATO, a G7 without Russia?" 6 March 2014. www.atlantic-community.org/web/guest/print/-/asset\_publisher/Bwkm77BDDnXu/content/a-crimea-in-russia-a-ukraine-in-nato-a-g7-without-russia-

That leaves NATO, which is what is relevant for changing the security guarantees of 1994 from paper guarantees, which can be enforced only by full-scale war after the fact, into a practical drawing of lines which potential aggressors can see in advance as real and too costly to cross. **That was the whole experience of the two world wars, the great lesson learned -- that if you give paper guarantees or form paper alliances, they will not deter aggressions that can slide into global wars**; if you form integrative alliances and position and train forces to show the lines are intended seriously, you will probably avoid war, even in such strained circumstances as half a century of cold war. **That is why the paper guarantees of 1994 for Ukraine, with Russia as a co-guarantor, are leading to war not peace;** serving as an alcoholic enabler for Russia, so it can get drunk on its own arguments about how it is itself protecting Ukrainians, even while it in fact is invading Ukraine; serving as a legalistic enabler for the rest of the world in case it wishes to risk war with Russia. That is why the suggestions of using this as a model for the rest of the post-Soviet space -- joint guarantees by Russia and the West -- are a mistake. NATO integration is not without its risks, but it has worked much better.

#### A2: Generic Military Support

##### NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen: NATO does not possess equipment nor have intelligence service as an organization. Military equipment and intelligence cooperation should be addressed at a bilateral level between Ukraine and individual allies.

##### An increase in defense spending by European NATO countries wouldn’t be beneficial

###### David Kashi (International Business Times): Any increase in defense spending wouldn’t have an impact for a number of years

Defense One: Their military/police is too corrupt/disorganized, needs internal reform before NATO help would actually be helpful

##### Russia would not be deterred as they would have the upper hand in a military conflict against Ukraine

###### Loren Thompson (Forbes): Russia would have a distinct advantage in any military confrontation near Ukraine due partly to geography and partly due to the modest U.S. investment US regional partners have made in war fighting capabilities

Military aid won’t help Ukraine (Eugene Rumer – Defense One)

Eugene Rumer (Defense One). "Sending Weapons to Ukraine Won’t Help." 2 June 2014. www.defenseone.com/threats/2014/06/sending-weapons-ukraine-wont-help/85666/

**Ukraine needs help, but the kind of help it needs cannot be reduced to shipments of military hardware. It needs to reform its armed forces and its law enforcement.** The conflict with Russia remains a threat, but the bigger and immediate threat is the proliferation of militias, gangs and separatists in eastern Ukraine, where effective action by a competent police force loyal to the state and the nation could have prevented the tragedy that is unfolding there now. Many law enforcement personnel were cashiered en masse following the revolution. That has created a security vacuum and, one suspects, provided plenty of able recruits to help fill the separatists’ ranks. It will take years, possibly even decades, for Ukraine to rebuild its military and police. In the absence of real security reforms, no amount of U.S. or other well-meaning nation’s weaponry will make Ukraine safe from Russia or from itself.

R2 – Increase in defense spending wouldn’t have a benefit for a number of years (David Kashi – International Business Times)

David Kashi (International Business Times). “US Asks Europe To Spend More Money For Defense, But It's Not Going To Happen.” April 4th, 2014.  
So while NATO officials said Russia may invade Ukraine "any day now," Korteweg believes the threat won't push governments to change their budgets in the short term, especially not in the 2014 fiscal year. “If you, for instance, decide to increase defense spending today, the impact will only let itself be felt in four or seven years down the line, so when dealing with the current Ukraine crisis, it won’t matter,” Korteweg said.

R2- The 2% bright line isn’t a sufficient mark to measure a countries military capabilities (David Kashi – International Business Times)

David Kashi (International Business Times). “US Asks Europe To Spend More Money For Defense, But It's Not Going To Happen.” April 4th, 2014.  
Korteweg’s point raises a contentious issue with many NATO experts, who believe that increasing defense spending to 2 percent of GDP average is not a sufficient metric to measure the effectiveness of a country’s military capabilities.

