Table of Contents

Offense 3

Miscellaneous Cards 3

Historical Examples 6

Georgia 6

Russian Sources Biased 7

Russian can’t fight NATO 8

Putin’s Motives 9

Troop Withdrawal 10

Russian Aggression 11

A2: Ceasefire 12

Military Aggression 15

Economic Aggression 16

Cyber Aggression 17

Pro-Russian Separatists in Ukraine 18

Defense 19

A2: NATO Violated Founding Act 20

A2: Russia won’t be aggressive 21

A2: Russia will not invade Ukraine 23

A2: Ukraine is unimportant 25

A2: Ukraine has poor strategic infrastructure 27

A2: Overconfidence 29

Russian Retaliation 30

A2: NATO will provoke Russia 31

A2: NATO will push Russia to other countries 34

A2: Military Retaliation 36

A2: Risks Nuclear War 38

A2: Energy Retaliation (Against Europe) 40

A2: Pushes Russia to Iran 44

A2: Pushes Russia to China 47

Alternatives 49

A2: EU Involvement 50

A2: US Involvement 52

A2: UN Involvement 54

A2: Sanctions 56

Irrelevant/Bad Blocks 58

A2: NATO aggression prompts reemergence of Cold War 59

A2: Russia Previously invaded Georgia over NATO 61

A2: Crimea deserves self-determination 63

A2: NATO expansion increases US heg in a bad way 65

A2: Russia has a right to Ukraine (ethnic Russia) 67

A2: Cannot afford involvement 70

A2: Membership Bad 72

# Offense

## Miscellaneous Cards

A coordinated approach by the EU, USA, & NATO is necessary (Paweł Kowal – EU-Ukraine Parliamentary Cooperation Committee)

European Parliament. "Ukraine: the way out of the crisis." 4 March 2014. www.europarl.europa.eu/news/en/news-room/content/20140303STO37479/html/Ukraine-the-way-out-of-the-crisis.

What should be done to resolve the crisis in Ukraine? Political leaders from around Europe and the world have had crisis talks for days in order to find the best way to deal with Russia over the divided country and prevent further escalation. We discussed the situation with Knut Fleckenstein (S&D, Germany), chair of the delegation to the EU-Russia Parliamentary Cooperation Committee, and Paweł Kowal (ECR, Poland), chair of the delegation to the EU-Ukraine Parliamentary Cooperation Committee.

How should the EU deal with Russia in order to defuse the current volatile situation?

Knut Fleckenstein

First of all, we insist that Russian troops leave Ukraine, because they are in clear breach of international laws and commitments. Secondly, we have to be prepared to help the interim government reach solutions that reflect the interests of a broad majority of citizens in their country, including people from all parts of Ukraine and of course the Russian speaking Ukrainians.

Pawel Kowal

The most important thing is to stand firmly on the ground of international law and basic facts – Crimea is an integral part of Ukraine and no-one has ever questioned that. Russian forces have breached international and bilateral commitments.

A coordinated and quick response of the EU is needed. Member states, the institutions, the USA, NATO and all other important players on the global scene, which we diplomatically trust, have to send the same message and send it fast to show there’s no place for fait accompli politics in Crimea. If we fail to do so today or tomorrow, we lose our chance.

Putin ignored international condemnation in Georgia (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.

It’s reasonable to offer Mr. Putin a face-saving way out of the crisis he has triggered. But Mr. Obama needs to be prepared for the very real possibility that, as in his previous invasion of Georgia, Mr. Putin will ignore international condemnations and press ahead.

NATO troops could easily deter Russia (Michael O’Hanlon – Foreign Affairs)

Michael O’Hanlon (Foreign Affaris), “NATO After Crimea,” April 17 2014, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/141227/michael-ohanlon/nato-after-crimea

At this point, NATO cannot afford to allow Putin to harbor any doubts about its other commitments to its allies. By basing troops in the Baltics, it can show its strength in a way that doesn’t provoke a major war over a non-NATO member.

There will be those in the United States who will argue against yet another American military deployment at a time when the United States is economically strapped and militarily overextended. But stationing permanent forces in the Baltics need not be a major burden. Because of the small size of the deployment, for example, it would not threaten the Obama administration’s rebalance to Asia. To be sure, there would be additional one-time costs associated with building new and durable bases in the Baltics. A reasonable proxy for the expenses might be the sum associated with moving a comparable number of U.S. marines from Okinawa to new facilities in Guam in coming years, which is estimated to be in the range of $10 billion. There may be less expensive ways to manage in the Baltics. But even a $5 billion cost, spread over five years, would be modest by Pentagon standards, especially considering that the stakes -- stability in Europe -- are so high.

It is still worth hoping that it doesn’t come to this. But if it does, the United States and NATO will have a straightforward, proportionate, and effective military response ready and waiting.

NATO can help Ukraine in many different ways (Ian Brzezinski – Atlantic Council)

Ian Brzezinski (Atlantic Council), “Four Steps NATO Can Take to Support Ukraine,” March 3 2014, http://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/new-atlanticist/four-steps-nato-can-take-to-support-ukraine

**Security assistance to Ukraine:** A package of military help, including anti-tank weapons, surface-to-air missiles, ammunition and other supplies should be foremost on the table. Ukraine’s military stands among the country’s more pro-Western establishments, with nearly two decades of interaction with the NATO through the alliance's Partnership for Peace program. Ukraine has regularly hosted NATO exercises and last fall contributed a company to the alliance's Article V exercise, STEADFAST JAZZ, in Poland.  
  
**Deployment of NATO surveillance capabilities in Ukraine**:  The deployment of NATO sensors, including air-to-ground surveillance assets, to Ukraine would be a clear demonstration of allied commitment to Ukraine. As passive systems they would not threaten Russia, but they would enhance Ukrainian defenses by providing greater awareness of the movement and presence of Russian forces.

NATO can help Ukraine in many different ways (Ian Brzezinski – Atlantic Council)

Ian Brzezinski (Atlantic Council), “Three Ways NATO Can Bolster Ukraine’s Security,” March 24 2014, http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/three-ways-nato-can-bolster-ukraines-security/2014/03/24/452e80fa-b369-11e3-8020-b2d790b3c9e1\_story.html

Third, NATO allies and partners should soon conduct a military exercise in Ukraine as part of the effort to train the Ukrainian military. The alliance’s plan to wait until its next scheduled exercise in Ukraine, this summer, could incentivize Russia to take additional military action before then.

The NATO Response Force, created to deploy on short notice a brigade-level force backed by combat air support, is well suited for such an exercise. The force offers a means to demonstrate Western resolve prudently and rapidly. It has the potential to significantly reinforce Ukraine’s defense against a sudden Russian offensive, but it is not big enough to jeopardize Russia’s territorial integrity.

NATO’s military and spending much larger than Russia (Pravda)

(Pravda), “Loose NATO may rise against Russia with Ukraine’s help,” April 4 2014, http://english.pravda.ru/world/americas/04-04-2014/127272-nato\_russia-0/

Noteworthy, the total budget of the alliance is ten times as big as the military budget of Russia. "If you compare their budget with that of Russia, then the Russian military budget is at least ten times smaller than the total military budgets of NATO members. Moreover, the alliance is superior in all major categories of weapons," Russia's permanent representative to NATO Alexander Grushko said.

Until Crimea, Russia-NATO relations were stable (Edward Joseph – Johns Hopkins University)

Edward Joseph (Johns Hopkins University). "NATO Expansion: The Source of Russia's Anger?" 1 May 2014. nationalinterest.org/feature/nato-expansion-the-source-russias-anger-10344.

Overall, NATO-Russian relations have been, until the crisis in Ukraine, largely stable. At Russia’s insistence, the alliance created the NATO-Russia Council, giving Moscow a privileged status that was sharply distinct from that of its former Warsaw Pact colleagues, which were relegated to a largely symbolic program known as ‘Partnership for Peace’. Moscow’s anger over the 1999 war in Kosovo did not prevent the alliance from successfully incorporating Russian units into the NATO-led peace implementation force there. NATO annoyed Russia by promising NATO membership to Georgia in 2008, but the alliance did nothing to challenge Russia’s use of force in the country later the same year, and has done little to advance Georgia’s membership prospects since. Ukraine’s relationship with NATO has been even less tangible; NATO capitals, including Washington, have repeatedly emphasized the absence of any obligation on the part of the alliance to defend Ukraine.

Attack on Russian embassy in Ukraine is a provocation of war (VOR)

VOR News. “Attack on Russian Embassy in Kiev a provocation to war.” 16 June 2014.

**Attack on Russian Embassy in Kiev a provocation to war.** The 1961 Vienna Conventions on Consular Relations which entered into force on April 24 1964 and have hence been supplemented have been the guiding rules. The preeminent document governing the working of diplomatic missions around the world and clearly laying out the framework for international relations since its inception. The Vienna Conventions have proven to be one of the most respected and successful international documents in history respected and followed even during times of war. Therefore the attack on the Russian Embassy in Kiev, Ukraine is a crime of international proportion which must be condemned by the entire international community.

…

On Saturday the Russian Embassy in Kiev was subject to a violent attack organized by one of the main architects of the Maidan Igor Kolomoisky and members of his Azov Battalion, who the US continues to support.

Initial reports and witness statements testify to the fact that the attack on the Russian Embassy was carefully planned and that the goal of the egregious attack on the diplomatic mission was to seize the building and shed the blood of Russian diplomats. Russian Ambassador to Ukraine Mikhail Zurabov believes the attack was thoroughly planned.

The tactics and the attempted storming of the embassy are the exact tactics that the Right Sector and Kolomoisky’s thugs used to overthrown the legitimate government of Ukraine with one very important exception: **an attack on an embassy is an attack on the sovereign territory of the country whose embassy is attacked. The junta in effect attacked the Russian Federation and historically such an attack has the potential for being considered a declaration of war.**

## Historical Examples

### Georgia

Russia attacked Georgia “precisely because it was not a NATO member” (David Ucko – World Politics Review)

David Ucko (World Politics Review). “Resetting Article 5: Toward a New Understanding of NATO's Security Guarantees“ October 6th, 2010.

While such a scenario is imaginable, it rests on two problematic assumptions: that an eventual attack on a NATO member would be unambiguous, and that NATO could mount a swift and effective response. Neither assumption is likely to hold. In the case of the Georgian war, Russia acted as overtly as it did precisely because Georgia is not a NATO member.

Georgia started war by attacking peacekeeping forces (Author – Institution)

Steve Rendall (FAIR). "Will Twisted History of Georgian War Facilitate a Repetition's." 14 Mar 2014. www.fair.org/blog/2014/03/14/will-twisted-history-of-georgian-war-facilitate-a-repetition/

In fact, Georgia started the war with a large-scale military attack on Russian peacekeeping forces and separatist militias in the breakaway Georgian province of South Ossetia, according to an European Union-commissioned report on the war (Independent International Fact-Finding Mission on the Conflict in Georgia, 9/30/09). Georgia's initial attack killed at least 10 Russian peacekeepers and an unrecorded number of South Ossetians. (Pursuant to a local treaty, Russian peacekeepers were in the two Georgian breakaway provinces, South Ossetia and Abkhazia, as part of the Joint Peacekeeping Task Force, which had Georgian peacekeepers protect other parts of the breakaway regions.)

## Russian Sources Biased

This is my tag (Author – Institution)

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

This is my evidence.

## Russian can’t fight NATO

Russia’s military too weak (Michael Cohen – Defense One)

Michael Cohen (Defense One), “D.C. ‘Insiders’ are wrong, NATO Could Beat Russia,” May 1 2014, http://www.defenseone.com/ideas/2014/05/dc-insiders-are-wrong-nato-could-beat-russia/83626/

There is perhaps no bigger challenge facing Russia than manpower. While Moscow has set a goal of fielding a 1 million-man army, the actual number may be as low as 700,000.  According to recent report by the Swedish Defense Research Agency the country’s vast public health problems and low birthrate have left half of potential recruits disqualified from service. Those entering the ranks are often in poor health, undereducated or have a criminal background. Its poor logistics units make it unlikely that the Army could sustain a long-term military operation, and its defense industry is considered “inefficient” and not up to the task of providing modern weapons to its armed forces. Ironically, the decision to seize Crimea has cut Russia off from one of its most important arms providers: Ukraine. With Russia facing economic hardship in the wake of its annexation of Crimea, it is unlikely that ambitious military reform efforts will be achieved.

As the recent **International Institute for Strategic Studies’s annual Military Balance** report notes, the Russian military has moved away from “the mass-mobilization model intended for large-scale conflict” and instead is “more aligned with the combat requirements of low- and medium-intensity local and regional warfare.” If NATO can’t counter a force like this it might as well pack up and go home.

To be sure, NATO has its **share of issues** — most glaringly large cuts in military spending by virtually all alliance members and a need for greater security cooperation. But it also features three countries (the United States, United Kingdom and France) that have among the six largest military budgets in the world; on the ground operational experience in Iraq and Afghanistan and a whole bunch of nuclear weapons. **In all, NATO can field 2 million troops and, because of its exponentially larger economies than Russia, can mobilize and re-arm far more effectively and quickly than Moscow.**

Russia too economically unstable to expand (Michael Cohen – Defense One)

Michael Cohen (Defense One), “D.C. ‘Insiders’ are wrong, NATO Could Beat Russia,” May 1 2014, http://www.defenseone.com/ideas/2014/05/dc-insiders-are-wrong-nato-could-beat-russia/83626/

However, that will almost certainly be unnecessary. NATO’s ability to deter Russia comes far less from its specific military capabilities as it does from its actual existence. No matter how newly aggressive Russia may be — and the seizure of a weak, neighboring territory without firing a shot is not exactly probative — it would be suicidal for Russia to embark on a war with a vastly richer and more powerful adversary like NATO. Already, **Russia is paying a serious price** for seizing Crimea – tens of billions in capital outflows, a faltering stock market, potentially negative growth and political and economic isolation. Those problems, exacerbated by international sanctions, would look like child’s play if Russia were ever to tangle with a NATO country. Indeed, it’s likely one explanation for why Russia has demurred in sending troops into Eastern Ukraine – fear of the larger political and economic consequences. The fact is that Russia is an exponentially larger threat to itself right now than it is NATO.

## Putin’s Motives

#### Troop Withdrawal

Troop withdrawal is because it wasn’t worth it to Putin (David Francis – The Fiscal Times)

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

He realized it wasn’t worth it. Goldberg said that it’s anyone’s guess as to what Putin’s real motivations are. He added that he suspects the cost of Ukraine, both in terms of Russia’s international reputation and its economy, became too heavy. “Privately one has no idea, but it could be that he realizes that there are no long-term gains here and possibly the economic pain is not worth it,” Goldberg said. “He made his point.”

## Russian Aggression

#### A2: Ceasefire

##### Wouldn’t stop the fighting

###### The Pro-Russian separatists have declared that they will not listen to any peace overtures and will continue aggression. As one separatist put it, “we have reached the point of no return.”

##### A ceasefire doesn’t necessarily mean peace

###### Caucasus Institute: e.g. in the 2008 Georgia-Russia war, Russia broke its ceasefire in less than a week

Russia broke its ceasefire with Georgia in 2008 (Caucasus Institute)

Caucasus Institute. "Russia’s War in Georgia: Causes and Implications for Georgia and the World." August 2008. www.silkroadstudies.org/new/docs/silkroadpapers/0808Georgia-PP.pdf.

August 22, 2008

The Russian Defense Minister claims Russia has withdrawn its forces in accordance with the cease-fire agreement, as it dismantles checkpoints and moves troops from several locations in Georgia, including Gori and Iogeti. Russia however states it intends to maintain troops and checkpoints within zones of responsibility of Russian peacekeepers outside Abkhazian and South Ossetian territory. These zones include Senaki, containing a Georgian military base and an airfield, the Poti port, and areas outside South Ossetia, including a portion of the Georgian east-west highway. Russia also states its intention to maintain 2,142 soldiers and a large amount of heavy equipment in Abkhazia, in addition to its peacekeeping contingent.

Georgia claims these measures are in breach of the cease-fire agreement. This stance is supported by a U.S. government statement, terming the Russian troop withdrawals insufficient and urging Russia to comply with its obligations under the cease-fire agreement and remove all its remaining forces on Georgian territory.

Russian separatists continue fighting (Andrew Kramer –New York Times)

Andrew Kramer (New York Times), “Despite Clash in Ukraine, Cease-Fire Talks Advance,” June 10 2014, http://www.nytimes.com/2014/06/11/world/europe/ukraine-opens-corridors-for-civilians-to-flee-violence-in-the-east.html

The Russian government has claimed to have no formal role in the insurrection, and no control over the fighters. Yet a number of senior rebel leaders have openly identified themselves as Russian citizens, and at least 31 rebels recently killed in fighting with the Ukrainian forces were found to be Russian nationals.

Despite the peace overtures, fighting continued in eastern Ukraine. Overnight on Tuesday, a Ukrainian military spokesman said its forces had repelled a separatist attack on an airport outside Kramatorsk, to the south of Slovyansk, and killed an estimated 40 separatist fighters. The report could not be confirmed. Phone calls to a rebel spokeswoman in the area went unanswered.

Russia separatists won’t stop even with ceasefire (NBC News)

(NBC News), “No Truce: Ukrainian Rebels Reject Peace Pleas, Vow to Fight on,” June 7 2014, http://www.nbcnews.com/storyline/ukraine-crisis/no-truce-ukrainian-rebels-reject-peace-pleas-vow-fight-n125481

Pro-Russian separatists poured scorn on peace overtures from Ukraine's new president Petro Poroshenko on Saturday as fighting rumbled on in the east of the country. Taking the oath of office in Kiev, Poroshenko appealed to the rebels to lay down their arms, offering peaceful dialogue and immunity from prosecution to "those who don't have blood on their hands". But rebel spokesmen in the self-styled Donetsk People's Republic, which has declared independence from Ukraine and wants to unite with neighboring Russia, told Reuters the fight would continue. "What they really want is one-sided disarmament and for us to surrender. That will never happen," said a top separatist official, Fyodor Berezin. "As long as Ukrainian troops are on our soil, I can see that all Poroshenko wants is subjugation," he said by telephone from Donetsk.

"We have reached the point of no return," said Andrei Sukhanov, commander of the separatist Kaskad (Cascade) militia, manning a road block in Slaviansk.

Putin wants separatists to stop being attacked (ABC News)

(ABC News), “Vladimir Putin and Ukraine’s Petro Poroshenko Agree to Ceasefire Talks as Bloodshed Continues in Slaviansk,” June 7 2014, http://www.radioaustralia.net.au/international/2014-06-07/vladimir-putin-and-ukraines-petro-poroshenko-agree-to-ceasefire-talks-as-bloodshed-continues-in-slav/1323606

After the meetings the Russian president said he welcomed proposals set out by Mr Poroshenko for ending the conflict. However, he declined to say what they were and said Ukraine must halt what he called "punitive" military operations against pro-Russian separatists. "I felt the attitude was right as a whole ... If this [plan] happens, then it creates conditions for the development of relations in other areas, including the economy," Mr Putin said.

#### Military Aggression

#### Economic Aggression

#### Cyber Aggression

Russia has infected thousands of Ukrainian IT systems (Sam Jones – Financial Times)

Sam Jones (Financial Times). "‘Masterly’ Russian operations in Ukraine leave Nato one step behind." 9 June 2014.

Then there is cyber space. Russia is widely believed to be the author of a virulent form of malware known as “Snake” that has infected hundreds – possibly thousands – of Ukrainian IT systems, giving operators unfettered access to data.

NATO and Ukraine have already worked on cyber defenses (NATO)

NATO. " NATO Escalates One-Sided Proxy War Against Russia In Ukraine." June 3, 2014.

Ministers further agreed a new cyber-defence policy, recognising cyber as part of NATO’s collective defence. This policy will help enhance information sharing and mutual assistance between Allies, improve NATO’s cyber defence training and exercises, and boost cooperation with industry.

NATO and Ukraine have already worked on Cyber defenses (NATO)

NATO. “NATO and partners examine cyber security strategies in Ukraine.” November 5, 2013.

Participants shared their experience in the development and implementation of cyber security strategies. They also consulted on Ukraine’s National Strategy on Cyber Defence, focusing on how to tackle private­public partnerships in the area of cyber security and protect national critical information infrastructure. Ukraine briefed participants on its efforts to counter cyber threats and initiatives in international cooperation.

Russia has been fairly restrained in their use of cyberweapons thus far (Max Strasser – Newsweek)

Max Strasser (Newsweek). “Why Ukraine Hasn’t Sparked a Big Cyberwar, So Far.” April 22, 2014.  
Still, experts say, Russia has been fairly restrained in its use of cyberweapons so far.  
“Russia didn’t have to launch cyberattacks against media outlets in Ukraine. They didn’t have to launch attacks against military websites. Their objective was to seize [Crimea], and they did that,” says Bumgarner. “They didn’t need cyber to seize the territory.”  
Russian cyberattacks were more aggressive in previous conflicts. Russian hackers shut down most of the Georgian government’s communications systems during the conflict there in 2008.

The level of cyber attacks would only increase if there was escalation (Max Strasser – Newsweek)

NATO. “NATO and partners examine cyber security strategies in Ukraine.” April 22, 2014.

Some cybersecurity experts say they could foresee something like that happening in the case of a serious escalation in the Ukraine conflict.

“If a shooting war starts, there will be cyberattacks to go along with that,” says Bumgarner. “It could be basic [distributed denial-of-service] attacks or sabotage stuff. But really, I’d be more worried about a 500-pound bomb falling on my head.”

Others are less sanguine. “I think ultimately if this does turn into cyberwarfare, there could be attacks on critical infrastructure,” says Darren Hayes, a professor at Pace University and an expert in digital forensics and cybersecurity. “If you think about someone hacking into the subway system, that’s a pretty serious blow.”