The Pentagon itself acknowledges as much. “The relevant challenge for us today (…) is no longer the total level of defense spending by allies but how these limited and dwindling resources are allocated and for what priorities,” Gates said.

For example, Greece spends 2.4 percent of GDP on defense, but contributes relatively little to the alliance. In contrast, Denmark’s military capability is one of the most valued in NATO, but the country only spends 1.4 percent on defense.

R1 – Ukraine has to seek bilateral help for military aid (PressTV)

PressTV. “NATO says won’t give military aid to Ukraine.”   
NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen said at a security conference in Slovakia on Thursday that such issues should be discussed with member states on a bilateral basis.  
According to Ukraine’s acting Foreign Minister Andriy Deshchytsia, Kiev had asked NATO in March to provide the country with technical equipment, including radar and border equipment.  
“Let me remind you that NATO does not possess equipment, NATO does not have an intelligence service as an organization. We are dependent on individual allies,” Rasmussen said, adding, “So the question about equipment, intelligence cooperation, etc. – that’s the issue that should be addressed at the bilateral level between Ukraine and individual allies.”

R2 – America’s ability to help Ukraine is limited (Rowan Scarborough – The Washington Times)

Rowan Scarborough (The Washingtom Times). “America’s peacetime retreat from Europe now leaves U.S. powerless in Ukraine.”   
The Obama administration has removed all operational combat tanks from Europe and key strike aircraft, limiting the options for a show of force to bolster eastern NATO allies as Russia contemplates invading Ukraine.  
Most analysts, and President Obama, say direct military aid to Kiev in the form of weapons, air power or ground troops is off the table.  
That makes it a top priority to show Russian President Vladimir Putin that Washington stands militarily behind NATO members such as the Baltic states, Poland and other countries once under Soviet domination.  
The problem is, the U.S. shelf is a bit bare. In the past two years, the Obama administration has deactivated the only two armored combat brigade teams in Europe equipped with the Army’s main M1 battle tanks. It also disbanded a squadron of A-10 ground-attack jets that proved effective over Libya.  
While Mr. Putin is flexing his muscle in the east, Washington is tilting military away from Europe and toward Asia.  
“Everyone is moving west when we need to be looking east,” said Luke Coffey, a former Army officer who was a defense adviser to Britain’s conservative government.  
“Ten thousand American troops have moved west out of Europe,” said Mr. Coffey, an analyst at The Heritage Foundation. “Ten thousand British soldiers have moved west out of Germany, while thousands of Russian soldiers have moved west to the Ukraine.”  
On Wednesday, NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen announced an increase in air policing missions over the Baltic member countries. More allied warships will be sent to the Baltic Sea and eastern Mediterranean, Mr. Fogh Rasmussen said.

R? – Russia would have the upper hand in a military conflict against Ukraine (Loren Thompson – Forbes)

Author (Institution). "Title." Date. URL.

3. NATO allies have no interest in military action. U.S. military strategy stresses the importance of multilateral action and coalition warfare in protecting shared interests, but America’s European partners are not willing to engage in a military showdown with Moscow. Aside from their concerns about escalation, they are economically dependent on energy supplies from the east and facing long-term demographic problems not unlike those afflicting Russia. European civilization might never recover from another regional war, and local leaders therefore are likely to remain passive in the face of Russian provocations. The countries nearest Russia are worried about their security, but they don’t want to hand Moscow an excuse for further military action.

#### A2: Intel/Info Sharing

##### Sharing Intel with Ukraine would be difficult and counterproductive

##### According to Christopher Carson of The American Thinker, “sharing with Kiev satellite images and real-time SIGNIT of Russian troop formations and FSB activity is complicated by the apparent total penetration of Ukraine intelligence services and military by the Russian state. Ousted president Yanukovich synchronized his secrets with Moscow; most of his cronies are still in place.”

##### While the U.S. has been gathering Intel about a possible Russian invasion, they are refusing to share this information with Ukraine

##### A senior U.S. intelligence official “said the practice of sharing intelligence with a country like Ukraine is dictated by long-standing intelligence sharing agreements. In the case of Ukraine, the United States historically does not share much out of concern that the information provided to Kiev would make its way back to Moscow.”