#### Pro-Russian Separatists in Ukraine

Rebels are actually Russians (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

The Russian government has claimed to have no formal role in the insurrection, and no control over the fighters. Yet a number of senior rebel leaders have openly identified themselves as Russian citizens, and at least 31 rebels recently killed in fighting with the Ukrainian forces were found to be Russian nationals.

# Defense

#### A2: NATO Violated Founding Act

##### Response

#### A2: Russia won’t be aggressive

##### Euractiv: Armed militants are currently attempting to cross over the Russian border to deliver ammunition and other materials.

###### There is no reason they wouldn’t continue doing this absent NATO involvement.

##### There are already Russian military personnel in Ukraine, and Russian presence is increasing. It will continue to increase without further NATO involvement.

##### Russia has already increased gas prices on Ukraine by 80%

###### Prime Minister Arseny Yatseniuk said that he expects Russia to go further in terms of pressure on the gas front, including limits gas supplies to Ukraine

R1 – Armed militants are currently trying to cross over the border to deliver ammunition (Euractiv)

Euractiv. “Ukraine says ‘armed Russians’ cross its border.” May 22nd, 2014.  
Ukraine’s foreign ministry has strongly protested attempts to cross the country’s border by armed insurgents from Russia, in what is seen as attempts to disrupt the presidential elections on 25 May, and destabilize the situation in the eastern region of the country.

In a statement published today, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine says that such attempts to cross borders “take place with the full connivance of the Russian authorities and unlawful inactivity by Russian border guards”.

“In particular, on 21 May in Krasnodonsky region of Lugansk Oblast Ukrainian border guards prevented an attempt of several groups of armed militants, who were escorting weapons and ammunition from the territory of the Russian Federation, to illegally break through the state border of Ukraine. The same day, a Russian MI-8 helicopter violated the airspace of Ukraine in Sumy Oblast”, the Ukrainian ministry stated.

R3 – Russia has already increased gas prices by 80% (Svetlana Burmistrova – Reuters)

Svetlana Burmistrova (Reuters). “Russia raises gas prices for Ukraine by 80 percent.” April 4th, 2014.  
The increase, announced in Moscow by Russian natural gas producer Gazprom, means Ukraine will pay 80 percent more for its gas than before the initial increase on Monday.  
Prime Minister Arseny Yatseniuk said the latest move, two weeks after Moscow annexed Ukraine's Crimea region, was unacceptable and warned that he expected Russia to increase pressure on Kiev by limiting supply to his country.  
"There is no reason why Russia would raise the gas price for Ukraine ... other than one - politics," Yatseniuk told Reuters in an interview in the Ukrainian capital Kiev.  
"We expect Russia to go further in terms of pressure on the gas front, including limiting gas supplies to Ukraine."

#### A2: Russia will not invade Ukraine

##### Russia doesn’t need to invade in order to take over Eastern Ukraine

###### According to Philip Breedlove, commander of U.S. and European NATO forces, “Russian President Vladimir Putin may be able to annex pieces of Ukraine simply by encouraging unrest among pro-Russian forces inside the country”

Russia can control Ukraine without invading (Sara Sorcher – National Journal)

Sara Sorcher (National Journal), “NATO Commander Says Russia Doesn’t Need to Invade to Take Over Eastern Ukraine,” May 2 2014, http://www.nationaljournal.com/defense/nato-commander-says-russia-doesn-t-need-to-invade-to-take-over-eastern-ukraine-20140502

Instead, Russian President Vladimir Putin may be able to annex pieces of Ukraine simply by encouraging unrest among pro-Russian forces inside the country, said Air Force Gen. Philip Breedlove, who commands U.S. and European NATO forces.

"As little as a week and a half, two weeks ago, I would have put military incursion as the most likely outcome," Breedlove told *National Journal*. "Now, I don't take that option off the table—[Putin] can still use it, his force is imminently prepared to do that—but he may be able to accomplish his objectives with simply the unrest his forces are causing in eastern Ukraine right now."

#### A2: Ukraine is unimportant

##### A peaceful and independent Ukraine is key to being a successful buffer between Russia and the West, and keeping a peaceful Russia

###### Michael Mendelbaum of Foreign Affairs writes, “Ukraine…is the opposite of marginal to NATO: it is central. So long as it remains independent it is a buffer between Russia and the rest of Europe. More important, an independent Ukraine is the best guarantee that Russia will remain a peaceful nation-state.

##### While NATO may not have a responsibility to help Ukraine, failing to solve this Russian aggression would delegitimize NATO, making Ukraine a strategic asset

###### Nicholas Burns of the Boston Globe explains that because of Putin’s resounding success in Ukraine, there is nothing stopping him from invading even weaker Baltic States. He writes, “By launching covert campaigns to incite the large ethnic Russian populations in NATO allies Estonia and Latvia, Putin could deliver a potentially devastating blow to NATO’s credibility to safeguard the security of its members. Unless NATO confronts Putin with much tougher sanctions and a credible conventional force in the Baltics, he may calculate he could get away with it.”

Ukraine key to peaceful Russia (Michael Mendelbaum – Foreign Affairs)

Michael Mendelbaum (Foreign Affairs), “Preserving the New Peace,” May 1995, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/50965/michael-mandelbaum/preserving-the-new-peace

Indeed, discussions of NATO tend to treat Ukraine as marginal.

Ukraine, however, is the opposite of marginal: it is central. So long as it remains independent it is a buffer between Russia and the rest of Europe. More important, an independent Ukraine is the best guarantee that Russia will remain a peaceful nation-state. Conflict between the two would have adverse repercussions to the west. And if Moscow absorbed Ukraine or attempted to do so, Russia would again become a multinational empire harboring a large, resentful subject nation, with poor prospects for the construction of a stable democratic system. It is not an exaggeration to say that NATO expansion will be good or bad depending on its effect on the peaceful coexistence of Ukraine and Russia.

Failing to solve crisis could delegitimize NATO (Nicholas Burns – Boston Globe)

Nicholas Burns (Boston Globe), “Where’s the US on Ukraine?”, May 8, 2014, http://www.bostonglobe.com/opinion/2014/05/08/what-stake-ukraine/UDvzSnTJdWvSocMYQ4IMKP/story.html

First, Putin’s success in Ukraine is resounding ominously in Central Europe — the countries once prisoners of the Warsaw Pact and, in the case of the three Baltic states, the Soviet Union itself. If he gets away with the destruction of a major state like Ukraine, what would stop him from destabilizing an even weaker Moldova? Might he then even be tempted to undermine NATO itself? By launching covert campaigns to incite the large ethnic Russian populations in NATO allies Estonia and Latvia, Putin could deliver a potentially devastating blow to NATO’s credibility to safeguard the security of its members. Unless NATO confronts Putin with much tougher sanctions and a credible conventional force in the Baltics, he may calculate he could get away with it.

#### A2: Ukraine has poor strategic infrastructure

##### NATO is working to secure strategic infrastructure in Ukraine

###### According to Euractiv, “NATO experts have visited Ukraine, in order to advise the government on improving the safety of nuclear power plants, gas pipelines and other critical infrastructure amid growing violence and fears of conflict with Russia, officials said on Wednesday. “

###### According to Reuters, “The defence ministers agreed to develop a "readiness action plan" for the NATO summit with longer term measures for beefing up eastern European security. These could include pre-positioning equipment in eastern Europe and preparing infrastructure to enable rapid reinforcement, more military exercises and shortening the response time of NATO's rapid reaction force.

NATO working to secure Ukrainian Infrastructure (EurActiv)

(EurActiv), “NATO Helps Secure Strategic Infrastructure in Ukraine,” May 8 2014, http://www.euractiv.com/sections/europes-east/nato-helps-secure-strategic-infrastructure-ukraine-301999

NATO experts have visited Ukraine, in order to advise the government on improving the safety of nuclear power plants, gas pipelines and other critical infrastructure amid growing violence and fears of conflict with Russia, officials said on Wednesday. Ukrainian Ambassador to NATO, Ihor Dolhov, said that NATO civilian experts had visited Ukraine last month, to assess critical infrastructure such as nuclear plants, pumping stations for gas pipelines and hydro-electric plants.

NATO working to secure Ukrainian Infrastructure (Reuters)

(Reuters), “U.S. Presses Allies to Raise Defense Spending After Ukraine,” June 4 2014, http://in.reuters.com/article/2014/06/03/ukraine-crisis-nato-idINL6N0OK3BA20140603

The defence ministers agreed to develop a "readiness action plan" for the NATO summit with longer term measures for beefing up eastern European security. **These could include pre-positioning equipment in Eastern Europe and preparing infrastructure to enable rapid reinforcement, more military exercises and shortening the response time of NATO's rapid reaction force.** Special operations forces are one of the priority areas the United States believes NATO should focus on developing, Hagel told the meeting. "Russia's asymmetric tactics in Ukraine underscore the need to enhance allies' unconventional capabilities," he said.

#### A2: Overconfidence

##### Response

## Russian Retaliation

#### A2: NATO will provoke Russia

##### NATO has done a lot in the past few months, why hasn’t there been backlash?

##### Paul Shinkman (US News): Russia’s blaming of NATO is complete falsification without foundation that Putin is using

##### e.g. Georgia:

##### Alternative: sets terrible precedent

##### Michael J. Quigley (Defense One): Putin has attempted to justify expansion before by saying that it protects “Russian Nationals”. If NATO doesn’t step in, Putin will continue using tactics to try to expand to locations such as Transdniestria, which is a breakaway province of Moldova.

##### Russia can’t retaliate

##### Even if Russia is ‘upset,’ they can’t retaliate because Ukraine will have the full support of NATO behind them

Russia’s blame of NATO is without foundation (Paul Shinkman – US News)

Paul Shinkman (US News). "The NATO Problem: Ukraine Edition." 20 May 2014. www.usnews.com/news/articles/2014/05/20/natos-very-existence-to-blame-for-ukraine-violence-ukrainian-pol-says

“If there were people questioning NATO’s purpose as it hit, earlier this year, its 65th birthday … those thoughts have been retired. NATO clearly has a new raison d’être, or its old raison d’être has been brought forward,” Alexander Vershbow, NATO’s deputy director general, said at a breakfast meeting with reporters this month. “It’s valuable to the U.S. to have a ‘coalition in waiting,’ which is what NATO is.”

The alliance provides an advanced and integrated command structure that, for example, was able to put together an attack plan a mere week before it invaded Libya in 2011.

Vershbow referenced his own frustrations that only four signatory countries – Estonia, Greece, the U.K. and the U.S. – live up to their commitments of spending at least 2 percent of their gross domestic products on defense. He believes, if anything, the ongoing crisis in Ukraine should provide the “wake-up call” all NATO members need to up their antes, now more than ever.

“Some people joke some countries may just hit the snooze button rather than increase defense spending,” Vershbow said. The point will likely take center stage at this year’s NATO summit in September.