Sharing Intel with Ukraine counterproductive (Christopher Carson – American Thinker)

Christopher Carson (American Thinker), “Increase Intelligence Sharing With Ukraine,” April 26 2014, http://www.americanthinker.com/blog/2014/04/increase\_intelligence\_sharing\_with\_ukraine\_.html

But sharing with Kiev satellite images and real-time SIGNIT of Russian troop formations and FSB activity is complicated by sthe apparent total penetration of Ukraine intelligence services and military by the Russian state. Ousted president Yanukovich synchronized his secrets with Moscow; most of his cronies are still in place.

U.S. refusing to share Intel with Ukraine (Eli Lake – The Daily Beast)

Eli Lake (The Daily Beast), “U.S. Won’t Share Invasion Intel With Ukraine,” April 8 2014, http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2014/04/08/exclusive-u-s-won-t-share-invasion-intel-with-ukraine.html

A senior U.S. intelligence official confirmed to The Daily Beast that Ukraine was not receiving detailed U.S. intelligence analysis of Russian troop positions. This official said the practice of sharing intelligence with a country like Ukraine is dictated by long-standing intelligence sharing agreements. In the case of Ukraine, the United States historically does not share much out of concern that the information provided to Kiev would make its way back to Moscow. Until February, Ukraine’s military maintained close ties to Russia. The chances that its military is penetrated by Russia’s military intelligence agency, the GRU are high. “We have to strike a balance between the information we share and the desire of foreign intelligence services to understand our sources and methods,” this official said.

#### A2: NATO Sanctions

##### Sections aren’t topical

##### Not strengthening relations

##### Valerie Insinna (National Defense Magazine): NATO does not have the legal authority to levy sanctions

##### Stepehn Krasner (Stanford): Russia is unlikely to be deterred by sanctions

##### China and Russia signed a $400B gas deal in May 2014, even if Europe stops buying Russia will have a buyers

R? – NATO can’t levy sanctions (Valerie Insinna – National Defense Magazine)

Valerie Insinna (National Defense Magazine) “With Ukraine Crisis Worsening, NATO Ponders Future Relationship with Russia “ May 1st 2014.

"Beyond that, [the response] would be to impose heavy costs, punitive steps in tandem with the EU and the U.S. and individual nations that would likely ratchet up sanctions, and of course responding with further adjustments to our own self defense posture,” he said. NATO cannot levy sanctions on Russia, but it can ostracize the country from discussions that could impact its economy, he said. "NATO will be a forum for consultations among nations on decisions such as whether to go forward with any major commercial or military contracts with Russia."

R? – Sanctions will not deter Russian Aggression (Stephen Krasner – Stanford University)

Stephen Krasner (Stanford University) “Sanctions against Russia may inflict some pain, Stanford scholars say “ May 7th 2014.

"Sanctions will not alter (Russian President Vladimir) Putin's policies," said Stephen Krasner, a Stanford professor of international relations and a senior fellow at the Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies. "Annexing Crimea and loosening Kiev's control over the eastern Ukraine have strengthened Putin's domestic position. "Stanford political scientists say new economic sanctions imposed against Russia are unlikely to cause it to scale back its Ukrainian military intervention.

China and Russia signed $400B gas deal (Anna Aruntaunyan – USA Today)

Calum MacLeod and Anna Arutunyan (USA TODAY). "China and Russia ink $400 billion gas deal." 21 May 2014. www.usatoday.com/story/news/world/2014/05/21/china-russia-gas-deal/9365155/

BEIJING — China and Russia signed off on a huge gas deal worth as much as $400 billion Wednesday that heralds a pivot east for Russian business amid ongoing tensions with the West over Ukraine, though few details of the deal were made public.
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#### A2: Diplomacy w/ Russia

##### Not resolutional (not strengthening relations with Ukraine)

##### The Economist: The last peace pact, the April 17th Geneva agreement, fell apart within days of signing. Trying to negotiate cannot and will not work; repeating our own mistakes is the definition of insanity.
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#### A2: F-22 Fighter Planes

##### Response

## Irrelevant Blocks

#### A2: Allows U.S. to focus on other goals when Russia is dealt with

##### Foreign policy in Ukraine/Russia and in other parts of the world are not mutually exclusive

###### At the end of April, Obama took a week-long visit to the Asia-Pacific Region to reassure the region of U.S. support and intentions, all in the midst of the Ukraine Crisis

##### This argument is dependent on the Pro proving that NATO intervention would definitely deter Russia, which is not likely

###### Steven Pifer of The Brookings Institute explains that Russia is unlikely to give up Ukraine without a large-scale fight because of how important keeping Ukraine close is to Putin. “First, his view of Russia as a great power includes a sphere of influence. An EU-oriented Ukraine would fall outside of—and gravely undermine—that vision.

###### Daniel Larison of The American Conservative finds that an alliance between NATO and Ukraine “would be exactly the sort of divisive and controversial move that Western governments should be discouraging the new government from making, and it could end up triggering more Russian intervention”

###### Con Coughlin of The Telegraph explains, “while John Kerry, the US Secretary of State, has warned Moscow that it would be making a "grave mistake" if it intervened militarily in Ukraine, there is precious little the Obama administration would do about it if they did. President Barack Obama has made it abundantly clear he has no appetite for overseas military adventures, as his hopeless handling of the Syrian crisis has demonstrated.”

Obama visited Asia-Pacific (Phil Mattingly - Businessweek)

Phil Mattingly (Businessweek), “Obama completes Asia Trip shadowed by China, Russia,” April 29 2014, http://www.businessweek.com/news/2014-04-29/obama-closes-asia-trip-focused-on-china-overshadowed-by-russia

The Asia trip, which took in Japan, South Korea and Malaysia before Obama arrived yesterday in the Philippines, has been one filled with state dinners and bilateral meetings, focused on reassuring the region of U.S. support and intentions, particularly as China continues to rise as an economic and military power.

Russia unlikely to give up Ukraine without a fight (Steven Pifer – Brookings Insitute)

Steven Pifer (Brookings Institute), “A Ukraine in Crisis Between Russia and the West,” January 31 2014, http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2014/01/31-ukraine-crisis-between-russia-west-pifer

Why does Ukraine matter so much to the Russian president? First, his view of Russia as a great power includes a sphere of influence. An EU-oriented Ukraine would fall outside of—and gravely undermine—that vision. Second, given the historical and cultural links between Russia and Ukraine, keeping Kyiv close is important to Mr. Putin and his conservative domestic political constituency.

Ukraine-NATO alliance would lead to more Russian intervention (Daniel Larison – The American Conservative)

Daniel Larison (The American Conservative), “Ukraine Isn’t Joining NATO, and That’s a Very Good Thing,” March 19, 2014, http://www.theamericanconservative.com/larison/ukraine-isnt-joining-nato-and-thats-a-very-good-thing/

If it seems that way, that’s very unfortunate, because Ukraine’s membership ought to be much less likely now, and it is less desirable than ever. For their part, the current Ukrainian government understands this better than many in the West, since they say they have no desire to join the alliance. That isn’t surprising, since most Ukrainians opposed joining in the past, and a substantial number even viewed the alliance as a threat to their country. **Pursuing NATO membership would be exactly the sort of divisive and controversial move that Western governments should be discouraging the new government from making, and it could end up triggering more Russian intervention.** NATO expansion was a bad policy in the 2000s, and it’s still a bad policy. The difference now is that it is also a much more dangerous one.

NATO will not deter Russia (Con Coughlin – The Telegraph)

Con Coughlin (The Telegraph), “Don’t Expect NATO to Save Ukraine from the Russians”

It is also likely that Russia is orchestrating the attempts by armed, pro-Russian groups to seize control of key government buildings, such as the government headquarters in Crimea in the regional capital Simferopol, which are now said to be controlled by a 60-strong group of Russian sympathizers.

**But if the Russians did decide to invade, would NATO really retaliate, as the tone of the defense ministers' bold communiqué implies? I think not.**

Firstly, while John Kerry, the US Secretary of State, has warned Moscow that it would be making a "grave mistake" if it intervened militarily in Ukraine, there is precious little the Obama administration would do about it if they did.