He added, “This is the challenge even going beyond this crisis: There’s a huge false narrative being put out by the Russians, which affects NATO very much. Putin has tried to blame NATO expansion for what happened in Ukraine and Crimea, to use NATO expansion to justify the annexation of Crimea, which is absolutely without foundation.”

NATO expansion simply an excuse for Putin (Max Boot – Commentary Magazine)

Max Boot (Commentary Magazine), “Putin’s NATO Justification,” May 7 2014, http://www.commentarymagazine.com/2014/05/07/putins-nato-justification/

The one action that the West did take after the Soviet Union’s collapse that Putin can label as provocative was the expansion of NATO to Eastern Europe. This was opposed by some at the time as a needless aggravation of Russia. That argument is now being heard anew not only from Putin but from those in the West eager to rationalize his aggression. But it is disingenuous to suggest that Putin’s desire to reassemble the Russian empire is fueled by fear of NATO, a purely defensive alliance. Only someone who has been binge-watching RT (formerly Russia Today)–the Kremlin’s propaganda organ–could possibly imagine that, absent NATO’s expansion, Putin would be behaving in a more neighborly fashion toward Georgia, Ukraine, or other neighboring states that he still considers to be Russian satrapies. NATO expansion may be an excuse for Russian aggression but it is not its cause. Actually, NATO expansion has been a great force for peace and stability, helping to lock in the democratic gains in Eastern Europe and to impose limitations on Russian bullying.

NATO expansion simply an excuse for Putin (John Aravosis – America Blog)

John Aravosis (America Blog), “Putin Wants Finland, Baltic States, Says Former Top Adviser,” March 31 2014, http://americablog.com/2014/03/putin-wants-finland-baltic-states-says-former-top-adviser.html

While the Baltic states are now part of NATO (since 2004), and any Russian aggression towards those countries would entail all out war with NATO, Finland is another story. While NATO has close ties with Finland, the country is not a member of NATO. And while any Russian attempt to undermine Finland, or even take its land, would probably be met with even more western sanctions, it’s not clear whether the west would react militarily. And that’s what Putin is betting on, according to Illarionov. Some are blaming NATO’s expansion into Poland and the Baltic countries with putting Putin in a position where he felt he had to strike back and take Georgia and Ukraine. Then again, the Baltic countries’ accession to NATO is the only thing guaranteeing that Russia will never again be able to Crimea-ize those small countries in the future. The same can’t be said of non-NATO Finland.

#### A2: NATO will push Russia to other countries

##### Russia seeking to expand to other countries is always preferable to the status quo, as they are already taking actions inside Ukraine.

##### Not helping in Ukraine would set the precedent that Russia can essentially do what it wants in terms of expansion.

###### Michael J. Quigley (Defense One): Putin has attempted to justify expansion before by saying that it protects “Russian Nationals”. If NATO doesn’t step in, Putin will continue using tactics to try to expand to locations such as Transdniestria, which is a breakaway province of Moldova.

R1 – Russia would want to continue regardless of NATO involvement (Eli Lake – The Daily Beast)

Eli Lake (The Daily Beast). “Is Putin’s Next Move to Take Over Odessa?”   
There have been multiple reports that Russia has moved new plainclothes personnel into Transnistra in recent days, flown into the Moldovan capital of Chisinau directly from Moscow and then bussed over the Moldova-Transnistria boundary line. On Wednesday, some leaders in Transnistria called on Russia to formally recognize them and incorporate them into the Russian Federation.  
The Russian government has publicly warning for weeks that it considered Transnistria a crucial part of its ongoing effort in Ukraine, because the lifelines to the Russian-speaking residents there—as well as the military supply routes—run through Ukrainian territory. Ongoing tensions between Moscow and Kiev could threaten those supply lines, leaving Russians there stranded.

R3 – Not being involved would set a bad precedent (Michael J. Quigley – Defense One)

Michael J. Quigley (Defense One). “NATO Expansion Will Put Russia in Its Place.” April 2nd, 2014.

Putin must not be allowed to make demands with a metaphorical gun at the head of the West. His adventurism in Georgia was justified as “protecting Russian nationals” – the same excuse for interfering in Crimea. Russia’s flagrant disregard for peaceful international mechanisms to address concerns establishes a pattern of regional bullying that cannot be ignored. Clearly, other places in the region that are home to Russian speakers are at risk. Transdniestria, a break-away province of Moldova along the border with Ukraine, may well be the next strategic objective in Putin’s campaign to casually redraw the map of Europe.  
A norm broken once is an anomaly, but a norm broken twice risks becoming a replacement. Thankfully, we have the means to reassure Russia’s neighbors. NATO, initiated by leadership from President Barack Obama, must bring Georgia into the fold via the Membership Action Plan. This would send a message to Moscow and demonstrate to other countries that the hard work of reform pays off. Furthermore, Western leaders should accept expansion for Macedonia and Montenegro at the NATO Summit this September in Cardiff, Wales.

#### A2: Military Retaliation

##### Response

This is my tag (Author – Institution)

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

This is my evidence.

#### A2: Risks Nuclear War

##### Highly unlikely that nukes would be used, mutually assured destruction

###### Seth Baum of the Huffington Post explains that it is very unlikely to reach nuclear warfare because “neither side has anywhere near enough at stake to justify such extraordinary measures. Instead, it seems a lot more likely that the whole crisis will get resolved with a minimum of deaths.”

###### Eoghan Burke of Urban Times finds “Despite enduring a bitter military rivalry and arms race which lasted for over 4 decades, the US and Soviet Union never engaged in direct confrontation with each other as each side was aware of the potentially catastrophic consequences of nuclear war. With both the US and Russia holding considerable military nuclear capabilities, the possibility of direct military confrontation is very low.”

##### The threat of nuclear war is simply a diplomatic ploy

###### “Neither the US nor Russia would actually choose to go to war over Ukraine. But both sides use the possibility that a conflict between them could escalate—whether because of an accidental launch or a poor choice—to deter the other. It’s a game of nuclear chicken: the country that is willing to go closest to the brink gets its way.”

Nuclear warfare highly unlikely (Seth Baum – Huffington Post)

Seth Baum (Huffington Post), “Best and Worst Case Scenarios For Ukraine Crisis,” May 7 2014,

It seems rather unlikely that the U.S. and Russia would end up in nuclear war over Ukraine. Sure, they have opposing positions, but neither side has anywhere near enough at stake to justify such extraordinary measures. Instead, it seems a lot more likely that the whole crisis will get resolved with a minimum of deaths. However, the story has already taken some surprising plot twists. We cannot rule out the possibility of it ending in direct nuclear war.

Nuclear warfare highly unlikely (Eoghan Burke – Urban Times)

Eoghan Burke (Urban Times), “5 Reasons Why the Ukrainian Crisis Won’t Lead to World War III,” March 4 2014

Despite enduring a bitter military rivalry and arms race which lasted for over 4 decades, the US and Soviet Union never engaged in direct confrontation with each other as each side was aware of the potentially catastrophic consequences of nuclear war. With both the US and Russia holding considerable military nuclear capabilities, the possibility of direct military confrontation is very low.

Nuclear war idea just a diplomatic ploy (Anthropocene)

(Anthropocene), “What’s At Stake For The World in Ukraine,” March 2 2014, http://anthropoceneblog.wordpress.com/2014/03/02/whats-at-stake-for-the-world-in-ukraine/

Schelling called this a “threat that leaves something to chance”. Neither the US nor Russia would actually choose to go to war over Ukraine. But both sides use the possibility that a conflict between them could escalate—whether because of an accidental launch or a poor choice—to deter the other. It’s a game of nuclear chicken: the country that is willing to go closest to the brink gets its way. Either country, of course, could simply choose to back down whenever the other country rocks the canoe. But that would mean effectively becoming the hostage of the other country.

#### A2: Energy Retaliation (Against Europe)

##### Not resolutional

###### Natalia Zinetss (Reuturs): No link to increased NATO relations. Russia threatened to cut off oil because Ukraine refuses to pay its oil debts

###### This isn’t Russian aggression, but rather Russia asking to be paid what is legally owed.

##### Carol Matlack (Bloomberg): Russia won’t cut off gas supplies because it would hurt their economy too much

##### Europe wouldn’t be badly affected

###### Al Jazeera: Russia only supplies 15% of Europe’s energy needs

###### Insa Wrede (Deutsche Welle): Europe can sustain the loss with its large gas reservoirs

###### New York Times: The U.S can ship gas to Ukraine to tie them over to future investment

##### Double Bind (Russian gas sales are vital to their economy)

###### Carol Matlack (Bloomberg): Russia won’t cut off gas supplies because it would hurt their economy too much

###### Daniel Yergin (Politico): If they cut off, it will destroy the Russian economy (prevent further Russian aggression).

Russia only supplies 15% of Europe’s energy needs (al Jazeera)

al Jazeera. 8 June 2014. "Ukraine-Russia gas talks to resume."

Russian natural gas transits through Ukraine supply about 15 percent of European needs [AP] Russia, Ukraine and the European Union will restart talks on Russian natural gas supplies to try to resolve a disagreement over price. "The next (round) of trilateral negotiations will take place tomorrow [Monday] evening in Brussels," a spokeswoman for the energy ministry said on Sunday.

Russia wouldn’t cut off gas supplies because it would hurt their economy too much (Carol Matlack - Bloomberg)

Carol Matlack (Bloomberg), “While Europe Seeks Compromise on Sanctions, Putin Could Cut Off The Gas,” May 12 2014, http://www.businessweek.com/articles/2014-05-12/while-europe-seeks-compromise-on-sanctions-putin-could-cut-off-the-gas

The best protection Europe may have against an abrupt gas cutoff is that Russia’s economy is in a slump, and the Kremlin badly needs revenue from its foreign gas sales. It’s eyeing new markets in Asia, but those will take years to develop. Freedman suspects the Russians will seek to negotiate higher prices with Ukraine, rather than halting shipments. “That would be the sensible option,” he says.

Europe is primed to withstand gas cutoff (Insa Wrede - Deutsche Welle)

Insa Wrede (Deutsche Welle), “Europe Has Little Reason to Fear Russia Gas Cut-off,” March 7 2014, http://www.dw.de/europe-has-little-reason-to-fear-russian-gas-cut-off/a-17480530

What if the dispute escalates and Moscow stops the flow of gas? Experts have said Western Europe would probably not be that badly affected. "That wouldn't affect the EU very much," said Jonas Grätz of the Center for Security Studies (CSS) in Zurich, adding a cut would hit eastern nations like Hungary and Bulgaria more than states in Western Europe, where the gas reservoirs are still filled to about 60 percent - enough for up to four months. "There's a glut on the international gas markets," said Claudia Kemfert, an energy expert with the Berlin-based German Institute for Economic Research (DIW). But Kemfert said in the long run, Europe is insufficiently prepared to purchase a third of the gas it needs elsewhere. "That is true in particular for countries in Southeast Europe that buy large amounts of gas in Russia."

Russia is not likely to cut gas supplies to Europe. "Russia heavily depends on energy deliveries to Europe," Kemfert said. "Some 60 percent of Russia's state income is due to oil, gas and coal sales - and a large part of that goes to Europe."

R? – This is my tag (Natalia Zinetss – Reuturs)

Natalia Zinetss (Reuturs) “Amid 'gas war' talk, Russia reassures Europe on supply” April 11th, 2014.

Moscow has said it will cut off supplies to Ukraine if it fails to pay what it owes. But Ukrainian Energy Minister Yuri Prodan told parliament the EU would stand by with Kiev to blunt the impact of any cut-off or reduction in supplies to Ukraine. "I want to say again: We do not intend and do not plan to shut off the gas for Ukraine," Putin said in televised comments at a meeting of his advisory Security Council. "We guarantee fulfillment of all our obligations to our European consumers." The stand-off, precipitated by the overthrow of the Moscow-backed Ukrainian president after he rejected closer ties to the European Union, has brought Russia's relations with the West to their most fraught since the end of the Cold War in 1991. In a sign of efforts to calm tempers, aides to EU foreign policy chief Catherine Ashton confirmed a meeting next Thursday involving Russia and Ukraine with Ashton and U.S. officials.

R? – This is my tag (Daniel Yergin – Politico)

Daniel Yergin (Politico) “Daniel Yergin: Vladimir Putin won’t threaten Europe’s gas — for now“ April 3rd, 2014.

“It would be highly counterproductive for Russian interests at a time when Europe is considering how to respond to Russian actions in Crimea, to take steps that would have a major and negative direct impact on Europe,” said Laurent Ruseckas, a senior associate at IHS CERA. Plus, shutting off the gas would deprive Russia of much-needed cash, and Russian state-run gas company OAO Gazprom would lose out on billions of dollars in payments from European countries if it turns off the spigot for a long period of time. Russia may have been willing to trade the prestige garnered from the Sochi Olympics for the strategic Crimean peninsula, but oil and gas revenues matter much more to Russia than figure skating,” the firm ClearView Energy Partners wrote in a research note. Russia still has a powerful grip on Europe’s natural gas supply, providing about 30 percent of European gas consumption in 2013. But Europe is less dependent on pipelines that go through Ukraine than it was in 2006 and 2009, the other instances when Russia shut off gas shipments. In addition, with spring weather moving in, seasonal demand for gas is dropping, making a shortage less likely. And EU countries are sitting on ample gas inventories, Reuters reported.

R? – This is my tag (Neil Buckley – Financial Times)

Neil Buckley (Financial Times) “Gazprom cannot afford another supply shut-off to Ukraine “ April 23rd, 2014.

It knows a third shut-off could finally shred Gazprom’s reputation as a reliable supplier – and inject new vigour into EU attempts to reduce its dependence on Russian gas. That would hit the Russian state, which has 51 per cent of Gazprom’s shares and relies on energy sales for half of state revenues, and shareholders, many of them foreign, who own the rest. Claims that Gazprom is bullying Ukraine are easily made. Since Kiev’s pro-European government took over after Russian-leaning president Viktor Yanukovich was toppled by mass protests in February, Russia has cancelled two price discounts. Much will depend, however, on the military side of the equation. Should Russia invade eastern Ukraine, the damage to Russia’s reputation will be so great that the EU will scurry to find new long-term energy sources even if the gas keeps flowing. If Mr Putin decides geopolitical priorities trump economic ones, the company that a few years ago seemed to be Russia’s golden goose, and its shareholders, risk becoming collateral damage.

R? – This is my tag (Coral Davenport – New York Times)

Coral Davenport (New York Times) “U.S. Hopes Boom in Natural Gas Can Curb Putin” March 5th, 2014.

The crisis in Crimea is heralding the rise of a new era of American energy diplomacy, as the Obama administration tries to deploy the vast new supply of natural gas in the United States as a weapon to undercut the influence of the Russian president, Vladimir V. Putin, over Ukraine and Europe. Mr. Pascual said that although the prospective American exports would not immediately solve the problems in Europe, “it sends a clear signal that the global gas market is changing, that there is the prospect of much greater supply coming from other parts of the world.” Photo A gas pipeline in a village outside Kiev. About 53 percent of all Russian gas exports to Europe pass through Ukrainian pipelines. “This is a radically changed market,” he added. “Our challenge is to look at U.S. production in the global context and understand how we can influence what happens. This will certainly finally teach the Russians what a nasty underhand trick it is to use gas as a political weapon. In the coming years, Gazprom’s influence will be further weakened as American supplies are shipped onto the global market, Mr. Pascual said.

R? – This is my tag (Staff – Reuturs)

Staff (Reuturs) “Europe Less Reliant on Russian Gas through Ukraine” March 3rd, 2014.

A mild winter and improved infrastructure mean Europe and Ukraine are less reliant on Russian natural gas than in past years, easing worries that the escalating crisis in Ukraine could hurt supplies. Analysts said a mild winter across Europe had left storage inventories unusually high, easing the impact of any potential supply cut. They also said improved gas infrastructure meant much of Russia's supplies could go to western Europe via alternative routes, such as the Nord Stream pipeline, which goes through the Baltic Sea to Germany, or through a pipeline that passes Belarus and Poland and also goes into Germany. “Low utilization means Ukraine's gas network is of lesser importance today than in the past,” Bernstein Research said on Monday in a research note. After a mild winter, meteorologists expect early spring to bring warmer-than-usual conditions over most of Europe, implying weak gas demand will continue, adding to already high storage levels. A European Commission spokeswoman said that there was around 40 bcm of gas in the European Union's storage sites, equivalent to almost 10 percent of the bloc's total annual demand. “Europe is better prepared [than in the past,]” said Maria van der Hoeven, Executive Director of the International Energy Agency [IEA] in Brussels.

In 2009, Ukraine was siphoning off gas

Andrew Kramer (NY Times). "Russia Cuts Gas, and Europe Shivers." 6 Jan 2009. www.nytimes.com/2009/01/07/world/europe/07gazprom.html?pagewanted=all

In one sign of the extent of the shutoff, Ukraine’s president, Viktor A. Yushchenko, said Gazprom intended to halt all shipments passing through his country, which account for about 80 percent of Russian gas exports to Europe. Europe, in turn, depends on Russia for 40 percent of its imported fuel.

While each side blamed the other for the scope of the latest drop in gas shipments, Russia’s prime minister, Vladimir V. Putin, had personally announced Monday evening on state television that he was ordering a sharp reduction in gas flows, saying Ukraine was siphoning gas from the pipelines without paying.

#### A2: Pushes Russia to Iran

##### Payvand (which is an Iranian news organization): Three reasons Russia wouldn’t foil an Iranian-US nuclear deal

###### Both the U.S. and Russia want to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons, so it makes sense for Russia to continue working with the U.S. to achieve this goal

###### Russia cooperating with the U.S. on this issue could provide other countries reason to avoid joining U.S. led efforts to criticize Putin over Ukraine

###### Russia actual ability to scuttle a nuclear agreement with Iran is limited.

The U.S. and Iran would not back away from a nuclear deal just because Russia wants it to do so

This move would make Putin look weak and ineffective-which is what he wants to avoid

##### Russia will not strengthen their alliance with Iran or help them subvert sanctions because it would be harmful to themselves

###### Michael Crowley of Time explains that not only would a nuclear Iran create a more unstable Middle East which Russia does not want, as well as the fact that “the failure of diplomacy with Iran would likely lead to the thing Putin hates most: American-led military action.

##### There will never be an alliance between Russia and Iran due to their traditionally negative relationship coupled with the economic harms to Russia if they helped Iran subvert sanctions

###### Suzanne Maloney of the Brookings Institute writes, “Anything is possible, but the anxieties over a newfound economic axis of resistance disregard the realities of the existing Russian-Iranian relationship. It is grounded in mistrust and historical grievances…Both are major energy exporters, and as such indirect competitors. This meant that Russia has been a direct beneficiary of the sanctions that halved Iran's oil exports since 2011, as well as the measures that have helped ensure that Tehran remained only a marginal exporter of natural gas.”

R1 – Three reasons Russia wouldn’t stop an Iran U.S. nuclear deal (Mark N. Katz – Payvand)

Mark N. Katz. “Why Russia Hasn't Played Spoiler to the Iran Nuclear Talks.”   
1) The government of President Vladimir Putin is willing to compartmentalize foreign policy issues. Dramatic disagreement with the U.S. on some issues does not preclude Moscow from cooperating with Washington on others where common interests are involved. Both the U.S. and Russia - as well as many other states - want to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons, so it makes sense for Moscow to continue working with Washington in pursuit of this aim.  
2.) Moscow is working toward a settlement of the Iranian nuclear issue in part to both limit and ameliorate international opposition toward Russian policy vis-a-vis Ukraine. There are quite a few governments that are far more concerned about the prospect of a nuclear Iran than about what Russia does in Ukraine. These include Israel, Turkey, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and perhaps even some West European members of NATO. Moscow's continued serious efforts toward a settlement of the Iranian nuclear issue may provide these states with a convenient rationale to avoid joining U.S.-led efforts to criticize Putin over Ukraine.  
3) Moscow's actual ability to scuttle a nuclear agreement with Iran might be limited.Washington and Tehran, of course, have never lacked reasons for disagreeing with each other in the past. But if a final agreement between the U.S. and Iran over its nuclear program is indeed attainable, neither of these states is going to back away from it at Moscow's behest. Indeed, any Russian effort to prevent a nuclear accord reached by Iran on the one hand and America and its European partners on the other could backfire and result in Moscow looking weak and ineffective - exactly what Putin wants to avoid.

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  |

Russia won’t help Iran subvert sanctions (Michael Crowley – Time)

Michael Crowley (Time), “Obama Officials: Putin Won’t Sabotage Iran Nuclear Talks Over Crimea,” March 20 2014, http://time.com/31205/russia-iran-nuclear-talks-crimea/

And however much he might relish undermining Obama’s grand foreign policy project, blowing up diplomacy with Iran would be self-defeating, for two main reasons.

Reason one is that a nuclear Iran would be bad for Russia as well as America. Countries that belong to the nuclear club tend not to welcome new members, which diminish their strategic advantage. And while Russia has better relations with Iran than does the U.S, remember that the northern tip of Iran is roughly 160 km from southernmost Russia. “Were Iran to develop a nuclear weapon, that weapon would be a whole lot closer to Russia than to many of us,” says a second senior administration official. Moscow also prefers stability in the Middle East (even if, as an oil exporter, it benefits from high crude prices), but an Iranian bomb could spark nuclear programs in Arab countries like Saudi Arabia, with unpredictable results.

Reason two is that the failure of diplomacy with Iran would likely lead to the thing Putin hates most: American-led military action. The promiscuous use of U.S. force was a central grievance in [Putin’s Wednesday speech](http://eng.kremlin.ru/transcripts/6889" \t "_blank) justifying his annexation of Crimea. President Obama has repeatedly warned that he would use force if necessary to keep Iran from developing a bomb—an idea that turns stomachs at the Kremlin: “Attempts to prepare and implement strikes on Iranian nuclear facilities… are a very, very dangerous idea,” Russian foreign minister Sergei Lavrov [said](http://in.mobile.reuters.com/article/worldNews/idINDEE90M08420130123) last January. “We hope these ideas will not come to fruition.”

Russia and Iran don’t trust each other (Suzanne Maloney – Brookings Institute)

Suzanne Maloney (Brookings Institute), “Three Reasons Why Russia Won’t Wreck the Iran Nuclear Negotiations,” March 25 2014, http://www.brookings.edu/blogs/iran-at-saban/posts/2014/03/22-russia-us-tension-sabotage-iran-nuclear-deal

Anything is possible, but the anxieties over a newfound economic axis of resistance disregard the realities of the existing Russian-Iranian relationship. It is grounded in mistrust and historical grievances — much like Tehran's tortured ties with Europe and America. A scan of the Iranian press turns up regular references to the Treaties of Golestan (1813) and Turkmenchay (1828), in which Iran ceded to Moscow its Caucasian territorial claims along with valuable economic prerogatives. Criticisms of more recent vintage focus on Russian foot-dragging in the construction of the Bushehr power plant, and its unwillingness to break ranks with Washington and the rest of the P5+1 or offer anything much beyond rhetorical support on the question of sanctions.

Despite the conventional wisdom that mercantile interests drive Moscow's relationship with Tehran, just the opposite is true. Both are major energy exporters, and as such indirect competitors. This meant that Russia has been a direct beneficiary of the sanctions that halved Iran's oil exports since 2011, as well as the measures that have helped ensure that Tehran remained only a marginal exporter of natural gas. Iranian officials and commentators are keenly aware of the [implicit payoff for Putin's cooperation with Washington](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/17/business/global/russian-oil-industry-set-to-capitalize-if-embargo-hits-iran.html?pagewanted=all" \t "_blank)on this issue.

#### A2: Pushes Russia to China

##### Russia and China do not seem to have a long lasting partnership in the works

###### According to Zack Beauchamp of Vox, “But the idea of a world-changing Russia-China alliance is poppycock. The natural gas deal doesn't augur an anti-American alliance in the near term. Even in the long term, no such alliance is likely.” He explains that this is because even though Russia and China have made this natural gas deal and have extensive military trading, Russia is arming India more significantly, who are one of China’s main competitors.

###### “Russian arms sales to China reveal their relationship for what it is: a shifting partnership where the two states work together when it's in both their interests, but neither hesitates to cut ties when it's not. Neither Russia nor China have really strong reasons to be allies.”

##### Russia sees China as more of a threat than an ally, as they have competing interests

###### According to Aurelia Condrat of the Huffington Post, “Russia doesn’t want to be a real partner for China” because “Russia wants to make sure that China doesn’t become the dominant country in Asia.”

Russia and China don’t have a real partnership (Zack Beauchamp - Vox)

Zack Beauchamp (Vox), “The Big Problems in the Russia-China Relationship Can’t Be Solved by a Gas Deal,” May 23 2014, http://www.vox.com/2014/5/23/5741362/russia-china-pipedream-alliance

But the idea of a world-changing Russia-China alliance is poppycock. The natural gas deal doesn't augur an anti-American alliance in the near term. Even in the long term, no such alliance is likely. Russia and China have a marriage of convenience, not any kind of more durable partnership. And sometimes, that turns into conflict: the two nations see each others as both potential partners and potential threats.

Moreover, there's been a recent slowdown in Russian sales to China. Part of that is about the growth of China's domestic arms industry, but it's also about growing Russian suspicion of Chinese military strength. Russia has cut off some sales of sophisticated ground weapons because it doesn't want China to have a leg up in a land war with Russia. Russian arms sales to China reveal their relationship for what it is: a shifting partnership where the two states work together when it's in both their interests, but neither hesitates to cut ties when it's not. Neither Russia nor China have really strong reasons to be allies

Russia sees China as more of a threat than an ally (Aurelia Condrat – Huffington Post)

Aurelia Condrat (Huffington Post), “Russia-China Gas Deal,” May 27 2014, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/aurelia-condrat/russia-china-gas-deal\_b\_5395214.html

Russia doesn't want to be a real partner for China, that's why I associate this deal with the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact. Russia wants to make sure that China doesn't become the dominant country in Asia, it also wants to be closer to China as a way of pushing back against the US. With this deal, Russia wants to make a point of showing that the US and its NATO partners are in decline.

## Alternatives

#### A2: EU Involvement

##### Washington Post: Russia is anti-West, not anti-NATO

###### US involvement doesn’t avoid any of their harms of NATO

##### Forbes: EU isn’t willing to have meaningful sanctions because of economic links with Russia

###### Sanctions don’t target any companies, business leaders, or broader sectors of the Russian economy

EU can’t agree on sanctions (Raoul Ruparel - Forbes)

Raoul Ruparel (Forbes), “The EU Remains Hopelessly Divided Over Stronger Sanctions On Russia,” April 22 2014, http://www.forbes.com/sites/raoulruparel/2014/04/22/the-eu-remains-hopelessly-divided-over-stronger-sanctions-on-russia/

This is not exhaustive list but highlights that the variety of views in Europe are driven by a variety of factors. Not only will deeper sanctions on the part of the EU require unanimous agreement, but focusing sanctions on specific sectors or firms gets increasingly difficult because they will asymmetrically impact different countries. EU agreement on deeper sanctions is not impossible, but the barriers remain very high and it would require a serious escalation. In the interim, Russia will likely continue to exploit the West’s divided approach.

EU sanctions not effective (Naftali Bendavid - MarketWatch)

Naftali Bendavid (MarketWatch), “U.S., Europe Divided On Russian Sanctions,” April 29 2014, http://www.marketwatch.com/story/us-europe-divided-on-russia-sanctions-2014-04-29

The European Union on Tuesday released a list of 15 more individuals it is hitting with asset freezes and travel bans, including Gen. Valery Gerasimov, chief of Russia's armed forces**. But the bloc declined to act against any companies, business leaders or broader sectors of the Russian economy.**

Some within the EU are complaining that the bloc isn't going far enough. While restrictions have been imposed on various political and military figures, they say, the EU hasn't named a single business leader. The EU should have "at least personal sanctions against the entourage around Putin," Guy Verhofstadt, a leader of the Liberal Party grouping in the European Parliament, said at a debate Monday. "We have not the guts to tackle the oligarchs."

"Europe has a completely different relationship with Russia than the U.S.," said Stefan Meister, senior fellow at the European Council on Foreign Relations. "It is much more economically interdependent with Russia."

"**There will not be any really serious [phase three] sanctions, because EU member states cannot agree, and the Russians know that," said Mr. Meister, who has served as an election observer in both Russia and Ukraine. "We still have an [economic] crisis in Europe, and every country will look for its own interests, and every country has a veto."**

#### A2: US Involvement

##### Washington Post: Russia is anti-West, not anti-NATO

##### US involvement doesn’t avoid any of their harms of NATO

##### George Friedman (Stratfor Global Intelligence): US isn’t willing to have meaningful sanctions

Russia is anti-West (Masha Gessen – Washington Post)

Masha Gessen (Washington Post). "Russia is remaking itself as the leader of the anti-Western world." 30 March 2014. www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/russia-is-remaking-itself-as-the-leader-of-the-anti-western-world/2014/03/30/8461f548-b681-11e3-8cc3-d4bf596577eb\_story.html

President Vladimir Putin would surely beg to differ. Over the past two years, a new ideology has taken shape at the Kremlin. Insistently pushed out over the airwaves of state-controlled television, it has taken hold as Russia’s national idea — and is the driving force behind its newly aggressive international posture. Russia is remaking itself as the leader of the anti-Western world.

U.S. sanctions purposefully ineffective (George Friedman – Stratfor Global Intelligence)

George Friedman (Stratfor Global Intelligence), “The U.S. Opts For ineffective Sanctions On Russia,” April 29 2014, http://www.stratfor.com/weekly/us-opts-ineffective-sanctions-russia

In addition, the United States doesn't want to threaten regime survival in a country with massive military power. Nor does it want to engage in an action that would trigger an invasion of Ukraine and force the United States to either back away or join a war it is unprepared for. It also will try to avoid mistakenly seizing U.S. and European assets -- assets deployed by Russia deliberately to bait Washington into making just such a mistake. The Obama administration has a final major reason to avoid effective sanctions. If someone had said a year ago that U.S.-Russian relations would reach the present point, they would have been laughed at, something I can attest to. Foreign investment is a major component of the U.S. economy, and distinguished political leaders are an excellent source of capital. If you are the leader of China, Saudi Arabia or India, all of which have problems with the United States that could conceivably mushroom, you might think twice before investing your money in the United States. And there are more countries than those four that have potential conflicts with the United States. The U.S. sanctions strategy is therefore not designed to change Russian policies; it is designed to make it look like the United States is trying to change Russian policy. And it is aimed at those in Congress who have made this a major issue and at those parts of the State Department that want to orient U.S. national security policy around the issue of human rights. Both can be told that something is being done -- and both can pretend that something is being done -- when in fact nothing can be done. In a world clamoring for action, prudent leaders sometimes prefer the appearance of doing something to actually doing something.

U.S. has no good military or tactical options (CBS)

(CBS), “Gates: ‘No Real Military Option’ For US in Russia, Ukraine Crisis,” May 12 2014, http://washington.cbslocal.com/2014/05/12/gates-no-real-military-option-for-us-in-russia-ukraine-crisis/

Speaking with CBS News’ “Face the Nation,” the former head of the Defense Department under both Presidents Barack Obama and George W. Bush said that Obama is in a “tough spot” in Ukraine. “In the short term, there’s not a lot we can do,” Gates told CBS News’ Bob Schieffer. He noted that Russia’s annexation of the Crimean Peninsula from Ukraine is a “done deal,” and that the U.S. has “no real military option” in addition to “few tactical options.” Gates reiterated that much of Russian President Vladimir Putin’s foreign policy moves are rooted in Russia’s superpower past. “I think the key to understanding Putin is the past. Vladimir Putin is all about lost empire, lost glory, lost power,” said Gates, noting that when Putin said the Soviet Union’s collapse was one of the largest 20th Century catastrophes, he meant it. “I don’t think [Russian President Vladimir Putin] will rest until there’s a pro-Russian government in Kiev or a federated Ukraine where the eastern part of the country, for all practical purposes, looks to Russia,” Gates said. Gates criticized political gridlock in Washington, saying that if “we can’t get some of our problems solved here at home,” then the “future of this country” itself will become a larger issue than foreign policy matters.

#### A2: UN Involvement

##### Simon Shuster (TIME): Since Russia is a permanent member of the UN Security Council, it can veto any action that the UN would plan to do

##### It did this with the UN’s Crimea resolution against Russia

Russia has UN veto power (Simon Shuster – TIME)

Simon Shuster (TIME). 9 June 2014. "Exclusive: Ukraine’s President Seeks ‘Understanding’ With Russia."

With the annexation of Crimea in March, Russia violated that agreement, and Poroshenko has since become convinced that even the U.N. Security Council is no longer capable of preventing conflict between major powers. “**When one of the veto- holding members of the U.N. Security Council has in effect become an aggressor, that shows that the old system isn’t working**,” he said. This argument came up in his talks with Western leaders last weekend in France, and he said they agreed “without question” about the need for the “global security architecture” to be revised. “The struggle for Crimea is a struggle to prevent such precedents from repeating themselves in the future,” he said. “We can’t allow unpunished aggression.”

Russia vetoed Crimea resolution

Associated Press. "Russia Vetoes U.N. Resolution Invalidating Crimea Referendum." 15 March 2014. time.com/26121/russia-vetoes-u-n-resolution-invalidating-crimea-referendum/

(UNITED NATIONS) — Russia has vetoed a U.N. resolution declaring Sunday’s referendum on the future of Ukraine’s Crimean Peninsula illegal, but its close ally China abstained in a show of Moscow’s isolation.

Supporters of the U.S.-sponsored resolution knew that Russia would use its veto. But they put the resolution to a vote Saturday morning to show the strength of opposition to Moscow’s takeover of Crimea. The 13 other council members voted “yes.”

#### A2: Sanctions

##### Tim’s responses

##### Washington Post: Not causal

##### Russia’s stock market was down 13% before sanctions were even put in place

Moscow stock market on decline before sanctions (Michael Birnbaum – The Washington Post)

Michael Birnbaum (The Washington Post). "U.S., E.U. sanctions on Russians amid Ukraine crisis have little impact on the ground." 29 April 2014. www.washingtonpost.com/world/europe/us-eu-sanctions-on-ukraine-have-little-impact-on-the-ground-in-russia/2014/04/29/c3e72b97-59a9-45d7-91ed-0e939893704b\_story.html

“We believe that [sanctions] can affect Russia’s calculus over time,” a senior administration official told reporters in a background conference call this week. The Moscow stock market is down 13.2 percent for the year, and the ruble is down 7.6 percent against the dollar — but those declines started before any sanctions were announced.

## Irrelevant/Bad Blocks

#### A2: NATO aggression prompts reemergence of Cold War

##### NATO expansion is not actually the cause of Russian aggression

###### Andrew Nagorski of the Daily Beast explains that this is a tale Putin is spinning to “justify his increasingly Draconian rule and his aggressive behavior,” but that it is “nothing else but warmed-over Cold-War Propaganda”

##### Russia does not have the economic or military capacity to expand any further even if he wants to due to Obama’s sanctions which are crippling the Russian economy

###### Greg Satell of Forbes writes, “There is, in fact, very little {Putin} can do besides make threatening noises while Obama’s sanctions erode the Russian economy. And that means trouble. Running an aggressive, authoritarian state takes money.”

NATO aggression not cause of Russian aggression (Andrew Nagorski – Daily Beast)

Andrew Nagorski (Daily Beast), “Putin: The Cold War Comeback Kid,” May 7 2014, http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2014/05/07/putin-is-the-cold-war-comeback-kid.html

“The decisions by the Bush I and Clinton teams to expand NATO laid the seeds of resentment that helped to create Putin and Putinism,” Friedman wrote in a recent [column](http://www.nytimes.com/2014/05/04/opinion/sunday/friedman-its-not-just-about-obama.html?action=click&module=Search&region=searchResults&mabReward=relbias%253As&url=http%253A%252F%252Fquery.nytimes.com%252Fsearch%252Fsitesearch%252F%253Faction%253Dclick%2526region%253DMasthead%2526pgtype%253DHomepage%2526module%253DSearchSubmit%2526contentCollection%253DHomepage%2526t%253Dqry273%2523%252Ftom%20friedman&_r=1" \t "_blank). This echoes the it’s-all-the-West’s-fault standard refrain of Katrina vanden Heuvel and Stephen Cohen, who wrote in *[The Nation](http://www.thenation.com/article/179579/cold-war-against-russia-without-debate" \t "_blank)* last month, that “twenty years of NATO’s eastward expansion has caused Russia to feel cornered.”

The fundamental flaw in that argument is that NATO does not threaten a Russia that is willing to live in peace with its neighbors. The reason the former subjects of the Soviet empire were eager for NATO membership in the first place, of course, was that no one trusted Russia to remain peaceful indefinitely. But one of the byproducts of NATO membership for a country like Poland was its growing willingness to explore a more positive relationship with Russia, allowing historical enmities to fade. Putin’s current course means that’s no longer possible.

If Putin wants to keep spinning that tale in order to justify his increasingly draconian rule and his aggressive behavior, especially with an eye to his weakening economy and the likely long-term erosion of popular support for his government, so be it. But it’s time to recognize that his narrative is nothing else but warmed-over Cold War propaganda. No one should have fallen for it then; no one should fall for it now.

Russia can’t expand because of US sanctions (Greg Satell - Forbes)

Greg Satell (Forbes), “Here’s How Obama’s Russia Sanctions Will Destroy Putin,” April 28 2014, http://www.forbes.com/sites/gregsatell/2014/04/28/heres-how-obamas-sanctions-will-destroy-vladimir-putin/

Perhaps most importantly, it’s hard to see how Putin will prevail.  Ukraine is a big place and occupying it [would take hundreds of thousands of troops](http://www.worldaffairsjournal.org/blog/alexander-j-motyl/could-russia-occupy-ukraine" \t "_blank)—something [Russia can’t afford](http://www.themoscowtimes.com/opinion/article/russia-is-in-no-economic-shape-to-fight-a-war/498728.html" \t "_blank) financially or militarily.   There is, in fact, very little he can do besides make threatening noises while Obama’s sanctions erode the Russian economy.

And that means trouble.  Running an aggressive, authoritarian state takes money.  You need a hefty military budget, a large internal security service, lots of money sloshing around to buy the loyalty of officials and extensive social benefits to keep the populace docile.  Even a brutal, corrupt ruler needs internal support.

#### A2: Russia Previously invaded Georgia over NATO

##### Russia does not even have the desire to invade Ukraine, making these two completely different situations

###### The Russian troops who are holding Crimea won't be sent into Ukraine, Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov says. "We have absolutely no intention of — or interest in — crossing Ukraine's borders."

##### Russia doesn’t need to invade Ukraine in order to further control Ukraine, making this a moot point

###### Russian President Vladimir Putin may be able to annex pieces of Ukraine simply by encouraging unrest among pro-Russian forces inside the country, said Air Force Gen. Philip Breedlove, who commands U.S. and European NATO forces.

##### NATO expansion is not the reason for Putin’s aggressiveness

###### Edward Joseph of The Hill explains that Putin has shown time and time again that he needs absolutely no pretext in order to act aggressively, as most recently evidenced by the Crimea situation

###### Andrew Nagorski of the Daily Beast explains that this is a tale Putin is spinning to “justify his increasingly Draconian rule and his aggressive behavior,” but that it is “nothing else but warmed-over Cold-War Propaganda”

Russia has no plans to invade Ukraine (Bill Chappell - NPR)

Bill Chappell (NPR), “Russia Says it Doesn’t Plan to invade Ukraine,” March 29 2014, http://www.npr.org/blogs/thetwo-way/2014/03/29/296247981/russia-says-it-doesn-t-plan-to-invade-ukraine

The Russian troops who are holding Crimea won't be sent into Ukraine, Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov says. "We have absolutely no intention of — or interest in — crossing Ukraine's borders," Lavrov told a Russian TV station Saturday, according to a translation by [Reuters](http://www.reuters.com/article/2014/03/29/ukraine-crisis-russia-idUSL5N0MQ05B20140329).

Russia can control Ukraine without invading (Sara Sorcher – National Journal)

Sara Sorcher (National Journal), “NATO Commander Says Russia Doesn’t Need to Invade to Take Over Eastern Ukraine,” May 2 2014, http://www.nationaljournal.com/defense/nato-commander-says-russia-doesn-t-need-to-invade-to-take-over-eastern-ukraine-20140502

Instead, Russian President Vladimir Putin may be able to annex pieces of Ukraine simply by encouraging unrest among pro-Russian forces inside the country, said Air Force Gen. Philip Breedlove, who commands U.S. and European NATO forces.

"As little as a week and a half, two weeks ago, I would have put military incursion as the most likely outcome," Breedlove told *National Journal*. "Now, I don't take that option off the table—[Putin] can still use it, his force is imminently prepared to do that—but he may be able to accomplish his objectives with simply the unrest his forces are causing in eastern Ukraine right now."

Putin doesn’t need pretext to invade (Edward Joseph – The Hill)

Edward Joseph (The Hill), “After Crimea, No Avoiding the Georgia Question,” March 14 2014, http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/foreign-policy/200723-after-crimea-no-avoiding-the-georgia-question

Skeptics will argue that the Kremlin can seize on Georgia’s promotion in NATO as the pretext to send Russian forces across Ukraine’s eastern border.  But as his actions in Crimea have shown, Putin hardly needs a pretext to act.  Furthermore, Georgia can be admitted to NATO without any obligation on the part of the alliance to recover the territories now occupied by Russia, a provision that should ease anxieties across the Atlantic and in Moscow.  Rather than provoke Putin, as part of the overall Western response to the Ukraine crisis, granting Georgia’s NATO advancement will restore an overall red line territorial sovereignty while confounding Putin’s strategy of slicing off bits of his neighbors’ territory in order to prevent them from joining NATO and the EU.

NATO aggression not cause of Russian aggression (Andrew Nagorski – Daily Beast)

Andrew Nagorski (Daily Beast), “Putin: The Cold War Comeback Kid,” May 7 2014, http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2014/05/07/putin-is-the-cold-war-comeback-kid.html

“The decisions by the Bush I and Clinton teams to expand NATO laid the seeds of resentment that helped to create Putin and Putinism,” Friedman wrote in a recent [column](http://www.nytimes.com/2014/05/04/opinion/sunday/friedman-its-not-just-about-obama.html?action=click&module=Search&region=searchResults&mabReward=relbias%253As&url=http%253A%252F%252Fquery.nytimes.com%252Fsearch%252Fsitesearch%252F%253Faction%253Dclick%2526region%253DMasthead%2526pgtype%253DHomepage%2526module%253DSearchSubmit%2526contentCollection%253DHomepage%2526t%253Dqry273%2523%252Ftom%20friedman&_r=1" \t "_blank). This echoes the it’s-all-the-West’s-fault standard refrain of Katrina vanden Heuvel and Stephen Cohen, who wrote in *[The Nation](http://www.thenation.com/article/179579/cold-war-against-russia-without-debate" \t "_blank)* last month, that “twenty years of NATO’s eastward expansion has caused Russia to feel cornered.”

The fundamental flaw in that argument is that NATO does not threaten a Russia that is willing to live in peace with its neighbors. The reason the former subjects of the Soviet empire were eager for NATO membership in the first place, of course, was that no one trusted Russia to remain peaceful indefinitely. But one of the byproducts of NATO membership for a country like Poland was its growing willingness to explore a more positive relationship with Russia, allowing historical enmities to fade. Putin’s current course means that’s no longer possible.

If Putin wants to keep spinning that tale in order to justify his increasingly draconian rule and his aggressive behavior, especially with an eye to his weakening economy and the likely long-term erosion of popular support for his government, so be it. But it’s time to recognize that his narrative is nothing else but warmed-over Cold War propaganda. No one should have fallen for it then; no one should fall for it now.

#### A2: Crimea deserves self-determination

##### President of Russia’s Council on Civil Society and Human Rights: The turnout of Crimean voters was only 30 percent, and of that only 50 percent voted for the referendum. This means that only 15 percent of Crimean citizens voted for annexation. NATO: The referendum violates Ukraine’s constitution, as any issues concerning altering the territory of Ukraine have to be resolved by the Ukrainian parliament.

###### A self-proclaimed Crimea leadership group that was installed by armed Russian military personnel organized the referendum in Crimea.

R1 – Only a small percentage of Crimeans voted for annexation (Paul Roderick Gregory – Forbes)

Paul Roderick Gregory (Forbes). “Putin's 'Human Rights Council' Accidentally Posts Real Crimean Election Results.” May 5th, 2014.  
As you may recall, the official Crimean election results, as reported widely in the Western press, showed a 97 percent vote in favor of annexation with a turnout of 83 percent. No international observers were allowed. The pro-Russia election pressure would have raised the already weak vote in favor of annexation, of course.  
Yesterday, however, according to a major Ukrainian news site, TSN.ua, the website of the President of Russia’s Council on Civil Society and Human Rights (shortened to President’s Human Rights Council) posted a report that was quickly taken down as if it were toxic radioactive waste. According to this purported report about the March referendum to annex Crimea, the turnout of Crimean voters was only 30 percent. And of these, only half voted for the referendum–meaning only 15 percent of Crimean citizens voted for annexation.

R2 – The vote violated Ukraine’s constitution (NATO)

NATO. “Russia’s accusations- setting the record straight.” April 2014.

Russian officials claim that the so-called referendum in Crimea on 16 March was legal.

The referendum was illegal according to the Ukrainian constitution (available in Ukrainian here, Russian here, English here), which states that questions “of altering the territory of Ukraine are resolved exclusively by an All-Ukrainian referendum. Crimea, as part of Ukraine, has the status of an autonomous republic, but any issues about its authority have to be resolved by the Ukrainian parliament (article 134) and its constitution has to be approved by the Ukrainian parliament (article 135).

Additionally, the so-called referendum was organized in a matter of weeks by a self-proclaimed Crimean leadership that was installed by armed Russian military personnel after seizing government buildings.

#### A2: NATO expansion increases US heg in a bad way

##### US heg isn’t increased since NATO doesn’t make decisions without a general consensus

###### All countries in NATO would have to agree on the level of involvement; it’s not unique to the United States

##### It’s better to have the United States have an increased amount of control rather than Russia continuing to be aggressive and expanding its power.

R? – This is my tag (Author – Institution)

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

This is my evidence.

#### A2: Russia has a right to Ukraine (ethnic Russia)

##### Even if there are Ukrainians who feel they should be a part of Russia, it’s not as if Russia can just come in and claim that land. If there are certain parts of Ukraine that Russia feels it has a right to, it has to attempt to stake its claim diplomatically and in a proper fashion.

###### Russia violated Ukraine’s constitution with its attempted annexation of Crimea

##### Radio Free Europe Radio Liberty: Only 17.3% of Ukrainians actually identify themselves as Ethnic Russians

###### Only 50% of Crimeans even voted to become a part of Russia (30% turnout rate)

###### Furthermore, only 29.6% say Russian is their first language

###### Russia doesn’t have a claim to Ukraine if such a minority of the country view themselves as Ethnic Russians

##### Stephen Blank (American Foreign Policy Council): The Russians have a loose interpretation of what it means to be an ethnic Russian

###### They can say it’s if you speak Russian or even that if you lived in Russia and it’s your native language you can be a citizen

###### Russians are manipulating the parameters of what it means to be an ethnic Russian to their advantage

##### Michael Quigley (Defense One): Sets precedent that Russia can invade all these other countries

R2 – Only 29.6% of Ukrainians speak Russian as their native language (Radio Free Europe Radio Liberty)

Radio Free Europe Radio Liberty. “Ukrainians Who Identify As Ethnic Russians Or Say Russian Is Their First Language.” June 2nd, 2014.



Only 17.3% of Ukrainians see themselves as ethnic Russians (Radio Free Europe Radio Liberty)

Radio Free Europe Radio Liberty. “Ukrainians Who Identify As Ethnic Russians Or Say Russian Is Their First Language.” June 2nd, 2014.



R3 – Russians have a loose interpretation of what it means to be an ethnic Russian (National Geographic Daily News)

National Geographic Daily News. “Ethnic Russians: Pretext for Putin's Ukraine Invasion?” May 2, 2014.   
"First of all, what constitutes 'ethnic Russians' in Ukraine?" asks Stephen Blank, a senior fellow with the American Foreign Policy Council. "The Russians have played fast and loose with this: Sometimes they mean Russian speakers. Or there is also the new Russian citizenship law that says if your grandparents lived in Russia and Russian is your native language, you can be a Russian citizen."

R3 – Not being involved would set a bad precedent (Michael J. Quigley – Defense One)

Michael J. Quigley (Defense One). “NATO Expansion Will Put Russia in Its Place.” April 2nd, 2014.

Putin must not be allowed to make demands with a metaphorical gun at the head of the West. His adventurism in Georgia was justified as “protecting Russian nationals” – the same excuse for interfering in Crimea. Russia’s flagrant disregard for peaceful international mechanisms to address concerns establishes a pattern of regional bullying that cannot be ignored. Clearly, other places in the region that are home to Russian speakers are at risk. Transdniestria, a break-away province of Moldova along the border with Ukraine, may well be the next strategic objective in Putin’s campaign to casually redraw the map of Europe.  
A norm broken once is an anomaly, but a norm broken twice risks becoming a replacement. Thankfully, we have the means to reassure Russia’s neighbors. NATO, initiated by leadership from President Barack Obama, must bring Georgia into the fold via the Membership Action Plan. This would send a message to Moscow and demonstrate to other countries that the hard work of reform pays off. Furthermore, Western leaders should accept expansion for Macedonia and Montenegro at the NATO Summit this September in Cardiff, Wales.

#### A2: Cannot afford involvement

##### Michael O’Hanlon (Foreign Affairs): NATO could deter Russia for $5B over 5 years (not a lot)

##### The resolution asks if NATO should help, not whether or not it will. Even if it would come at a high to cost to the countries’ economies, it is still enough to show that if NATO did become involved, then further Russian aggression would be deterred.

##### Our case literally shows you way its worth to spend the money for NATO to assist Ukraine

NATO troops could easily deter Russia (Michael O’Hanlon – Foreign Affairs)

Michael O’Hanlon (Foreign Affaris), “NATO After Crimea,” April 17 2014, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/141227/michael-ohanlon/nato-after-crimea

At this point, NATO cannot afford to allow Putin to harbor any doubts about its other commitments to its allies. By basing troops in the Baltics, it can show its strength in a way that doesn’t provoke a major war over a non-NATO member.

There will be those in the United States who will argue against yet another American military deployment at a time when the United States is economically strapped and militarily overextended. But stationing permanent forces in the Baltics need not be a major burden. Because of the small size of the deployment, for example, it would not threaten the Obama administration’s rebalance to Asia. To be sure, there would be additional one-time costs associated with building new and durable bases in the Baltics. A reasonable proxy for the expenses might be the sum associated with moving a comparable number of U.S. marines from Okinawa to new facilities in Guam in coming years, which is estimated to be in the range of $10 billion. There may be less expensive ways to manage in the Baltics. But even a $5 billion cost, spread over five years, would be modest by Pentagon standards, especially considering that the stakes -- stability in Europe -- are so high.

It is still worth hoping that it doesn’t come to this. But if it does, the United States and NATO will have a straightforward, proportionate, and effective military response ready and waiting.

R2 – Canada has helped out with troop training and other initiatives before (Ottawa Citizen)

Ottawa Citizen. “Canada, NATO allies to consider military deployment over Ukraine.” April 16th, 2014.   
It’s unclear to what degree Canada and other governments are willing to contribute militarily to help bolster Eastern Europe in the face of Russian aggression. Canada has previously helped train forces and bolster capabilities in surrounding countries during crises in Mali and Syria, and has provided non-lethal equipment to militaries in Central America. Similar high-level efforts in Poland, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia would likely be inexpensive and involve little risk.

#### A2: Membership Bad

##### Ukraine’s membership to NATO would effectively create a geographic barrier between Russia and Europe

##### According to Rick Rozoff of the Voltaire Network, “The acquisition of Ukraine as a full NATO member… has been seen as the decisive linchpin in plans by the U.S. and its NATO allies to effect a military cordon sanitaire severing Russia from Europe.”

##### Russia would be weakened by Ukraine membership to NATO

##### Alex Berezow of Forbes explains that Ukraine should be fast-tracked to NATO membership because “A Ukraine fully integrated into the West is what Mr. Putin fears the most. The West should make it clear that its goal is to accomplish that sooner rather than later.”

Ukraine Membership to NATO would create geographic barrier for Russia (Rick Rozoff – Voltaire Network)

Rick Rozoff (Voltaire Network), “NATO’s Incremental Absorption of Ukraine,” April 26 2014, http://www.voltairenet.org/article183470.html

The acquisition of Ukraine as a full NATO member or even as it now is, a partner lending its territory, troops and general military assets to the alliance, would, with the likely prospect of Finland being enlisted in tow, cover the entire western flank of Russia from the Arctic Ocean and Barents Sea in the north to the Black Sea in the south with NATO air bases, naval docking facilities, firing ranges and training grounds, airfields, radar installations, storage compounds, cyber warfare centers, interceptor missile batteries, armored vehicles, troops and tactical nuclear weapons. **Ukraine is and for decades has been seen as the decisive linchpin in plans by the U.S. and its NATO allies to effect a military cordon sanitaire severing Russia from Europe.**

Russia would be weakened by Ukraine membership to NATO (Alex Berezow - Forbes)

Alex Berezow (Forbes), “How Should U.S. and NATO Respond to Russia Over Ukraine?” March 3 2014, http://www.forbes.com/sites/alexberezow/2014/03/03/how-should-u-s-and-nato-respond-to-russia-over-ukraine/

Fast-track Ukraine to NATO and EU membership. A Ukraine fully integrated into the West is what Mr. Putin fears the most. The West should make it clear that its goal is to accomplish that sooner rather than later.