**President Barack Obama has made it abundantly clear he has no appetite for overseas military adventures, as his hopeless handling of the Syrian crisis has demonstrated.**

#### A2: Other countries want NATO to intervene

##### [response – they don’t want it to]

##### Even if other countries want them to do it, that doesn’t necessarily mean that NATO should do it

###### NATO does not have an obligation to Ukraine, nor would they help

Ashton B. Carter (Harvard University): NATO only has an obligation help out member states

Daniel Larison of The American Conservative finds that an alliance between NATO and Ukraine “would be exactly the sort of divisive and controversial move that Western governments should be discouraging the new government from making, and it could end up triggering more Russian intervention

##### While NATO has an obligation to protect member states, they don’t necessarily have to strengthen relations with Ukraine in order to do so. The Baltic States and Poland can be protected without intervening in Ukraine.

R1- The purpose of NATO (Ashton B. Carter – Harvard University)

Ashton B. Carter (Harvard University). “Defining NATO’s purpose.” 1999.

What is NATO's purpose? In fact, NATO does not serve a single purpose; it serves three purposes, the first two military and the third politico-military. First, and originally paramount, is territorial defense, enshrined in Article 5's pledge that an attack on any member ‘shall be considered an attack against them all.’ Second, deriving from Article 4 as well as Article 5 is NATO's provision of a standing mechanism for the rapid formation of combined military forces with prearranged mechanisms for command and control and for a habit of working together. These forces can be mobilized to protect common interests either in Europe, as in the Bosnian peacekeeping force, or outside Europe, as when the U.S.-led coalition that defeated Iraq in 1991 drew upon forces and habits of cooperation forged in NATO. Third is NATO's historic role of drawing members together, encouraging them to resolve disputes peacefully, causing them to plan and work with rather than against one another, and fostering respect for democratic values and institutions.

Ukraine-NATO alliance would lead to more Russian intervention (Daniel Larison – The American Conservative)

Daniel Larison (The American Conservative), “Ukraine Isn’t Joining NATO, and That’s a Very Good Thing,” March 19, 2014, http://www.theamericanconservative.com/larison/ukraine-isnt-joining-nato-and-thats-a-very-good-thing/

If it seems that way, that’s very unfortunate, because Ukraine’s membership ought to be much less likely now, and it is less desirable than ever. For their part, the current Ukrainian government understands this better than many in the West, since they say they have no desire to join the alliance. That isn’t surprising, since most Ukrainians opposed joining in the past, and a substantial number even viewed the alliance as a threat to their country. **Pursuing NATO membership would be exactly the sort of divisive and controversial move that Western governments should be discouraging the new government from making, and it could end up triggering more Russian intervention.** NATO expansion was a bad policy in the 2000s, and it’s still a bad policy. The difference now is that it is also a much more dangerous one.

#### A2: Hurts space relations

##### Pete Spotts (Christian Science Monitor): Despite all the angry rhetoric coming from Moscow about the future of the International Space Station, operations are continuing on a business-as-usual basis. NASA has no other choice but to cooperate and neither do the Russians.

##### John Logsdon (GWU): The Russians couldn’t even operate the station without the U.S. There’s such a level of mutual interdependence that they both really need one another.

Space continuing on business-as-usual (Pete Spotts – The Christian Science Monitor)

Pete Spotts (The Christian Science Monitor). "International Space Station: How serious are Russia’s threats?" 14 May 2014. www.csmonitor.com/Science/2014/0514/International-Space-Station-How-serious-are-Russia-s-threats

The safe landing in Kazakhstan Wednesday of a Russian Soyuz capsule returning three astronauts from the International Space Station suggests that for all the thunder and fury coming from Moscow about the future of the station, operations are continuing on a business-as-usual basis, at least for now.

Russian and US are interdendent (John Logsdon – GWU)

John Logsdon, Professor emeritus of political science at George Washington University, May 14th 2014. http://voiceofrussia.com/news/2014\_03\_22/US-more-dependent-on-Russia-in-space-than-Russia-on-US-NASA-0038/

The United States and Russia were mutually dependent to ensure the ISS functioning, Logsdon said. He believes the station cannot work successfully without the support of the American mission control centre based in Texas. Thus, Russia needs support of the American side, but not to the same degree as the United States needs Russia, he noted. Read more: